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A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF DISAGREEMENT ACT IN THE FAULT IN OUR STARS MOVIE

Dwiansari Ramadhani
11211144027

ABSTRACT

This research aims to examine and describe the types of disagreement acts employed in The Fault in Our Star movie, identify the way certain types of disagreement acts are expressed, and reveal the reasons for using certain types of disagreement acts in the movie.

This research employed a descriptive qualitative approach. The data of the research were in the form of utterances that were spoken by the characters in The Fault in Our Stars movie. The context of the research was the dialogs of the movie. Meanwhile, the main data source of this study was a movie script of The Fault in Our Stars. The primary instrument of this study was the writer herself who was involved in the whole process of data collection and data analysis. The researcher conducted note-taking to collect the data and employed content analysis to analyze the data. The data were triangulated by verifying to the expert lecturers and other students about the relevant theories and the findings to enhance trustworthiness.

The results of this research are as follows. First, there are two types of disagreement acts found in the movie. They are mitigated disagreement acts and unmitigated disagreement acts. The mitigated ones become the main type of disagreement acts performed by the characters. Second, each type of disagreement acts is realized in some ways. Mitigated disagreement acts are realized by (1) the use of hedges, (2) the use of modal verbs, (3) question objection, (4) objective explanation, (5) personal emotion, (6) changing topic, (7) shifting responsibility, (8) in-group identity marker, and (9) token agreement. Meanwhile, unmitigated disagreement acts are realized in the form of (1) a short direct of opposite orientation, (2) sarcastic remark, and (3) a short rude question. Objective explanation becomes the most used realization because the characters want to minimize biased information. Third, there are eight reasons for performing certain disagreement act strategies in the movie. Those reasons are categorized by analyzing the setting and the situation of the conversations depending on their contexts. The reasons that can be found are because the character is (1) showing uncertainty about his/her own idea, (2) respecting the first speaker, (3) refusing the first speaker’s judgment, (4) showing off authorities, (5) prohibiting the first speaker to do an action, (6) making an excuse of the initial statement, (7) avoiding the topic of conversation, and (8) criticizing the first speaker’s statement. The most appeared reason is because the characters are refusing the first speaker’s judgment as a result of entirely different arguments between two speakers.

Keywords: disagreement acts, types, realizations, reasons, The Fault in Our Stars
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Language is the most important aspect in human life for people to communicate to each other. People use language in everyday’s life either spoken or written because it is one of people’s ways to express their minds, feelings, ideas, and emotions. When there are two persons or more in a certain situation, it is almost impossible for those people to interact to each other or to do something without communication. For instance, it is almost impossible for a doctor to interact with his patient without talking to one another as the doctor needs a brief explanation of complaint from the patient before he could give any diagnose and medicine. They must have conversation so that their messages could be delivered to one another.

There is always structural pattern in conversation. It means that when a person says an utterance which is considered as the first part, the addressee will say the next act as the second part which is expected or unexpected by the first person. The former is called preferred response while the later is called dispreferred response. The preferred responses are in the form of agreement and acceptance, while the dispreferred responses are in the form of disagreement, refusal, and declination. George Yule (1996: 82) in his book Pragmatics states that the expression of a dispreferred response represents distance and lack of
connection. It happens when the second person does not give an expected answer to what is being expected by the first person. It could arouse problems if the dispreferred response is not delivered properly by the second person. This phenomenon inevitably happens in daily life.

One of the forms of dispreferred responses is disagreement act. Sifianou (2012: 1554) states that disagreement can be defined as the expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker. When two or more people communicate and express their opinions, it is inevitable that they may have different opinions and say their disagreement. For example, a boy asks a girl to a date tomorrow. Actually, the girl does not like the boy but she does not want to hurt the boy’s feeling. She tries not to say a direct answer as a ‘no’ to the boy but she gives explanations and reasons why she is not available tomorrow instead. In fact, what the girl has stated is one of the forms of disagreements as disagreement acts could be delivered through several different ways. This kind of act then could make a difficult and unpleasant situation even might risk threat.

Conversation can be as natural as people’s daily interaction but it can also be arranged first. For instance, there are a director and a script writer who manage all the dialogue of the characters in a movie. Indeed, it is not a natural conversation as the participants of the conversation have known what would be responded by others. It is different from natural conversation in which people who are in the midst of
conversation do not know what others will respond to their question or argument. They could only expect and guess.

However, movies represent the daily life condition. What happen in a movie could also happen in daily life so that it can be mirror to the real world phenomena. The differences would be on the way those conversations happen. In daily life, people do not arrange what they will utter. It would be according to the topic they are discussing. Meanwhile, in a movie, the conversation would be arranged and planned first by the director. However, the fact is that every situation and the way people communicate would be the same. They exchange ideas to communicate through language.

The choice of a movie script as the subject of the study is made up upon the consideration that the dialogue is within limited time and that it contains preference structure to be analyzed. The dialogue that is being analyzed is from a movie entitled *The Fault in Our Stars* which is adopted from a novel of the same title by John Green. It was directed by Josh Boone and released on June 6, 2014 in the United States. It receives several awards and nominations afterward. The main plot of the movie starts when Hazel Grace Lancaster (Shailene Woodley), a teenager who is diagnosed having thyroid cancer, meets Augustus Waters (Ansel Elgort), a teenager who has lost one of his legs from bone cancer, in a cancer patients’ support group. They travel to Amsterdam together with all of their weaknesses. During the trip, the relationship between Hazel and Augustus grows from friendship to love.
The writer chooses *The Fault in Our Stars* as the subject of analysis because it has some problems containing disagreement expressions. They are reflected in a movie like in a real setting of natural daily conversation. Despite its high rating, the movie also gives values for people of all ages; it attracts people’s sympathy toward a love line between two sick young fellows who are enthusiastically doing what they think they have to do before dying. Thus, it is very interesting to be discussed.

**B. Research Focus**

In *The Fault in Our Stars* movie, several problems can be identified from the dialogues. First, the utterances produced by the characters contain speech acts in indicating that those utterances do not only use correct grammatical structures and words but also perform actions. Those speech acts could be analyzed through the conversation in the movie since there are many different kinds of speech acts found in the dialogue; those speech acts are declaratives, representative, expressive, directives, and commissives.

Second, the emergence of maxim flouting in the dialogue makes the characters obey the cooperative principles that people should avoid in order to maximize understanding between people in a conversation. It occurs when the characters in the movie does not really pay attention to the context of the question in which they are asked about. The cooperative principles that elaborate four sub-maxims such as quantity, quality, relation, and manner should be applied in a conversation so that it reaches certain purpose or direction.
Third, the emergence of disagreement act in dispreferred responses found in the dialogue of the movie. It happens when the characters of the movie have dispute or different argument with the others. The disagreement acts occur for several times in the movie as they are used by the characters to show their own feeling or ideas. Thus, from the numerous issues that could be analyzed, this research only focuses on identifying the disagreement acts in the movie. The use of disagreement act becomes interesting to be analyzed because there are several disagreement responses found in the dialogue that construct a more problematic movie.

To be more specific, the researcher makes some limitations. The researcher analyzes the responses of each conversation. The responses are varied; they could be an agreement or a disagreement. The researcher only focuses on disagreement responses and reveals how they are delivered. It could be a question and a statement. The researcher concentrates on three problems based on the occurrences of disagreement acts; those problems can be formulated as follows.

1. What are the types of disagreement acts employed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie?
2. How are the types of disagreement acts expressed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie?
3. What are the reasons that influence the characters to use certain types of disagreement acts in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie?
C. Research Objectives

Based on formulation of the problems, the objectives of this research are:

1. to examine and describe the types of disagreement acts employed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie,

2. to identify the way certain types of disagreement acts are expressed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie, and

3. to reveal the reasons that influence the characters to use certain types of disagreement acts in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.

D. Research Significance

This research is expected to give some contributions both theoretically and practically.

1. Theoretically, this research is expected to be beneficial to enrich knowledge for the development of linguistic study for students within the same major.

2. Practically, the results of the research are expected to show many kinds of disagreement responses. It is useful for people who want to show their disagreements in a polite way so that they do not hurt somebody’s feeling. In addition, it would increase people’s awareness about disagreement acts that might be used by others so that they could prevent any misinterpretation in understanding the interaction.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter discusses the literature review that contains several theories used to help the researcher conducting and writing this research, brief description of *The Fault in Our Stars* movie as the subject of the study, and previous studies related to the topic of this research. In addition, this chapter also explains conceptual framework and analytical construct of the research.

A. Literature Review

1. Pragmatics

   This study employs Pragmatic approach in analyzing the data. Pragmatics is the study of meaning. To study pragmatics, people need to not only understand the language as a communication tool but also consider the context and conditions in which the language is used considering who the speaker is talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances. Then, pragmatics can also be described as the study of contextual meaning (Yule, 1996: 3).

   Pragmatics has some topics of discussions. One of them is the study of speech acts. It deals with utterances and contexts since it describes as actions performed via utterances (Yule, 1996: 47). The language used by the speaker would be interpreted by the hearer who should notice the context of the utterance. There are three related acts in the action performed by producing an utterance (Yule, 1996: 48). They are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. The concept of an
Illocutionary act is central to the concept of a speech act. J. Mey in his book *Pragmatics* (2001: 163-168) adapts classification of illocutionary acts from Searle; they are representatives (assertive), directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

Besides speech act, there are also cooperative principles and implicature in pragmatics’ scope. When a listener hears the expression of the speaker, she/he first has to assume that the speaker is being cooperative and intends to communicate something. That something must be more than just what the words mean. It is an additional conveyed meaning called an *implicature* (Yule, 1996: 35). In order for the implicature to be interpreted, some basic cooperative principles must first be assumed. The assumption of cooperation can be stated as a *cooperative principle* of conversation and elaborated in four sub-principles called *maxims*. Grice (in Yule, 1996: 37) divides those kinds of maxims into four categories; they are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

The other topic in pragmatics is the study of politeness. The study of disagreement is also often explored using politeness theory which is introduced by Brown and Levinson. Yule in his book *Pragmatics* states that politeness, in an interaction, can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face. Face refers to the public self-image of a person that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize (Yule, 1996: 60). There are two types of politeness; they are positive and negative politeness. Positive politeness refers to the appeal to share common goals and even friendship via expression (Yule, 1996: 64).
Meanwhile, negative politeness means respects to the hearers who need to be independent, have freedom of action, and not be imposed by others (Cutting, 2002: 45).

