#### CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this chapter, the writer analyzes verbal disagreement strategies which are used by Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law in the film *Meet the Fockers* based on Locher's theory (2004). Then the writer also analyzes about the differences and similarities of verbal disagreement strategies that are used by Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law. The data are presented in the tables and they show the strategies used by Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law.

Toward his father, Greg uses six of eight types of verbal disagreement strategies to show his disagreement: hedges, giving personal or emotional reasons for disagreeing, shifting responsibility, stating objection in the form of question, the use of *but*, and non-mitigated disagreement. The verbal disagreement strategies which are not found in Greg's utterance toward his father is modal auxiliary and repeating an utterance by a next or the same speaker.

While toward his future father-in-law, Greg uses sevent of eight types of verbal disagreement: hedges, giving personal or emotional reasons for disagreeing, modal auxiliaries, stating objection, the form of question, the use of *but*, and non-mitigated disagreement, and repeating an utterance by a next or the same speaker. The verbal disagreement strategies which are not found in Greg's utterances toward his father-in-law is shifting responsibility.

Table of verbal disagreement strategies used by

Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law

No.	Utterances	Categories of Disagreement Strategies							
		Н	PR	MA	SR	О	В	R	NM
1	Greg toward his father	1	V	-	$\sqrt{}$	V	$\sqrt{}$	-	$\checkmark$
2	Greg toward his future father-in-law	1	V	1	1	V	√ 	<b>V</b>	V

## Note:

H = the use of hedges O = objections in the form of question

PR = personal or emotional reasons B = the use of but

MA = modal auxiliaries R = repetition of an utterance

SR = shifting responsibility NMD = non mitigating disagreement

# 4.1 Types of verbal disagreement strategies produced by Greg toward his father

This part discusses about the analysis on verbal disagreement strategies produced by Greg toward his father which happens in the movie. The verbal disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father are hedges, giving personal or emotional reasons for disagreeing, shifting responsibility, stating objection in the form of question, the use of *but*, and non-mitigated disagreement.

**4.1.1 Hedges** 

The use of hedges which may "soften the impact of negative statement

(Locher, 2004). In general, Greg applies hedges to soften his disagreement

toward his father's satement. The power of father, which is higher than the

son, makes it possible to use this category. Since father has to be respected,

Greg keeps trying to respect his father by sometimes using softer ways to

show his disagreement. It is shown in datum below.

Datum 1

Bernie

Oh, little baby. How are you, Little Jack?

Greg

: (a.4) Just talk to him like a person

Greg disagrees to his father's statement which is talking to Little Jack

with infant language. Since Jack told him to talk to Little Jack like talking to

a person, Greg tells his father the same thing. He shows his disagreement by

using just in order to soften his disagreement, and even gives a solution for it,

that is to talk to Little Jack like a person.

4.1.2 Giving personal or Emotional Reasons for Disagreeing

Locher (2004) stated that giving personal or emotional reasons for

disagreeing means using subjectivity of a disagreement to protect both

speakers' and the addresse's face. Greg uses personal or emotional reasons

when he disagrees over his his father's statements but he may be unable to

find any logical reason to disagree, or he wants to save his father's face. To

respect his father, Greg keeps trying to protect his father's face when he disagree with him.

#### Datum 2

Bernie : Gay, you are just in time to hear me tell the gang how you lost

your virginity to Isabel.

Pam : You s-slept with Isabel?

Bernie : We were relieved.

Greg : Why-why would you, why – why would you bring that up?

Bernie : What's the problem?

Greg: (a.11) It was, what, 15 years ago

Greg reacts to his father's statement which is revealing his old story with Isabel. Greg uses a personal reason by saying it was 15 years ago which means for Greg, it is an old story so it is not necessary to talk about that thing. He tries to make people become sympathetic to him by using emotional reason so that his reason of disagreeing becomes accepted.