In politeness, there are two concepts that are relevant to the theory of disagreement acts: FTA (Face Threatening Act) and FSA (Face Saving Act). According to Yule (1996: 61), if a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual’s expectations regarding self-image, it could be referred as an FTA. Meanwhile, the FSA means when some action might be interpreted as a threat to another’s face, the speaker can say something to lessen the possible threat.

2. Conversation Analysis

In his book An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Wardhaugh (2006: 298) states that conversation is a cooperative activity that involves two or more parties, each of whom must be allowed the opportunity to participate. Consequently, there are some principles which govern the turn who gets to speak, i.e., principles of turn-taking. According to Yule (1996: 72), turn-taking is any situation where control is not fixed in advance but anyone can attempt to get it. Turn-taking also applies in variety of circumstances, on the telephone or face to face interaction, as long as it is conducted by at least two participants regardless of the length of utterances.

A turn-taking might cause a slight overlapping of speaking during the transition between turns when one person speaks at the same time with the other who thinks that it is him/her to be the one whose turn to speak. Overlap is the condition
that both speakers are trying to speak at the same time (Yule, 1996: 72). However, there are several ways of signaling that speakers use in indicating a turn-point in turn-taking such as the use of words or expressions, the pitch level of voice, and directing gaze to the listener. Within a turn-taking, there are also some possibilities that might happen as well such as occurrence of pauses and backchannels. The latter is a condition when the hearers give signals to indicate that they are still listening to the current speaker.

3. Adjacency Pairs

In every conversation, there are always automatic patterns within its structure. Those patterns are called adjacency pairs which is a study dealing with conversation sequence in conversation analysis. The sequence consists of a first part and second part. The first part that is uttered by the first speaker always creates an expected answer that is followed by the second speaker. The answer of the second speaker is the second part. It always happens within the same pair. Yule (1996: 77) illustrates the adjacency pair in the format below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Pair</th>
<th>Second Pair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.  A. What time is it?</td>
<td>B. About eight-thirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. B. Thanks.</td>
<td>B. You’re welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. C. Could you help me with this?</td>
<td>B. Sure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sequence for number (i) is a question-answer, number (ii) is a thanking-response, and number (iii) is a request-acceptance. Those sequences would happen only if the second speaker produces the-should-be-answer. For instance, a request basically would be answered by an acceptance as the second part. When the second
speaker produces a refusal instead, then the pair would fail and the first speaker does not get the answer that she/he has expected. The concept of second pair part is always correlated with the concept of preference structure.

According to Bilmes (1988: 161), preference is treated as a single concept in conversation analysis but it has developed into a compilation of some related concepts. Yule (1996: 133) makes an easy explanation related to preference saying that preference is a pattern in which one type of utterance will be more typically found in response to another in a conversational sequence. For instance, the first part of a conversation that contains a request or an invitation will more typically make an expectation that the second part will be an acceptance than a refusal. This structure is called preference structure. This concept is originally-proposed by Sacks in his lectures in April, 1971.

He gives a brief example of how the preference structure is automatically made of. He sets an example of a preferred use in a dinner invitation. The first part of the preference structure is the invitation itself, then the second part would be an acceptance or a refusal. He also emphasizes on his explanation that preference in this notion is not about whether someone likes one thing more than the other in the sense of comparison (Sacks in Bilmes, 1988: 162-163). Here is the example:

A : “Are you free tonight? I’d like you to come to my house for dinner. My Mom has cooked a very delightful beef steak for us.”
B : “Wow, it sounds interesting. I like beef steak so much!”

In the conversation above, A is giving an invitation (namely the first part/pair) and B is giving an acceptance (namely the second part/pair). B’s answer is the
expected-response that A wants to hear. However, B could probably give an unexpected response by refusing A’s invitation such as “Wow, it sounds interesting. I’d love to but I have already had an appointment with my lecturer”. Thus, the second pair or part of the preference structure is divided into two acts; they are preferred second part and dispreferred second part.

Levinson (1983: 336) states that given a structural characterization of preferred and dispreferred turns we can then correlate the content and the sequential position of such turns with the tendency to produce them in a preferred or dispreferred format. For example, a disagreement of assessment and proposal would always be in a dispreferred format. Meanwhile, an agreement of such kinds of first part is always be in a preferred format. The table below indicates the consistent match between the format and the content of first part and second part in a conversation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Part</th>
<th>Second Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer/Invite</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Expected Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>Denial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Yule (1996: 79) also makes a table named ‘the general patterns of preferred and dispreferred structures’ following Levinson. He presents the general patterns in a different way as in the following table.
Table 2. The general patterns of preferred and dispreferred structures (following Levinson 1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Part</th>
<th>Second Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Dispreferred Second Part

Due to the fact that this paper only explores about disagreement which is one of kinds of dispreferred response, the dispreferred second part would be explained more. According to Levinson (1983), on the basis of linguistic markedness, dispreferred/marked second have more material and structurally more complex compared to preferred/unmarked second, namely delay components and various degrees of structural build-up. Dispreferred second part is mostly followed and/or preceded with different kinds of structural complexity. Yule (1996: 80) has provided an example to ease the understanding.

Cindy : So chiropodists do hands I guess.
Julie : Em—well—out there—they they mostly work on people’s feet.

In the conversation above, Julie’s statement indicates dispreferred response since the preferred one is an answer such as ‘Yeah’ or ‘I think so’. Julie’s response is marked with hesitation as there is an indication of delay such as ‘em’ plus pause (—). After that, she produces a preface ‘well’ which indicates disagreement will come to follow it. There is also a stumbling repetition which is shown as a word ‘they’ is produced twice. The overall effect is that Julie is having difficulty while uttering her
disagreement toward Cindy. The example above is one of examples of dispreffered response namely disagreement of assessment. Besides it, there are also other kinds of dispreferred seconds like rejections of requests, refusals of invitation, admission of blames, disagreement of proposal, and declination of offers.

5. Disagreement Act

a. Definition

As stated by Sifianou (2012: 1554), disagreement can be defined as the expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker. When two or more people communicate to each other, there is always possibility that the disagreement will appear. It is because people have several different opinions in their minds and the second speaker does not think or argue the same with the earlier speaker. Due to the fact that disagreement perceptions might lead into conflict, people normally will delay his/her disagreeing response. It is usually marked with silence, preface, or hesitation. However, some people often state their disagreements directly as stated in the example below.

R : …well never mind. It’s not important.
D : Well, it is important.  
(Pomerantz, 1984: 74)

In the conversation above, D responds R’s idea by delivering a sentence which is on the contrary with what R has stated. According to Pomerantz (1984: 74), disagreement types are differentiated as strong and weak. She adds that a strong disagreement happens when a conversant delivers his/her statement which is contrastive with the prior statement. It occurs in turns when disagreement
components are not combined with agreement components. Thus, the example above is an example of a strong disagreement as D responds R by stating ‘it is important’ which is contrastive with R’s prior statement saying ‘it is not important’.

Meanwhile, a week disagreement happens when agreement components accompany disagreement components. It is also marked by the use of mitigation components in the expressions to soften the effect of disagreement acts.

When a person does not directly answer what the earlier speaker has said, it can be ensured that he/she will disagree because some seconds of silence can indicate that the person who will respond is thinking what he/she should answer to avoid any verbal conflict as he/she has an opinion contrary to the previous speaker. Thus, there would be any gap between the first utterance and the second utterance. Disagreement studies are also examined in relation to politeness theory which is introduced by Brown and Levinson. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 66), disagreement belongs to acts that threaten the positive face-want by indicating that the speaker does not care about the addressee’s feelings or wants.

The disagreement act itself occurs when a first speaker initiates an assessment. The first assessment always invites one or more actions which is structured to be a judgment, invitation, offer, proposal, or request. Thus, the second speaker or the recipient will either agree or disagree with the initial assessment; the second speaker’s utterance could be a preferred response or dispreferred one. The disagreement act is considered as dispreferred response.
b. Types of Disagreement Act

1. Mitigated Disagreement Act

Panic-Kavgic (2013: 449) states that mitigated verbal disagreements are disagreements whose potential face-threatening force has been softened or minimized. It employs mitigating strategies for avoiding straightforward disagreement. This type of disagreement strategies is mainly used by native speakers of English. In addition, Pomerantz and Sacks in Liddicoat (2007: 198) state that disagreements tend to be sentenced in mitigation form and they usually come late in the turn.

[Lunch]
Joy : The new paint job is an improvement isn't it.
Harry : *Yeh tiz b' d I don' really like the colour.*

(Liddicoat, 2007: 120)

In the conversation above, Joy says to Harry about his opinion toward the new paint which is good enough for him. However, Harry does not give the expected answer to Joy’s first assessment. He gives his disagreement instead, saying that he does not really like the color. Thus, in avoiding a strong effect that might cause a conflict, he utters his disagreement in a ‘yes-but’ form which can be called as a token agreement. A token agreement is one of strategies used by people in expressing their disagreement using mitigation tools. The other mitigation tools are the use of hedges, the use of modal verbs, etc. They would be discussed more in the chapter of expressions of disagreement act.
2. Unmitigated Disagreement Act

The other type of disagreement strategies is the ones which omit the mitigation tools in the sentence. Different with native speakers, English non-native speakers tend to use unmitigated disagreement when delivering their disagreements. While native speakers use the mitigated ones which have more complex expressions, the non-native express disagreement in a linguistically simple manner (Kreutel, 2007: 5). They use mitigation devices less frequently. According to Kreutel (2007: 7), non-native speakers often express undesirable features such as message abandonment, lack of mitigation, use the performative I disagree, bare exclamation no, and blunt statement of the opposite. Sometimes, it could be interpreted as harsh or rude because it is more direct in uttering people disagreements.

A : And that happened last year.
B : That happened this year.
A : Last year. Cuz I was in the sixth grade then. (Goodwin, 1983: 663)

The example above shows a conversation between two children who are arguing about something happened before that they both did know. First, A gives the first assessment that is directly disagreed by B. Accepting B’s responses, A answers B’s accusation again. In this conversation, both A and B do not use mitigation tools in expressing their disagreements. They use short direct of opposite statements to show that their arguments are strong disagreements. Thus, unmitigated disagreements could be referred to strong disagreements.
c. Expressions of Disagreement Act

There are several ways of expressing disagreement whether using mitigation tools or not. When a person uses mitigation tools, he/she tries to soften their disagreement expression. These mitigation tools are also varied; the variation is differed by the use of linguistic features in each utterance such as the use hedges, discourse markers, modal verbs, identity markers, etc.

1) Mitigated Disagreement Act

a) The Use of Hedges

Meanwhile, Kreutel (2007: 12) supposes that both native and non-native speakers appear to employ a greater use of hedges. Hedges, as defined by Yule (1996: 130), are cautious notes expressed about how an utterance is to be taken, used when giving some information. Therefore, according to Goody (1987: 117), hedges could be used to soften FTAs of suggesting, criticizing, and complaining by blurring the speaker’s intention. The use of hedges that are frequently used such as well, just, I think, and I don’t know (Locher, 2004: 117-124).

Peter : Well I wasn’t always. … It has been a year. How long does he expect us to wait?
Susan : I think it’s time to accept the fact that we live here. It’s no use pretending any different.

(The Chronicles of Narnia, 2007)

In this context, Susan uses hedges ‘I think’ to indicate that she has a different opinion with Peter who thinks that it has been long time enough since they are in Narnia. In the contrary, Susan believes that they should have accepted
that they currently live in the real world. Beside well, just, I think, and I don’t know, hedges are often expressed by the use of fillers such as hesitation and pauses.

b) The Use of Modal Verbs

According to the British Council, modal verbs are used to show if we believe something is certain, possible or not possible, talking about ability, asking permission, making requests, etc. It includes can, may, shall, will, could, might, should, and would. It is used as markers of putative and tentative meaning (Panic-Kavgic, 2013: 450).

Susan : Why can’t you just walk away?
Peter : I shouldn’t have to! Don’t you ever get tired of being treated like a kid?

(The Chronicles of Narnia, 2007)

In the example above, Peter uses one example of modal verb ‘should not’ to indicate that he himself does not totally agree with Susan’s question that contains a suggestion to Peter to just avoid the fight.

c) Question Objection

According to Kreutel (2007: 4), giving requests for clarification to the previous speaker’s statement is a strategy to help ‘buying time’. Thus, it softens the FTA by its delay.

A : Don’t act like you know something about me, okay?
B : What do you think those kids need…to make them believe, to give them hope? You think they need another drug-dealing cop or do you think they need a fallen black hero?

(Panic-Kavgic, 2013: 450)
In the conversation above, B disagree with A’s statement. It can be seen that B does not express his/her disagreement directly but he/she gives a long objection in a question to make A uncertain about the statement he/she has stated.

**d) Objective Explanation**

People are having hard times when they deliver their disagreement expressions as it might cause conflict talk. Thus, in avoiding the conflict, people often give their objective explanation and the reason why they disagree with the previous speaker, by means of providing unbiased information on relevant causes (Panic Kavgic, 2013: 450).

Council Member 2 : You go too far, Miraz! You expect us to stand by while you blame such a blatant crime on fairytales?

Miraz : We forget, my lords. *Narnia was once a savage land. Fearsome creatures roamed free. Much of our forefather's blood was shed to exterminate this vermin. ... Or so we thought. But while we've been bickering amongst ourselves, they've been breeding, like cockroaches under a rock. Growing, stronger, watching us. Waiting to STRIKE!*  
*(The Chronicles of Narnia, 2007)*

In the conversation above, although Miraz is a cruel and a greedy King, he wants to get a good impression from the council members who are in charge in making decision with him. Thus, he ensures the council members who do not believe in the existence of the Narnians by giving some objective explanation of the facts about Narnia and its creatures so that the council members believe him.
e) Personal Emotion

Locher (2004: 127) states that people give personal or emotionally colored reasons for disagreeing to indicate that the speakers ‘cannot help feeling the way they do’.

A : You’re snapping at me!
B : I’m not snapping at you! I am angry. (Panic-Kavgic, 2013: 451)

In the example above, B directly shows his/her disagreement by stating the opposite mark of the previous utterance which is delivered by A. Then, B adds his/her expression of disagreement by giving his/her own personal emotion as well so that A can feel what B feel about A’s sentence.

f) Changing Topic

Changing topic is shown by shifting the other issue which is unrelated or irrelevant to the previous issue that is discussed by the previous speaker as seen in the example below.

A: I want the locks changed again in the morning.
B: You want… Why don’t you just go lie down? Have you checked on James? (Panic-Kavgic, 2013: 451)

It is concluded that A has a higher position than B. When A wants to change the locks, B changes the topic instead by asking A to just go lie down and check on James. B, who disagrees with A, does not want to change the locks which are good enough for him but he does not want to say it directly to A as he knows it might cause her feel offended.
g) **Shifting Responsibility**

It is a strategy that forces the interactants being not responsible for what they are reporting (Locher, 2004: 130).

Nikabrik : See? I told you we should’ve killed him!
Trufflehunter : *You know* why we can’t!

*(The Chronicles of Narnia, 2007)*

In the conversation above, Trufflehunter wants to make Nikabrik sure that Nikabrik’s statement is not true because it is only his own judgment. Trufflehunter states his disagreement by giving the ‘point-of-view’ distancing as labeled by Brown and Levinson (1987: 204-206).

h) **In-group Identity Marker**

In group identity markers can also be mentioned as first-name address. This strategy employs a positive politeness strategy to indicate an informal relationship between the first and second speakers and to increase the degree of friendliness (Panic-Kavgic, 2013: 451).

Nikabrik : Well, I don’t think I hit him hard enough.
Trufflehunter : *Nikabrik*, he’s just a boy!

*(The Chronicles of Narnia, 2007)*

It might be concluded that Nikabrik and Trufflehunter are best friends in this context. Thus, as a best friend of Nikabrik, Trufflehunter wants to warn him that what he has done is too much by spelling out Nikabrik’s name as an indication of friendship.
i) **Down-toning the Effect of Statement**

Down-toning the effect of any statements means giving a lower degree of the intensity or importance of the statements. The example below shows how this strategy works in mitigating a disagreement expression.

A: I’m seriously starting to think that you are jealous of Karen.

B: *Hardly*. I’d just like to see you get through a meal without calling her or anyone else.

(Panic-Kaygic, 2013: 452)

The conversation above shows how the strategy of down-toning the effect of statement can be used to mitigate disagreement. When A proposes an idea that might be hard to be accepted by B, B states his disagreement by down-toning the effect of A’s assessment by saying ‘hardly’ in his preceding answer. In this context, B does not really agree with A but he does not make it totally wrong as well.

j) **Token Agreement**

Pomerantz (1984: 72) states that there is a way to preface the disagreement which is by agreeing with the first speaker’s position first. When the agreement component and the disagreement component are included within the same turn, they would be conjoined using a contrast conjunction like “but”. People use this kind of strategy in the way of telling why they disagree with the assessment when they have to agree. Although both agreement and disagreement components are presented in the same turn, it is always used for disagreeing rather than agreeing (Pomerantz, 1984: 75).

Becky : Come over for some coffee later.
Wally : Oh—eh—I'd love to—but you see—I—I’m supposed to get this finished—you know.  

(Yule, 1996: 81)

In the example above, after producing a preface ‘oh’ and a hesitation ‘eh’, Wally agrees Becky’s statement by uttering ‘I would love to’ which is kind of token agreement aiming to appreciate the first speaker. However, he also follows his utterance by telling ‘but’ which is a contrast conjunction indicating that he is not totally agree. This kind of expression can be accomplished to state something that is not literally said but gets communicated (Yule, 1996: 81). The disagreement expressions that occur in the agreement-plus-disagreement turns are not strong. They are called weak disagreements.

2) Unmitigated Disagreement Act

a) A Short Direct of Opposite Orientation

According to Goodwin (1983: 669), more aggravated types of disagreement can be produced by omitting any prefices to soften the effect. It is used to show an immediate disagreement that the second speaker thinks it is very important to be delivered. Goodwin has provided an example of this kind of strategy using a short direct of opposite orientation.

A: You didn’t have to go to school today, did you.  
B: Yes *we did have to go to school today.*  

(Goodwin, 1983: 669)

In the example above, B wants to directly disagree with A’s statement. Though B precedes the answer using ‘yes’ statement, B then follows it with his argument which is disagreement to A’s previous assessment. The effect of
opposition marker ‘yes’ is to emphasize the entire utterance as having opposite meaning in relation to the preceding assessment (Goodwin, 1983: 669).

b) **Sarcastic Remark**

As defined by Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, sarcasm is the use of remarks which clearly mean the opposite of what they say, which are made to hurt someone’s feelings or to criticize something in a humorous way. According to Stoker (2012), sarcasm is used to communicate disagreement with something that the other person do, think, or propose. It will also make the first person who makes the first assessment ultimately look bad.

A: Hannah, it was 25 years ago, and it wasn’t an affair.
H: *Oh, don’t insult my intelligence.*

(Panic-Kavgic, 2013: 454)

The example which is given by Panic-Kavgic shows a really clear explanation on how sarcasm can give a bad effect on disagreement. This type of strategy is considered impolite, harsh, or even rude because it is not combined with any mitigation devices.

c) **A Short Rude Question**

The other type of disagreement act that omit mitigation devices in the expression is directly stating a short rude question. It threatens people’s face. The example would be as follows.

Charlotte: Oh, Lord, Noah, let the boy alone.
Noah: *Let him alone?*

*(Oliver Twist, 2005)*
The example is taken from a dialogue in *Oliver Twist* movie. In this context, Charlotte asks Noah to just let Oliver alone by not bothering him anymore but he does not seem that he wants to. It is because Noah hates Oliver so much like a foe. Thus, in showing his strong disagreement with Charlotte’s assessment, he uses a short rude question by repeating Charlotte’s initial statement.

**d. Reasons for Using Certain Disagreement Acts**

Despite of the users of disagreement acts, English’ native speakers or the non-native ones, there are also several reasons why people use certain types of disagreement act. People use mitigation tools when uttering their disagreements could be caused by their doubt for their own idea. They do not agree with the prior statement yet they also are not really sure about their own opinions which are different from what they oppose. The other reason could be because of the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. Here is the example:

A : I believe the reason why Pablo leaves for this company is because he gained lower income in his previous company.
B : Or they do not provide weekly interpersonal training for the workers.

In the example above, Boss A gives his opinion about a new worker named Pablo (the first assessment). The worker B then delivers his mitigated disagreement by explaining his objective explanations or reasons for disagreeing by means of providing on relevant causes, consequences or circumstances (Panic Kavgic, 2010: 450). His objective explanation ‘*they do not provide weekly interpersonal training for the workers*’ functions as a mitigation device that softens the effect of disagreement. Worker B wants to respect his boss by
delivering the mitigated disagreement because he knows that if he uses a strong disagreement, his boss will get mad or feel like he is being disrespected.