# 4.1.3 Shifting Responsibility

Shifting responsibility is a strategy when the speaker excludes the third person in her/his disagreement to spread responsibility. Usually the speaker will prefer use pronouns such as *they* or *you* to use *we* or *I*. Greg uses shifting responsibility when he disagree over his father's statements which seems to blame him, when he dose not want to be included in his father's mistakes, or when he does not want to be considered the one who has to be responsible. His closeness to his father makes Greg spread responsibility with his father

without considering his father's face. The writer gives a datum to define shifting responsibility used by Greg toward his father.

### Datum 3

Bernie: Hey!There you are. What the heck is that contraption?

I thought you guys were flying in tonight

Greg : I left a message yesterday. We were driving - -

Bernie : oh, I didn't get a message

Greg : (a.1) I left you like five messages

Greg replies to his father's statement who is surprised of Greg and the Bryness' (his future father-in-law's family) early coming. His father siad that he did not get any message. Then, Greg shows his disagreement by using *you*, which refers to his father, to show that he is irresponsible about that thing since he is sure that he has left messages in his father's answering machine.

# 4.1.4 Stating Objection in the Form of Question

In this strategy, the speaker stated the objection in a form of question to express the disagreement to the addresse which means using questions with disagreement that requires a clarification from the addresser to the addressee (Locher, 2004). Greg uses question to show objections when he disagree about his father's statements and he seeks his father's clarification about it. The writer provides a datum to explain the objection in a form of question used by Greg toward his father.

Datum 4

Bernie : Gay, you're just in tme to hear me tell the gang how you lost your

virginity to Isabel

[Bernie] He was 19. A late bloomer Pam : You slept with Isabel?

Bernie : We were relieved

Greg : (a.10) Why-why would you, why – why would you bring that up?

Greg reacts to his father who just revealed about his old story with Isabel. Since he disagree about that idea, he tries to show his disagreement toward his father. He asks why is father would have brought about that story up. He shows his disagreement in the form of questions so that his disagreement objection is stated less directly and it softens the FTAs.

**4.1.5** The use of *but* 

When *but* occured within the turn of the same speaker, it was used to indicate disagreement with a previous speaker's utterances or to give an evaluation of the speaker's own contribution. Greg uses *but* what he wants to give an evaluation or further explanation of his disagreement. The writer provides a datum to clarify the use of but used by Greg toward his father.

Datum 5

Bernie : Most people? Since when do you care about most people?

Greg : (a.8) I don't, but Jack is really into winning and competition and

sports

Greg's father suspects that Greg has been changing in his ways of thinking, so he asks Greg since when he cares about most people. Since he does not feel he is like that, Greg disagrees about his father's statement by

saying that he does not. However, the one who is like that is Jack. Greg uses

but in order to give an evaluation of his denial of his father's accusation.

4.1.6 Non-mitigated Disagreement

Locher (2004) stated that non-mitigated disagreement is there is no

additional booster used to show the disagreement. Non-mitigated

disagreement can occur in context where it is more important to defend one's

point of view than to pay face considirations to addressee. Another possible

motivation for using no-mitigated disagreement startegies is the wish to be

rude, disruptive or hurtful. To clarify non-mitigated disagreement used by

Greg toward his father, the writer provides data below.

Datum 6

Bernie: Hey, we got him, didn't we, dude, huh? Was he impressed?

: (a.17) No, Dad, he wasn't. That was a really hard shot. You

could've hurt him

Greg disagrees about his father's action for attacking Jack in the

football game. His father thinks that he has done a good job by showing that

he is stronger than Jack. Then, Greg gives a reason by saying you could've

hurt him which means that it is possible that his father's action could have hurt

Jack even though it does not really happen

4.2 Types of verbal disagreement strategies produced by Greg toward his

future father-in-law.

This part discusses about the analysis on disagreement strategies produced by

Greg toward his future father-in-law which happen in the movie. The

disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law are hedges,

giving personal or emotional reasons for disagreeing, modal auxiliaries, repeating

utterances by the next or the same speaker, stating objection in the form of

question, the use of but, and non-mitigated disagreement.

**4.2.1 Hedges** 

Greg applies hedges to soften his disagreement toward his future father-

in-law's statement. Since his future father-in-law is distant from him and

Greg respects him a lot, Greg tries to soften his disagreement toward his

future father-in-law. To define hedges used by Greg toward his future father-

in-law, the writer provides a datum below.

Datum 7

Jack

: What did you do, Focker?

Greg

: Nothing. He ... (b.3) I think he has to poop

Greg disagrees with his future father-in-law who seems to suspect him

in everything he does. Greg shows his disagreement toward his future father-

in-law by using hedges I think followed by a reason as an excuse for not

being suspected.

## 4.2.2 Giving Personal or Emotional Reasons for disagreeing

Greg uses personal or emotional reasons when he disagrees with his future father-in-law's statement but he still has to save his future faher-in-law's face. Since his future father-in-law is distant from him and Greg has to respect him, Greg tries to respect future father-in-law by protecting his future father-in-law's face when he disagrees with him.

#### Datum 8

Jack

: Well, in these uncertain times, Greg, I opted for a Kevlar-reinforced hull with two inch thick. Plexiglas windows, just like the ones they design on the Russian Widowmaker submarines. I want you to conduct a field tet for us, Greg. I want you to demonstrate the impregnable outer skin of the coach. Throw it at the window.

Greg : Oh Jack, (b.1) I'm not gonna throw a brick at your window

Greg reacts to his future father-in-law who tells him to do a test of the impregnable outer skin of his future father-in-law's coach. He disagrees about his future father-in-law's idea. Greg uses a personal reason by saying *I'm not gonna throw a brick at your window* which is used by Greg to point the subjectivity of his disagreement. Greg says maybe because of his respect to his future father-in-law so that he is afraid of doing inappropriate things, like *throwing a brick at his future father-in-law's window*, although his future father-in-law tells him so. However, Greg's personal reason can protect both his face and his future father-in-law's face. His future father-i-law's face is saved because Greg does not deny his future father-in-law's statement. However, Greg still able to show that he disagrees with the idea.

#### 4.2.3 The Use of Modal Auxiliaries

The next category is the use of modal auxiliaries to soften disagreement (Locher, 2004). Greg uses modal auxiliaries to soften his disagreements toward his future father-in-law's statement. Due to the distance, Greg tries to soften his disagreement toward his future father-in-law. The writer gives a datum in order to explain modal auxiliaries used by Greg toward his future father-in-law.

### Datum 9

Jack : Well, in these uncertain times, Greg, I opted for a Kevlar-

reinforced hull with two inch thick plexiglas windows, just like the ones they design on the Russian Widowmaker submarines. I want you to conduct a field test for us, Greg. I want you to demonstrate the impregnable outer skin of the coach. Throw it at the window,

Greg : Oh Jack, I'm not gonna throw a brick at your window

Jack : It's a simple demonstration

Greg : (b.2) I'd - I'd really rather not

Greg disagrees with his future father-in-law who forces him to check the impregnable outer skin of his coach by throwing a brick at its window. Greg shows his diagreement toward his future father-in-law by using *would rather*, modal auxiliary of preference. He says that he would really rather not to do it. Actually, he use *would* to soften his disagreement toward his future father-in-law.

## 4.2.4 Repeating Utterances by the Next or the Same Speaker

The next category used is repeating an utterance by a next or the same speaker which means continuing and supporting the previous speaker's view

or the current speaker's own view (Locher, 2004). Greg uses repetition of the next or the same speakers when he wants to emphasize his view. Greg tries to seek for other peoples statement and support it, or sometimes repeats his own statement to convince his future father-in-law that his future father-in-law is not right.

#### Datum 10

Greg: What are you holding? What's in your hand?

Jack : Nothing

Greg : Jack, I can see it in the mirror(b.13) what is it?you get something

in your hand

Greg disagrees over his future father-in-law's action which seems to be weird. Greg has seen that his future father-in-law is holding something in his hand and he suspects what the thing is. Firstly, he asks about it. However, his future father-in-law denies it by saying it is nothing. Then, Greg shows his disagreement toward his future father-in-law by repeating again his previous statement which asks what the thing is.