Another reason that people use certain types of disagreement act is when the topic of discussion deals with someone’s personal belief or about highly controversial topics. Therefore, revealing the reason behind conversation can be gained through understanding the meaning of utterances carefully. The meaning of utterances can be found out through the context of conversation. It is used to interpret speaker’s action.

6. The Fault in Our Stars Movie

**Figure 1. The Fault in Our Stars Movie Poster**

*The Fault in Our Stars* is a film directed by Josh Boone and based on a novel of the same title by John Green. There are several characters which include Hazel Grace Lancaster (Shailene Woodley) as the main female lead and Augustus Waters (Ansel Elgort) as the main male lead in the movie.

The movie which genre is an American romantic comedy-drama mostly sets in America and Amsterdam, the capital city of the Netherlands. The story
centers on Hazel Grace Lancaster, a girl teenager who is diagnosed having thyroid cancer that has spread to her lungs, and Augustus Waters, a boy teenager who has lost one of his legs from bone cancer, who meet in a cancer patients’ support group. Since they have met for several times either in the group or in each house, they become closer.

One day, they travel to Amsterdam in order to meet Hazel’s favorite mysterious author, Peter Van Houten who writes her very favorite novel entitled *The Imperial Affliction*, to ask about the novel’s ambiguous ending. Hazel is very curious about the ending as it tells about a cancer girl which is similar to her own experience. During the trip, the relationship between Hazel and Augustus grows from friendship to love.

After its release date which is on June 6, 2014, in the United States, it receives a positive reception from critics. It becomes number one at the box office during its opening weekend and receives several awards and nominations afterwards.

7. Previous Studies

The researcher analyzes the disagreement acts in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. To prove that this research is original and not only copying from other previous research, the researcher also presents the relevant studies similar to this topic. The researcher took a journal and a master dissertation as references in conducting this research. Both of the researches below have different results because there are also differences in the subject and the theme of the study.
The first research is an article written by Karen Glaser from Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany, entitled “Acquiring Pragmatic Competence in a Foreign Language – Mastering Dispreferred Speech Acts” in 2009. In her research, Glaser analyzed the comparison of expressing disagreement between English’ native speakers (NS) and the Non-native speakers (NNS) of English via Discourse Completion Test (DCT). She emphasizes on the importance of teaching disagreement strategies for any language learners who aim to be proficient in the foreign language. It is very helpful for the non-native speakers to avoid ‘social errors’ and avoid any misunderstanding. Some features of nativelike disagreement realization are beneficial to be included in the English as Second Language (ESL) or the English as Foreign Language (EFL) teaching such as token agreement, hedging, pausing, request for clarification, suggestions, and explanations.

The second research is a master dissertation conducted by Sonia Shabaka Fernandez from English Linguistics, Faculty of English Philology, entitled “The Linguistic Realization of Disagreements by EFL Egyptian Speakers” in 2013. Her paper is aimed to investigate disagreement strategies in different context and she divides the analysis section into four parts. In other words, the aims of Shabaka’s master dissertation are to explore the disagreement strategies employed by Egyptian speakers of English in social network site Facebook, to analyze the type of strategies used depending on the method of data collection, to analyze the kind of strategies displayed by Egyptian speakers of English and America in a DCT
(Discourse Completion Test), and to identify the role of *topic* in the employment of disagreement strategies.

She finds that the non-native speakers of English do not employ simple and unmitigated disagreement strategies. The Egyptians and Americans both employed similar strategies although the Egyptians tend to use mitigated disagreement expressions like token agreement and hedges; their disagreement is structured in the form of “sandwich pattern” which had been referred as a native-speaker characteristic (Kreutel, 2007). Shabaka adds, in her last part of her analyses, that *topic* has proved to play a crucial role in determining the kind of disagreement strategies that the participants use.

Compared to the article and dissertation, there are some differences between those previous research and this research. First, the previous research use Discourse Completion Test (DTC) as the object of the research while this research uses *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. Second, the two previous research analyze the comparison between native speaker and non-native speaker of English in producing disagreement act strategies. Meanwhile, this research analyzes the types, realizations, and reasons of disagreement acts which are employed by the characters of the movie.

**B. Conceptual Framework**

Firstly, *The Fault in Our Stars* movie as the main source of the research is analyzed using pragmatic approach. The research applies this approach since it discusses the speakers’ meaning behind their utterances and reveals strategies in
using the linguistics tools that people use in delivering their messages. Therefore, the utterances of the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie become the core points of this research. Meanwhile, the analysis is focused only on the disagreement acts within the utterances that could be found in the movie. The disagreement acts that would be explored are their types, realizations, and the reasons why the characters use a certain disagreement.

There are some types of disagreement strategies that can be used by people. This research is conducted based upon the categorizations of disagreements by Locher. In his book entitled *Power and Politeness in Action: Disagreements in Oral Communication*, he categorizes varieties of disagreement realizations into mitigated disagreement and unmitigated disagreement. Furthermore, each type of disagreement strategy is realized in various expressions. Mitigated disagreements can be realized in the use of hedges, the use of modal verbs, question objection, objective explanation and reason, personal emotion, changing topic, shifting responsibility, in-group identity marker, and down-toning the effect of statement. In addition, the use of token agreement by Pomerantz is also used. Meanwhile, unmitigated strategies are expressed by the use of a short direct of opposite orientation, sarcastic remark, and a short rude question. The types and realizations of each type of disagreements are analyzed to reveal the reasons behind the use of those certain expressions.

Thus, the researcher provides a systematic way in the form of analytical construct to conduct the analysis. The analytical construct is presented in Figure 2.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Type

Before conducting research, a researcher needs to decide a research design to make his/her research specific and understandable. According to Creswell (2009: 3), a research design is the procedures used by the researcher to decide detailed methods of data collection and analysis. In short, it is a plan or proposal to conduct research. He added that a study tends to be qualitative than quantitative or vice versa. Besides them, there is also mixed method research that is a combination of the elements of both approaches. Meanwhile, according to Vanderstoep and Johnson (2009: 7), there are two types of research approach that could be done; they are quantitative and qualitative research. Quantitative research is an approach which identifies the phenomena under study in numerical data. Qualitative research is an approach to describe the phenomena under study in narrative descriptions.

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach because it describes and analyzes the phenomena of the study in narrative descriptions. This type is conducted to observe attitudes and behaviors during the investigation including their meanings according to specific context. Furthermore, qualitative research is an interpretative research since it identifies reflexively biases, values, and personal background that should be interpreted by the researcher (Creswell, 2009: 177). Thus, the focus of this
research is to get a deeper understanding of disagreement acts based on certain contexts found in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.

**B. Form, Context, and Source of Data**

The data of the research were in the form of utterances that were spoken by the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. The context of the research was the dialogs of the movie. Meanwhile, the main data source of this study was a movie script of *The Fault in Our Stars* that was directed by Scott Neustadter and Michael H. Weber. The movie script was downloaded from [http://gointothestory.blcklst.com/free-script-downloads/](http://gointothestory.blcklst.com/free-script-downloads/).

**C. Research Instruments**

In conducting the research, the researcher needed some instruments that help her in working on this research. The primary instrument of this study is the writer herself who is involved in the whole process of data collection and data analysis. It is relevant with what had been stated by Creswell (2009: 175), that the key instrument of a research is the researcher him/herself. He/she should gather information by him/herself instead of only using other instruments from other researchers. The secondary instruments which were used to support the primary instrument of this study are a data sheet and some writing equipment such as a notebook and a pen. They were used to note the disagreement acts found in the script of *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.
The data sheet containing a table of each type of disagreement acts and their realizations was used to help the researcher classify and analyze the data easily, which is presented in the table below.

**Table 3. The Example of Data Sheet of Types, Realizations, and Reasons of Disagreement Acts in The Fault in Our Stars Movie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UD/oo/C/00:15:12</td>
<td>Dr.Maria: She’s depressed. Hazel: I’m not depressed!</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In this datum, there is a type of the disagreement acts of unmitigated disagreement in the form of a short direct of opposite orientation. When Dr. Maria judges Hazel that she’s depressed, she totally disagrees with Maria’s assessment by directly stating that she is not depressed. She wants to say to Dr. Maria that she is totally fine. By saying this, Hazel is expressing that she refuses Dr. Maria’s judgment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
No : Datum Number
Types
MD : Mitigated Disagreement
UD : Unmitigated Disagreement
Reasons
A : Showing uncertainty of his/her own idea
B : Respecting the first speaker
C : Refusing the first speaker’s judgment
D : Showing off authorities
E : Prohibiting the first speaker to do an action
F : Making an excuse of the initial statement
G : Avoiding the topic of conversation
H : Criticizing the first speaker’s statement

Realizations:
hg : The Use of Hedges
mv : The Use of Modal Verbs
qo : Question Objection
oe : Objective Explanation
pe : Personal Emotion
ta : Token Agreement
oo : A Short Direct of Opposite Orientation
sr : In-group Identity Marker
de : Down-toning the Effect of Statement
im : Shifting Responsibility
ta : Token Agreement
scr : Sarcastic Remark
rq : A Short Rude Question
D. Technique of Data Collection

After finding out the best selected movie, which is *The Fault in Our Stars*, the writer downloaded the script, re-watched the movie, checked the accuracy between the movie and the script, and tried to find out the disagreement acts and all of important details that supported the data. The writer also did some library research to get more information related to disagreement acts. The data collection was conducted in some steps as follows.

1. Watching the movie and observing the objective of the research.
2. Reviewing related literature and consulting them to the supervisors.
3. Downloading the movie script from the internet in order to make the process of analysis easier.
4. Taking a note on the disagreement acts based on the script and the movie.
5. Collecting and classifying the data in the data sheet.
6. Coding each datum in the data sheet.

E. Technique of Data Analysis

After the data were collected, they were categorized and analyzed. It is in line with the statement by Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009: 190-191) that data analysis is conducted after the whole data are collected and it should determine the focus and strategies used in data collection. The data of this study were analyzed using qualitative method based on the theory proposed by Locher (2004) about varieties of disagreement strategies. In analyzing the data, the researcher conducted some steps as follows.
1. Categorizing the data into each type and realization of disagreement acts based on Locher’s categorization in the data sheet referring to the theories in literature review.

2. Describing and analyzed the data that have been pursued.

3. Applying the trustworthiness of the data by consulting to friends and lecturers to check the data to reach its credibility.

4. Making a conclusion of the analysis based on the results and gave suggestion.

**F. Trustworthiness of the Data**

This research describes the phenomena of language use in human experience by interpreting the data. The researcher also employs subjectivity in explaining the phenomena. As a result, she used credibility as the criterion to check the data and to gain the trustworthiness. It is a researcher’s way to ensure the accuracy of the data. In addition, the credibility of research results comes from the accuracy of methods in analysis and sampling (Bernard, 2006: 195). Therefore, to make the research and the interpretation credible, the data were triangulated by verifying to the expert lecturers and other students about the relevant theories and the findings. Triangulation is a method that combines different methods to investigate the same case or phenomenon (Balnaves and Caputi, 2001: 95). Therefore, to check the trustworthiness of the data, the researcher involved her supervisors to discuss the findings and the results of the data. They are the lecturers of English Language and Literature study program in Yogyakarta State University. In addition, the researcher also discussed the data with students who are in the same field. By conducting the triangulation with the lecturers
and other students, the researcher could correct any mistakes during the whole process of interpreting data so that the research reached its credibility.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The objectives of this research as presented in the first chapter are to examine
and describe the types of disagreement acts employed, identify the way certain types
of disagreement acts are expressed, and reveal the reasons that influence the
characters to use certain types of disagreement acts in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.
This chapter consists of two main parts, namely findings and discussion. The findings
are presented in the table which shows the occurrence of types, realizations, and
reasons of disagreement acts employed by the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars*
movie. Meanwhile, the discussion section describes the objectives of the research
with some explanation and interpretation of the analysis of types, realizations, and
reasons of disagreement acts in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.

A. Findings

The findings of types, realizations, and reasons of disagreement acts are
presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types and Realizations</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Mitigated Disagreement | The Use of Hedges | 6,7,10,11, 13,14,21, 23,32 | • Showing uncertainty of his/her own idea  
• Respecting the first speaker  
• Prohibiting the first speaker to do an action  
• Making an excuse of the initial statement  
• Criticizing the first speaker’s statement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The Use of Modal Verbs**       | 7,18,24, 34,37               | • Respecting the first speaker  
• Refusing the first speaker’s judgment  
• Prohibiting the first speaker to do an action  
• Making an excuse of the initial statement |
| **Question Objection**           | 13                           | • Criticizing the first speaker’s statement                                  |
| **Objective Explanation**        | 4,5,9,11,14, 17,18,19,21, 23,25,26,27, 31,33,39,41, 49 | • Showing uncertainty of his/her own idea  
• Respecting the first speaker  
• Refusing the first speaker’s judgment  
• Showing off authorities  
• Prohibiting the first speaker to do an action  
• Making an excuse of the initial statement  
• Criticizing the first speaker’s statement |
| **Personal Emotion**             | 15,19,22, 33,38               | • Refusing the first speaker’s judgment  
• Prohibiting the first speaker to do an action  
• Making an excuse of the initial statement  
• Criticizing the first speaker’s statement |
| **Changing Topic**               | 8,32,40,46                   | • Respecting the first speaker  
• Avoiding the topic of conversation |
| **Shifting Responsibility**      | 6,14,35                      | • Showing uncertainty of his/her own idea  
• Making an excuse of the initial statement |
| **In-group Identity Marker**     | 1,5,19,21, 31,32,33,37, 39,43,44 | • Showing uncertainty of his/her own idea  
• Respecting the first speaker  
• Refusing the first speaker’s judgment  
• Prohibiting the first speaker to do an action  
• Making an excuse of the initial statement  
• Criticizing the first speaker’s statement |
| **Token Agreement**              | 10,12,13, 14,35               | • Showing uncertainty of his/her own idea  
• Making an excuse of the initial statement  
• Criticizing the first speaker’s statement |
| **Unmitigated Disagreement**     | A Short Direct of Opposite Orientation 2,3,20,27, 29,36,45, 47,48 | • Refusing the first speaker’s judgment  
• Showing off authorities |
| **Sarcastic Remark**             | 16,30                        | • Refusing the first speaker’s judgment  
• Criticizing the first speaker’s statement |
| **A Short Rude Question**        | 42                           | • Criticizing the first speaker’s statement                                  |

Based on the table, there are two types of disagreement act strategies found in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie; they are mitigated disagreement act and unmitigated disagreement act. Each type of strategy is performed in the form of different
realizations. The mitigated disagreement acts are realized by (1) the use of hedges, (2) the use of modal verbs, (3) question objection, (4) objective explanation, (5) personal emotion, (6) changing topic, (7) shifting responsibility, (8) in-group identity marker, and (9) token agreement. However, not all realizations of disagreement acts which have presented in the literature review are found in this movie. The type which is not found is in the form of down-toning the effect of statement because the characters in the movie often deliver their disagreements in order to show that the current speaker’s statement is wrong and its effect should not be down-toned. As presented in the table, the mitigated disagreement acts which are performed often by the characters in The Fault in Our Stars movie is the realization of objective explanation in disagreement expression.

Meanwhile, the occurrence of unmitigated disagreement acts is realized in three ways. Those realizations are (1) a short direct of opposite orientation, (2) sarcastic remark, and (3) a short rude question. From the data above, a short direct of opposite orientation is considered as the main realization of unmitigated disagreement act because it often occurs in this movie.

Furthermore, there are eight reasons for performing certain disagreement act strategies. The reasons that can be found are because the character is (1) showing uncertainty of his/her own idea, (2) respecting the first speaker, (3) refusing the first speaker’s judgment, (4) showing off authorities, (5) prohibiting the first speaker to do an action, (6) making an excuse of the initial statement, (7) avoiding the topic of conversation, and (8) criticizing the first speaker’s statement. The reasons of
producing the disagreement acts are categorized by analyzing the setting and the situation of the conversations depending on their contexts. From the findings, it can be concluded that the characters in the movie produce the disagreement acts mostly because they are refusing the first speaker’s judgment which seems contradictory with their own opinions or realities.

B. Discussion

This section provides explanation and in-depth interpretation of the findings. Some utterances spoken by the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie are taken as examples along with the detailed explanation which is presented to describe the objectives of the research. It covers the discussion of types and realizations of disagreement acts in the movie, and the reasons for choosing the strategies of disagreement acts in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.

1. Types and Realizations of Disagreement Acts Employed in *The Fault in Our Stars* Movie

There are two types of disagreement acts that can be found in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie; they are mitigated disagreement acts and unmitigated disagreement acts. In the movie, each type of strategies is realized in different ways. Mitigated disagreement act is realized by the use of hedges, the use of modal verbs, question objection, objective explanation, personal emotion, changing topic, shifting responsibility, in-group identity marker, and token agreement. Meanwhile, the realizations of unmitigated disagreement act are a short direct of opposite orientation, sarcastic remark, and a short rude question.
a. Mitigated Disagreement Acts

1) The Use of Hedges

The use of hedges involves the use of linguistic devices such as sort of, maybe, I mean, and well. Aijmer in Locher (2004: 114) defines that hedges function to free the speaker from the responsibility of words or phrases she/he has stated. In addition, Tannen also adds that hedges may soften the impacts of negative statements, hence, it is considered as face saving act. There are some occurrences of mitigated disagreements which are realized by the use of hedges employed by the characters in The Fault in Our Stars movie. One of the examples can be seen in the dialogue between Augustus and Hazel which happens when Gus takes Hazel into his house. The dialogue is presented as follows.

Augustus : Wait, your hands are so cold.
Hazel : Well, they’re not so much cold as just under-oxygenated. (Datum 11)

The conversation happens right after Augustus hands Hazel his favorite book which Hazel should read. Augustus holds Hazel’s hand accidentally and feels that Hazel’s hands are so cold. Hazel responds this by stating that her hands would be much colder if they are under-oxygenated. She wants to tell Augustus that there is another condition which makes her hands feel much colder than this; therefore she does not worry much about this. In this context, Hazel rather disagrees with Gus’ assessment yet she does not make it totally wrong. Thus, she performs the use of hedge ‘well’ as a preface to indicate her disagreement.
Another example which shows the occurrence of hedge as a strategy to mitigate disagreement acts can be seen through another conversation between Augustus and Hazel below when Augustus confesses his feelings to Hazel in the backyard of Hazel’s home.

Augustus: Hazel, I’m saying I wouldn’t mind. It’d be a privilege to have my heart broken by you. It’s a…

Hazel: Gus, I’m a grenade. One day I’m gonna explode and I’m gonna obliterate everything in my wake and… I don’t know, I feel like it’s my responsibility to minimize the casualties. (Datum 21)

Hazel employs the use of hedges as she says ‘I don’t know’ and ‘I feel like’ when she chooses to disagree about Augustus’ feeling to her. The utterance ‘I don’t know and ‘I feel like’ presented in her response are used to indicate that she does not have certainty in her own expression. She knows that when she dies, she will hurt everyone who loves her and in her surroundings; thus she considers herself as a grenade. As it seems difficult for her to utter her disagreement, she uses hedges to mitigate and minimize the effect of her disagreement act as it might cause their relationship to break. In addition, those hedges are also used as an avoidance of an explicit disagreement.

The next example is a conversation between Isaac and Augustus. Isaac, Augustus, and Hazel are friends in the Support Group they attend. Isaac has just gotten his eyes surgery; as a result, he cannot see at all as he is loose both of his eyes. Meanwhile, Augustus and Hazel have just come back from Amsterdam and this is their first time to meet Isaac and they ask for his condition.
Hazel: So how are your eyes, Isaac?
Isaac: They’re good. They’re not in my head is the only problem. Besides that…
Augustus: Well, umm, it appears my entire body is made out of cancer now. So, sorry to one-up you, dude.

(Datum 32)

Augustus’ utterance is included as the use of hedges as he performs three kinds of hedges which are ‘well’, ‘umm’, and ‘it appears’ in his disagreement expression. Augustus uses the expression ‘well’ as a preface to indicate a topic change. He does not want Isaac to feel sad only because he has lost his sight as he himself suffers a worse condition that his entire body is attacked by cancer which will make him dead soon. Finally, his strategy works as Isaac can show his smile, hearing Augustus’ sentence and forgetting about his own problem.

2) The Use of Modal Verbs

In using modal verbs in disagreement acts, some characters use some kinds of modal in their expression like will, can, may, etc as an indication that their statement is uncertain to happen as it is only based on their opinions instead of real facts. The first example is taken from a conversation between Hazel and Dr. Simmons in a hospital when they are arguing about whether Hazel still can go to Amsterdam or not considering her bad condition.