## 4.2.5 Stating Objection in the Form of Question

In this strategy, the speaker stated the objection in a form of question to express the disagreement to the addressee. Although his future father-in-law is distant from him, Greg is sometimes still brave to seek for clarification of what his future father-in-law has said. To give an example of objection in the form of question used by Greg toward his future father-in-law, the writer provides data.

Datum 11

Jack : Yes, it is. You seem tense. I was going to ofer you a sedative

Greg : (b.14) You're Jocking right?

Greg disagrees over his future father-in-law's action which seems to be

weird. Greg shows his diagreement toward his future father-in-law by asking

him, whether he is joking or not, to seek for clarification of his future father-

in-law's weird action.

**4.2.6** The Use of *but* 

When but occured within the turn of the same speaker, it was used to

indicate disagreement with a previous speaker's utterances or to give an

evaluation of the speaker's own contribution. Greg uses but what he wants to

give an evaluation or further explanation of his disagreement. The writer

provides data to explain the use of but used by Greg toward his future father-

in-law.

Datum 12

Bernie : There is something you don't see every day

Jack : Focker! Focker!

Greg : Okay. (b.6) I know this looks bad, but I can explain it

Greg's future father-in-law is angry because something terrible

happened with his grandson. Since he does not feel I that he has to

responsible with that thing, Greg admits his fault. However, Greg uses but in

order to disagree about his future father-in-law's accusation which seems

accusing him irresponsible with his future father-in-law's grandson.

4.2.7 Non-mitigated Disagreement

Non-mitigated disagreement can occur in context where it is more

important to defend one's point of view than to pay face considirations to

addressee. Another possible motivation for using non-mitigated disagreement

strategies is the wish to be rude, disruptive or hurtful. Although his future

father-in-law is distant from him, Greg sometimes still threatens his future

father-in-law's face in showing disagreement. To clarify non-mitigated

disagreement used by Greg toward his future father-in-law, the writer

provides the data below.

Datum 13

Jack : Did you have a nice conversation with your son?

Greg : Jack, I've never even met that kid before

Jack : Focker, you've been covering this up from the very beginning Greg : (b.11) No, I haven't, Jack. It's just another one of your crazy

theories.

Greg rejects a statement come from his future father-in-law. His future

father-in-law accuses him that he hides a secret from Pam which he has a son.

Greg disputes what his future father-in-law's said. He uses direct

disagreement by using no and followed any emphasize to show his

disagreement to his future father-in-law.

# 4.3 The Differences and Similarities of the Verbal Disagreement Strategies Used by Greg toward his Father and his Future Father-in-law.

After discussing the verbal disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law, the writer will show the differences and similarities of the verbal disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law. For further explanation, the writer discusses any differences and similarities of each category of verbal disagreement strategies used by Greg one by one in the next part.

The writer uses the table below to help her easily in showing the differences and similarities of the verbal disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law.

Table 4.3 The frequency of verbal disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father and his future father-in-law

Variable		Categories of Disagreement Strategies								
variable		Н	PR	MA	SR	О	В	R	NM	
Greg to his	Т	2	3	0	3	5	1	0	13	
father	%	7.40	11.11	0	11.11	18.51	3.70	0	48.14	
Greg to his future father in	Т	1	4	1	0	2	1	1	7	
law	%	5.88	23.52	5.88	0	11.76	5.88	5.88	41.17	

Note:

H = the use of hedges O = objections in the form of question

PR = personal or emotional reasons B = the use of but

MA = modal auxiliaries R = repetition of an utterance

SR = shifting responsibility NMD = non mitigating disagreement

The analysis shows the occurance of verbal disagreement strateges used by Greg in their conversation toward his father and his future father-in-law. The table above shows that Greg as son uses different strategies toward his father and his future father-in-law. Toward his father, Greg uses hedge is in the fifth position (7.40%). Moreover, in disagreement toward his future father-in-law the use of hedges is in the fourth position (5.88%). It shows that toward older people Greg still put respect to them so that the use of hedges in order to soften the disagreement is still frequent.

In disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father, giving personal or emotional reasons is in the third position (11.11%). However, in disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law is in the second position (23.52%). Actually, the use of personal and emotional reasons in both of them shows that Greg uses subjective disagreement which protect both speakers' and addresses' face, which means Greg still put respects toward older people by not irritating them.

In disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father, the writer didn't find that Greg uses modal auxiliaries category. However, in disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law is in the fifth position (5.88%). It is a common fact that older People, have higher power than younger

people. That is why Greg seems to put higher respect to his future father-in-law, so he tries to polite by softening his disagreements.

In disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father, the use of shifting responsibility is in the fourth position (11.11%). However, in disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law, the use of shifting responsibility is not found at all. This happen possibly because Greg is afraid of his future father-in-law so that he is afraid of "blaming" or spreading responsibility with his future father-in-law. It shows that Greg seems to put higher respect to his future father-in-law, or he is distant from him, so he is afraid of using this strategy.

In disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father, the use of stating objection in the form of question is in the second position (18.51%). However, in disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law, the use of stating objection in the form of question is in the third position (11.76%). It shows that Greg is more put higher to his future father-in-law than his father, it's because since he is distant from his future father-in-law. Using this strategy makes his disagreements formulated less directly and helps him to soften the FTAs.

In disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father, the use of *but* is in the sixth position (3.70%). However, in disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law, the use of *but* are in the sixth position (5.88%). It can be seen this category is rarely used toward both Greg's father and his future father-in-law. This happens possibly Greg tries his best to avoid using this category as his disagreement strategy, since the use of *but* might how any FTAs or

might show softened FTAs. It seems that he tries to play safe by not using this strategy.

In disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father, the use of repeating an utterance by a next or the same speaker category is not found at all. However, in disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law, the use of repeating an utterance by a next or the same speaker category is in the seventh position (5.88%). this happen possibly because Greg tries his best to minimize the use of this strategy.

In disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his father, the use of non-mitigated disagreement is in the first position of the frequency of the usage (48.14%). Moreover, in disagreement strategies used by Greg toward his future father-in-law, the use of non-mitigated disagreement is also in the first position (41.17%). As Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (2003) said that although men are not status conscious, which makes them do not really care about their personal relationships including impact of FTAs, showing disagreement directly is actually the easiest way to show disagreement. It does not always mean that it is used to show impoliteness but sometimes it has to be used so that people directly understand that there is a disagreement from others.

Based on the above explanation, it can be seen that Greg uses softer disagreement strategies more often toward his future father-in-law. It means that toward a more distant person, Greg uses softer disagreement strategies. Moreover, the differences in races between his family (American-Jewish) and his future father-in-law (American) seems to make his father and his future father-in-law's

point of views different. This might result in the different disagreement strategies used by Greg toward them. Greg's father, who is an American-Jewish believes that home is where people learn about hapiness and wholesomeness so that his relationship with Greg is close (Feder, 2011). This make Greg sometimes brave, even he seems harsh toward his father. However, as American who are famous of their individuality and high respect to privacy, the relationship of the Bryness is distant from one another, and so does to other people who do not belong to the family. This makes Greg is afraid of threatening his future father-in-law's face so that will not be considered impolite or disrespectful by his future father-in-law.

In conclusion, the writer found that social distance factor influences Greg's choice of verbal disagreement strategies toward both his father. It can bee seen from the result that non-mitigated disagreement strategies is used the most by Greg to show his disagreement toward both his father and his future father-in-law. Greg still shows his directly without paying attention to the FTAs. From the result, shifting responsibility category is not used by Greg to his future father-in-law. This is probably because of the distance between Greg and his future father-in-law so that Greg is afraid of using this strategy. Moreover, Greg does not use repetation of an utterance by a next or the same speaker to show his disagreement toward his father. This is probably because he has lower power than his father so he tries to show his respect to his father.