Dr. Simmons: You’re stage four.
Hazel: This is an opportunity that I may never get again. Ever. If the medication is working, I don’t understand why…

(Datum 18)

As an initial assessment, Dr. Simmons judges that Hazel’s current cancer condition is in stage four. He wants to emphasize that this is the worst condition since
Hazel was a child; it is impossible to let Hazel go to Amsterdam as it may cause a
dangerous effect to Hazel’s health. In the second pair part of the dialogue, Hazel
responds her disagreement to Dr. Simmons by stating ‘this is an opportunity that I
may never get again’. In this expression, Hazel uses a modal auxiliary ‘may’ to state a
possibility emphasizing that going to Amsterdam with Augustus and not with her
own money is the only chance she gets in her entire life; there is a possibility that
Hazel can die first before going to Amsterdam, a city that she wants to visit so much
before dying to get the answer from Peter Van Houten about the ending of her
favorite book.

The next conversation happens in Oranje Restaurant when Hazel and
Augustus are having dinner in Amsterdam. They are discussing some unseen things
that they both believe or disbelieve, such as the Afterlife, God, Angels, and Heaven.

Hazel : Maybe there is no point.
Augustus : I won’t accept that.

(Datum 24)

Modal verb is used by Augustus in his expression ‘I won’t’ to indicate that
he disagrees with Hazel for her opinion. In this context, Augustus asks Hazel what is
the point of believing Heaven and Hazel says that maybe there is no point. Thus,
Augustus answers her using a modal verb ‘will not’ in his expression to mitigate his
disagreement in responding Hazel’s answer.

The last example of the occurrence of modal verbs in disagreement acts can
be seen in the conversation below between Hazel and Augustus. It occurs in a gas
station when Hazel tries to help Augustus who is infected by the G-tube installed
above his belly button where the surgery is. There is also vomit everywhere surrounding him. It seems like Augustus is dying and Hazel can do nothing except calling for an ambulance.

Hazel : Gus, I have to call somebody.
Augustus : No, no. Please don’t call 9-1-1. Please. Don’t call my parents or 9... I will never forgive you if you call them.

(Datum 34)

However, Augustus disagrees with Hazel’s idea who will call somebody including his parents as he does not want to make them worry. He wants to do anything by himself without making anyone interrupt his action; that is the way he thinks he will die in peace with everyone remembering his heroic action instead of a pathetic boy who only depends on somebody else. He expresses ‘I will never forgive you if you call them’ as a threat to Hazel hoping that Hazel will not call the ambulance or his parents. The modal verb ‘will’ that he uses is also an indication of possibility of future act.

3) Question Objection

A question objection is realized in the form of question. The question which is uttered by the hearer or the second speaker contains objection. Thus, this category is included as mitigated disagreement as the objection contains an explicit disagreement. The conversation below happens when Hazel talks to Augustus via phone, discussing the ending of a novel entitled An Imperial Affliction which according to Augustus is inappropriate.

Hazel : I know. It is rather abrupt.
Augustus: “Rather abrupt”? Are you kidding? It’s evil! I mean, I understand that she dies but there’s an unwritten contract between author and reader. And I feel like ending your book in the middle of a sentence violates that contract, don’t you think?

(Datum 13)

Augustus performs three kinds of objection that he says in question forms. First, he says ‘rather abrupt?’ repeating Hazel’s initial assessment that refers to the novel. He does not think that when the novel ends in the middle of sentences and the main characters of the story are unknown is appropriate enough. Therefore, he adds ‘are you kidding’ to Hazel and continues with his own explanation about an unwritten contract between author and reader that Peter Van Houten, the writer of *An Imperial Affliction*, has violated. He also ends his statement by questioning Hazel ‘don’t you think’ to emphasize his disagreement. Although Augustus clearly states his disagreement, he expresses this by smiling and with no anger at all.

4) Objective Explanation

People express their disagreement acts by explaining objective reasons in order to make their opinion believed because it is based upon real condition and facts. It indicates that they provide unbiased information. For example, in datum 9, Hazel gives a long explanation of the reason for disagreeing with Augustus’ statement.

Augustus: Yeah. You see, I intend to live an extraordinary life. To be remembered. So, I’d say if I have any fears, it would be to not do that.

Patrick: Would anyone else in the group like to speak to that? Hazel? Unexpected.

Hazel: I just want to say that there’s gonna come a time when all of us are dead. There was a time before humans and there’s gonna be a time after. It could be tomorrow, it could be a
million years from now. And when it does, there will be no one left to remember Cleopatra or Muhammad Ali or Mozart let alone any of us. Oblivion’s inevitable. And if that scares you, then I suggest you ignore it. God knows it’s what everyone else does.

(Datum 9)

The conversation happens in the beginning of the class of Support Group. It is the first time that Augustus attends the group on behalf of Isaac’s request. When he introduces himself in front of other people, suddenly Patrick asks him about his ultimate fear. He answers that he fears oblivion. Then Patrick asks to others to deliver their opinion related to that. Unexpectedly, Hazel offers to speak; she gives a long explanation of why there is no need for people to fear oblivion. She explains her disagreement by giving the example of facts related to some well-known figures such as Cleopatra, Muhammad Ali, and Mozart who died and there is no one who remembers them in the day when all people are dead in the end of the world.

The next conversation happens when Hazel, Augustus, and Frannie, Hazel’s mother, are having flight to Amsterdam. It is told that Augustus likes to put a cigarette in his mouth but he does not lit the fire to literally smoke. He is used to do it because he likes to think of this action as a proverb: that he put the killing thing (cigarette) in his mouth but he does not give it the power (fire) to kill him. Meanwhile, Hazel has understood this in the very first time they meet. When Augustus put the cigarette in the airplane because of nervousness of his first flight, a flight attendant warns him.
Hazel: Yeah, no, it’s just a metaphor. He puts the killing thing in his mouth but he doesn’t actually give it the power to kill him.

Flight Attendant: **Well, that metaphor, it’s prohibited on today’s flight.**

(Datum 23)

Hazel tries to explain to the flight attendant that Augustus does not really smoke by describing the metaphor. However, the flight attendant does not agree with the action and prohibit Augustus to put the cigarette in his mouth by giving an objective explanation ‘it’s prohibited on today’s flight’ which means that people are not allowed to smoke in every airplane even only putting the cigarette; it is the general rule that all passengers should obey. Thus, the flight attendant’s disagreement implies that she orders Augustus not to smoke in the airplane.

An example of objective example can also be seen in the conversation between Hazel and Frannie below. Frannie does not understand why Hazel wears a common T-shirt to meet Peter Van Houten who is her idol. She also disagrees with a quotation stated on the T-shirt. The dialogue below happens when Frannie utters her opinion toward the T-shirt.

Frannie: “This is not a pipe”. But it is a pipe.

Hazel: **But it’s not. It is a drawing of a pipe. See? A drawing of a thing is not the thing itself. Nor is a T-shirt of a drawing of a thing, the thing itself.**

(Datum 25)

Hazel uses objective explanation because she gives a quite long explanation in her disagreement expression. She explains to her mother about a knowledge she already knows to share with her mother. It quite works as her mother does not give
another objection to disagree with her daughter. She only says that Hazel has already grown up well that she has such thinking.

5) Personal Emotion

Expressing personal emotion is one of strategies of disagreement act which includes someone’s feelings toward the initial statement by the first speaker. One of the examples is when Augustus and Hazel are in Hazel’s room discussing a title of a swing set that they want to sell in online advertisement. At first, Hazel writes ‘Swing Set Needs Home’ in her laptop but Augustus does not really like it and changes the title into ‘Desperately Lonely Swing Set Needs Loving Home’. It seems like Hazel gets an idea from this title and she changes it again into ‘Lonely, Vaguely Pedophilic Swing Set Seeks the Butts of Children’ that Augustus does not agree with.

Augustus : No. No.
Hazel : No? I like it.

(Data 22)

Hazel employs personal emotion in delivering her disagreement as she directly confesses what she feels toward the title she has written by saying ‘I like it’ as a response to Augustus who says ‘No’ regarding the title.

Another example of disagreement act in the form of expressing personal emotion can be shown by Isaac in the dialogue below. It takes place when Hazel, Augustus, and Isaac are in front of Monica’s house to take revenge on her for abandoning Isaac after his eyes surgery.

Hazel : Gus, I think we should wait until dark.
Augustus : It’s all dark to Isaac.
Isaac: Dude, I’m not deaf. I’m just blind. So I can hear when you make fun of my disability. **And I don’t love it.**

(Datum 33)

After Isaac fails in throwing an egg on Monica’s car in his first attempt, Augustus asks Isaac to move a bit left. Hazel says her opinion to Augustus that they should wait until dark so nobody can see them because what they are doing is an act of rebellion. Augustus responds Hazel that for Isaac, every time is dark since he is blind so it is just the same for doing it in the morning, afternoon, or noon. Hearing this, Isaac does not agree with Augustus’ opinion for making fun of his disability. He says ‘I do not love it’ for Augustus’ expression. This expression contains his personal emotion of unhappiness that indicates his disagreement.

Furthermore, an employment of personal emotion in disagreement acts is also used with an expression indicating what the speaker feels during the conversation. The example below shows how Hazel shows his feeling to indicate her disagreement toward her parents.

Michael: Hazel, you cannot not eat.
Hazel: **I’m aggressively un-hungry!**

(Datum 38)

The personal emotion that Hazel uses in her expression is when she says to her father that she is aggressively un-hungry. She says this because Michael judges her that she cannot pass the dinner before leaving the house as she has missed lunch. Thus, he thinks that Hazel must be hungry. The expression ‘aggressively un-hungry’ is one of personal emotion that shows the speaker’s feeling during the conversation.
6) Changing Topic

The characters of this movie sometimes also perform changing topic as a means of disagreeing. They often use this strategy to avoid the current topic of conversation in which they are involved in. It can be in the form of statement, question, and order as long as the response does not correspond with the initial statement.

An example of changing topic in the form of order can be seen in the conversation between Hazel and her mother, Frannie, when they are arguing. Hazel does not want to come to the Support Group anymore. She demands a fake ID instead so she can go to the pub, consume any alcoholic drink, and any other things she can use with a fake ID. Frannie and Michael, Hazel’s father think that Hazel needs to socialize with other friends in a positive way. Thus, in response of disagreeing, Frannie asks Hazel to just get in the car instead and go to the Support Group.

Hazel : Well, that is the kind of thing I would know with a fake ID.
Frannie : Can you just get in the car, please?  

(Datum 8)

Frannie’s response ‘can you just get in the car, please?’ does not correspond with the initial statement which is stated by Hazel who talks about a fake ID she should have. It means that Frannie does not want to talk about a fake ID anymore as she disagrees if Hazel owns that kind of thing only for night clubbing. Her strategy works quite well as Hazel does not talk about it anymore and does what her Mom asks to although with halfhearted.
Changing topic as an indication of disagreement acts is also used by the character in order to deny the first speaker’s sentence. In the conversation below, Hazel changes the topic of conversation when she talks to her parents in the kitchen.

Frannie : Hazel, I know Gus is sick, but you got to take care of yourself.
Hazel : This has nothing to do with Gus.

(Datum 40)

Frannie, as a mother, asks Hazel to have dinner first before leaving. She barely knows that her daughter is going to visit Augustus. She also knows that Hazel has not taken her lunch yet so she assumes that Hazel must be hungry. When Hazel does not want to eat, Frannie says that she needs to take care of herself and be healthy. As a response, Hazel answers that the reason she does not want to eat is not because of Augustus. By saying this, Hazel changes the topic of conversation because she says a thing which contradicts with her first sentence.

The next conversation happens when Peter and Hazel are arguing in Hazel’s car. Peter, who is suddenly appearing in Augustus’ funeral, forces himself to go inside Hazel’s car to talk to Hazel personally. Remembering what Peter has done with her and Augustus, Hazel does not want to talk any further to him even if she ever adores him once.

Peter : Hazel, I’m trying to explain something to you. I’m trying to give you what you wanted.
Hazel : No, you’re not! You are a drunk, and you’re failure and I need you to get out of my car right now so that I can go home, and be by myself and grieve!

(Datum 46)
In the second part of the dialogue, Hazel responds her disagreement toward Peter by saying that Peter is only a failure and that she needs to go home right now. Hazel’s expression is considered as changing topic because it does not correspond with what Peter has said before as the initial statement. In the first part of the dialogue, Peter says that he wants to explain something to Hazel but Hazel responds with another topic of conversation as the act of disagreeing instead.

7) Shifting Responsibility

Shifting responsibility means implying disagreement by employing the pronouns of a second party such as he or she and a third party such as they or people instead of pronouns of a first party like I. Each of the examples can be seen in the following.

Augustus and Hazel are in the midst of discussing the ending of a novel ‘An Imperial Affliction’. The ending is uncommon because it is not a sad-ending or happy-ending. The novel ends in the middle of the story. For Augustus, ending the novel like the way Peter Van Houten does is inappropriate as it leaves the readers in curiosity. However, Hazel does not find it so much trouble as she has her own reason.

Augustus : “Rather abrupt”? Are you kidding? It’s evil! I mean, I understand that she dies but there’s an unwritten contract between author and reader. And I feel like ending your book in the middle of a sentence violates that contract, don’t you think?

Hazel : Okay, yes. I know what you mean but, to be completely honest, I think it’s just so truthful. You know, you just die in the middle of life. You die in the middle of a sentence. (Datum 14)
Hazel tries to understand what Augustus believes yet she does not want to put the blame on Peter because she knows his way of thinking. She says ‘you know’, ‘you just die’, and ‘you die’ which referred to Augustus in order to emphasize that Augustus must know the fact that everyone, including him just die in the middle of life while doing something. It is also the same as a character who dies in the middle of the story. In addition, Hazel uses this strategy to make Augustus feel that he is being involved in the proverb so he can think about what she thinks.

Another example of the occurrence of shifting responsibility is shown in datum 35 below.

Hazel : You are special, Augustus.
Augustus : Yeah, I know. But… you know what I mean.  
(Datum 35)

In this conversation, Augustus employs shifting responsibility which can be seen in the expression ‘you know what I mean’. It indicates that Augustus tries to make Hazel understand the real meaning of his sentence. Augustus wants to be meaningful and special to everyone in this world so that he can die in peace. That is why Hazel tries to convince Augustus that he is special to her and there is no need to make a big effort to be special. However, Augustus wants more and he knows that Hazel understands this.

8) In-group Identity Marker

In-group identity marker is a strategy of disagreement aimed at building an informal relationship and increasing the friendship between the speakers. In datum 1,
for example, Hazel addresses her mother with an expression ‘Mom’ which she used in order to soften the degree of her disagreement of her mother’s judgment.

Frannie : She just eats like a bird, she barely leaves the house.
Hazel : **I am not depressed, Mom.**

(Datum 1)

This conversation happens in the beginning of the movie. Frannie is talking to Dr. Maria in a hospital about Hazel’s strange behavior these days. Hazel is in the same room. When Frannie is describing her behaviors which lead into depression toward Dr. Maria, she directly objects her mother’s judgment by directly saying that she is not depressed. She adds her statement with the identity-marker ‘Mom’ right after that as an indication of a close relationship.

Furthermore, in-group identity marker in expressing disagreement acts is also used by the characters by addressing the first name. As presented in Datum 31, the use of in-group identity marker is accomplished by Hazel when she tries to convince Augustus.

Augustus : I don’t suppose you can just forget about this. You know, just treat me like I’m not dying.
Hazel : **I don’t think you’re dying, Augustus. You’ve just got a touch of cancer.**

(Datum 31)

The occurrence of in-group identity marker is shown by Hazel when she addresses ‘Augustus’ using his first name. Augustus feels so much in trouble when he realizes that his cancer has already spread in his whole body. However, he does not want to lose Hazel. He thinks that Hazel will treat him differently when she knows
this fact so he just asks Hazel to treat him like he is not dying. Therefore, Hazel convinces Augustus that she never thinks that way.

Besides the use of kinship term and a first name or nickname, in-group identity marker is also performed by the employment of pet name. Some examples of pet names include dear, honey, buddy, etc. The example of using pet name in disagreement act is shown in Augustus’ expression when he addresses Isaac in the dialogue below. The conversation happens when Isaac, Augustus, and Hazel are in a church for practicing speech in Augustus’ funeral.

Isaac : “Augustus Waters was a cocky son of a bitch. But we forgave him. Not because of his superhuman good looks or because he only got 19 years when he should’ve gotten way more.”

Augustus : **18 years, buddy.**

(Datum 44)

Augustus employs a pet name as he addresses ‘buddy’ to refer to Isaac. Augustus uses this kind of term as he and Isaac have been friends for a long time. In addition, buddy is the term frequently used by people to build a closer relationship even though they are not close yet. Isaac, as Augustus asks to, is practicing to deliver some speech for Augustus’ funeral when he dies as the best friend of him. He mentions Augustus’ age in his speech which is wrong for Augustus. Thus, he corrects Isaac by stating his real age. In expressing this, Augustus’ statement indicates that he disagrees with Isaac’s judgment about his age using in-group identity marker.

9) **Token Agreement**

Several characters in this movie also employ token agreement in delivering their disagreement acts. This kind of strategy is usually marked by the occurrence of
‘yes, but…’ expression in the sentence. One of the examples of token agreement is shown by Hazel in her expression in Datum 10.

Augustus: I enjoy looking at beautiful people. See, I decided a while back not to deny myself the simpler pleasures of existence. Particularly, as you so astutely pointed out, we’re all gonna die pretty soon.

Hazel: Okay, well, that’s great. But I am not beautiful.

(Datum 10)

Feeling confused with Augustus’ sentence, Hazel does not know how to respond him. In addition, Augustus says it fast and combines two different topics. At first, he expresses that he enjoys looking at beautiful people as a response to Hazel who asks him why he keeps looking at her before. Then, he adds his sentence with a different topic which is about the idea of oblivion that they had argued about in the classroom. As a result, Hazel responds Augustus using token agreement indicating that all that Augustus has just said is right but she does not agree with the idea that she is beautiful.

The next example below is taken from a dialogue between Hazel and Augustus when they discuss their mutual book ‘An Imperial Affliction’ in Augustus’ room. Augustus utters ‘An Imperial Affliction’ energetically with a bright smile to Hazel. Hazel understands that Augustus’ expression indicates that he likes the book.

Hazel: Yes. I’m so glad that you liked it.
Augustus: Yes, I did. But the ending.

(Datum 12)

‘Yes, I did. But the ending’ is an example of token agreement because it employs an agreement plus a disagreement within one set of utterance. At first, Augustus agrees with Hazel’s statement that he likes the book by saying ‘Yes, I did’.
However, he directly adds his disagreement statement which is contrary with his agreement. By saying this, he wants to express that he actually likes the whole story of the novel but he does not really agree with the ending, which seems absurd to him.

b. Unmitigated Disagreement Acts

1) A Short Direct of Opposite Orientation

A short direct of opposite orientation is one of unmitigated disagreement act strategies which is realized simply by expressing the opposite meaning of the initial statement or judgment. The example can be seen in Hazel’s utterance below. The context of the conversation occurs when Hazel and her mother visit Dr. Maria for consultation. Frannie explains about Hazel’s behaviors which indicate that Hazel is depressed to Dr. Maria who agrees with her.

Dr. Maria : She’s depressed.
Hazel : I’m not depressed!

(Datum 2)

Hazel directly expresses her disagreement toward Dr. Maria and Frannie’s judgment by yelling at them. The expression ‘I am not depressed’ is considered as a strategy of opposite orientation as Hazel only uses a simple utterance which is contrary with Dr. Maria’s assessment.

The next conversation between Hazel and Augustus takes place in the backyard at Hazel’s house. It is told that Augustus has some feeling toward Hazel but Hazel does not want to accept this because she does not want to hurt Augustus when she dies even though she also has the same feeling.

Hazel : No, you don’t understand.
Augustus : I do understand.

(Datum 20)

This datum shows an occurrence of a short direct of opposite orientation employed by Augustus in delivering his disagreement act. In the first pair part of the dialogue, Hazel assesses Augustus that he does not understand with her difficult condition which is directly responded by Augustus. He says that he does understand. His expression ‘I do understand’ is in contrast with Hazel’s expression ‘you don’t understand’. It means that he disagrees with Hazel’s judgment.

The last example of the occurrence of a short direct of opposite orientation is taken from the conversation between Peter and Hazel. Although Hazel adores Peter so much before, she does not want to talk to him anymore after what Peter did toward her and Augustus when they visited him in his house in Amsterdam. Therefore, when Peter attends Augustus’ funeral and tries to talk to Hazel as an apology, she does not even want to hear a word from him.

Peter : You’ll want to read this.
Hazel : I don’t want to read anything. Can you just get out of my car?

(Datum 47)

Peter guesses that Hazel must be wanting to read the letter he brings but Hazel does not agree with him and does not want to read it because she thinks that the letter was written by Peter himself. In fact, she does not know that Augustus is the one who wrote it before he died. Thus, Hazel says ‘I do not want to read’ which is in contrast with the initial statement stated by Peter ‘You will want to read this’. In addition,
Hazel also asks Peter to get out of the car harshly as she needs a time to calm down after this whole hard time.

2) Sarcastic Remark

Sarcasm is one of unmitigated disagreement acts because this strategy is often employed by people to threat other faces. One of the examples is when Hazel, Frannie, Michael, and several doctors are having a meeting for a decision whether Hazel is permitted to go to Amsterdam after her last relapse or not.

Dr. Simmons: It would increase some risks.
Hazel: But so does going to the mall.  

(Datum 16)

Dr. Simmons, who takes the biggest responsibility for Hazel’s medication, thinks that it is too dangerous for Hazel if she still intends to leave. In addition, Amsterdam is not a near place to go from Indiana, a place where they stay. As a response of disagreement, Hazel answers that going to the mall would be dangerous too. She intends to insult Dr. Simmons way of thinking sarcastically because he lets Hazel go to the mall before.

A sarcastic expression can also be uttered in a question form. In The Fault in Our Stars movie, this kind of strategy occurs once in Hazel’s expression in the dialogue below. The conversation happens when Hazel, Frannie, and Augustus are having breakfast in Oranje Hotel right before they are going to leave for the United States.

Hazel: Probably don’t have time to do everything, but...
Frannie: You’re just gonna have to come back.
Hazel  : **Could you just not be ridiculous right now, please?**

(Datum 30)

Hazel asks her mother whether they have enough time to do sightseeing anymore or not. She says that she wants to visit the famous Van Gogh Museum but then she realizes that they do not have enough time to do everything they want in Amsterdam. After that, Frannie also reminds her that after all the things Hazel has done in Amsterdam like what she wishes, the most important point is that she has to come back home. Hazel finds that Frannie’s expression is not appropriate to be uttered that time so she mocks her own mother by giving her a question not to be ridiculous as she does not agree with Frannie’s utterance.

3) **A Short Rude Question**

A short rude question is categorized as unmitigated disagreement acts. It is performed in the form of repetition of the initial statement. One of the occurrences of a short rude question is performed by Hazel in the following dialogue. The conversation happens when Hazel argues with her mother and her father for not allowing her to go outside without having dinner.

Frannie  : Well, then you’ve got to stay healthy. Come on, just eat something, honey.

Hazel  : **“Stay healthy”?** Okay, I’m not healthy, and I’m gonna die. **Do you realize that?** I’m dying, and you’re gonna be here and you’re not gonna have anyone to look after, or hover around and you’re not gonna be a mother anymore, and I’m sorry but there’s nothing I can do about that. So, can I please go?

(Datum 42)

Frannie says that Hazel needs to eat something to stay healthy. Hazel, who disagrees with Frannie’s judgment directly shouts at her by giving a rude question.
The expression ‘Stay healthy?’ is a repetition of Frannie’s initial statement ‘You’ve got to stay healthy’. She disagrees with this statement because she herself and her parents know that Hazel is not healthy. She has cancer in her body and will die soon. She wants to remind her parents that fact by adding another rude question ‘Do you realize that?’ in her expression.

2. Reasons of Disagreement Acts Employed in The Fault in Our Stars Movie

In The Fault in Our Stars movie, there are eight reasons of disagreement acts employed by the characters which are analyzed by considering the context of the conversation. Those reasons are because the characters are (1) showing uncertainty of his/her own idea, (2) respecting the first speaker, (3) refusing the first speaker’s judgment, (4) showing off authorities, (5) prohibiting the first speaker to do an action, (6) making an excuse of the initial statement, (7) avoiding the topic of conversation, and (8) criticizing the first speaker’s statement. The details of each reason are described further in the following section.

a. Showing Uncertainty of His/Her Own Idea

In expressing disagreement acts, some characters in The Fault in Our Stars movie perform some expressions that indicate uncertainty. It occurs since the speakers themselves are uncertain for what they state or are reporting to. An example is presented in Datum 21.

Augustus : Hazel, I’m saying I wouldn’t mind. It’d be a privilege to have my heart broken by you. It’s a…
Hazel : Gus, I’m a grenade. One day I’m gonna explode and I’m gonna obliterate everything in my wake and… I don’t know, I feel like it’s my responsibility to minimize the casualties.

(Datum 21)

Augustus confesses his feeling toward Hazel but Hazel does not want to accept this feeling since she realizes that she will die pretty soon because of cancer. However, she herself is not really sure about her feeling toward Gus. She loves him but she does not want to hurt him the day when she dies. Thus, Hazel utters her disagreement by stating uncertain statements ‘I do not know’ and ‘I feel like’. This expression is expressed by Hazel because she herself is uncertain about her own idea.

b. Respecting the First Speaker

In this movie, some disagreement acts are performed by the characters because they want to respect the first speaker even though they deliver their disagreements. The following example explains how respecting the first speaker becomes one of the reasons of stating disagreement acts.

Augustus : I don’t suppose you can just forget about this. You know, just treat me like I’m not dying.

Hazel : I don’t think you’re dying, Augustus. You’ve just got a touch of cancer.

(Datum 31)

This scene is taken when Augustus tells Hazel that his cancer has spread over his whole body. Augustus is not the one who can easily be sad but he does not want Hazel to be sad for this news. In addition, Augustus does not want Hazel to treat him differently just because he might die pretty soon as well because of this cancer spreading. He wants Hazel to pretend like he is not dying. Hazel, who is definitely
sad hearing the news, tries to make Augustus better by delivering her disagreement. She says that Augustus got a cancer attack and not all people who got cancer die. Therefore, it can be concluded that Hazel’s reason in expressing her disagreement is because she wants to respect the first speaker, in this case is Augustus.

**c. Refusing the First Speaker’s Judgment**

The third reason why the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie deliver their disagreement acts is because the speaker is refusing the first speaker’s judgment. It often occurs when the characters directly state their disagreement in a shorter way than other disagreement strategies. The example of this reason is presented in Datum 36.

- Frannie : Hazel, you have to be hungry. You didn’t even eat lunch.
- Hazel : I’m just not hungry.

(Datum 36)

This datum shows an occurrence of disagreement acts which is performed by Hazel by giving an opposite orientation of the initial statement. In this context, Frannie assesses that Hazel must be angry looking at the fact that Hazel has not had lunch today. This expression indicates that Frannie asks Hazel to eat first before going out. Hazel, who feels no hunger, does not accept Frannie’s assessment by saying that she is not hungry. In this case, Hazel utters her disagreement act because she refuses her mother’s judgment.

**d. Showing Off Authorities**

Another reason of disagreement acts performed by the characters in this movie is that the current speaker wants to show off her/his authorities upon the
addressee so that the addressee understands that the current speaker has a higher degree than him/her. In this datum, Michael, Hazel’s father performs a disagreement act for showing off his authorities.

Hazel : You cannot make me.
Michael : **Of course we can. We’re your parents.**

(Datum 3)

In this conversation, Hazel utters that she does not want to attend the Support Group that her parents register for her anymore. She thinks that it is her right to do anything she wants and that her parents do not have that right to make her come. In response of disagreeing, Michael states an objective fact that he and Frannie, Hazel’s mother, are her parents. That is why they have the right to make Hazel do some activities outside as they are aware of their authorities upon their daughters. It means that Michael shows off his authority of being Hazel’s parent toward his daughter to make her attend the Support Group.

e. Prohibiting the First Speaker to Do an Action

Some disagreement acts are identified as a strategy to prohibit the first speaker to do an action. It can be seen by the context and by the expression that the characters use. The characters often perform disagreement acts because of this reason by performing an expression which contains prevention. The dialogue between Hazel and Augustus represents the occurrence of this reason.

Hazel : Gus, I have to call somebody.
Augustus : **No, no. Please don’t call 9-1-1. Please. Don’t call my parents or 9... I will never forgive you if you call them.**

(Datum 34)
Hazel states that she needs to call somebody in hurry seeing Augustus’ condition that she cannot handle it by her own. Furthermore, Augustus performs his disagreement for Hazel’s assessment by immediately stating bare exclamation ‘No’. He also clearly states ‘Please don’t call 9-1-1. Please. Don’t call my parents or 9…’ that contains an expression of begging and preventing. He also adds a threat for Hazel by saying ‘I will never forgive you if you call them’. In this context, Augustus’s statement explicitly shows that he prevents Hazel to call his parents or 9-1-1. Therefore, it can be concluded that the reason of this kind of disagreement acts is because the current speaker prohibits the first speaker to do an action.

f. Making An Excuse of the Initial Statement

The other reason that the characters in The Fault in Our Stars movie perform disagreement acts is because the current speaker is making an excuse of his/her initial statement. The example is taken from a dialogue between Michael and Hazel in Datum 7 below.

Michael  : Uh, you don’t “take” pot.
Hazel     : **Well, that is the kind of thing I would know with a fake ID.**

(Datum 7)

The conversation takes place in Lancaster family’s home when Hazel protests to her parents that she does not need to go to the Support Group anymore for the sake of socializing. Hazel gives another alternative to her parents if they want Hazel to be a teenager, they need to get a fake ID to Hazel so that she can go to clubs and take marijuana (pot) as she likes. Then, Michael notices that ‘pot’ or a specific kind of drug is not ‘taken’ to consume. However, Hazel delivers her disagreement by making
an excuse of her initial statement saying that she needs a fake ID. She excuses that she will know that kind of knowledge only with a fake ID. In other words, the character performs this kind of disagreement expression because she is making an excuse of the initial statement.

**g. Avoiding the Topic of Conversation**

Some characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie often employ disagreement acts as means of avoiding the topic of conversation. It happens frequently when the speaker performs his/her disagreement in the form of changing the topic as the strategy. The example is as follows.

Hazel : Well, that is the kind of thing I would know with a fake ID.
Frannie : **Can you just get in the car, please?**

(Datum 8)

In this dialogue, Hazel argues with her parents that she does not need to go to the Support Group anymore. She thinks that she just need a fake ID to do something outside like going to the club and consuming pot. Frannie, who definitely disagrees with this idea, tries to drag Hazel to the car to go to the Support Group with her by saying ‘Can you just get in the car, please?’. This kind of question does not correspond with the initial statement by Hazel who talks about getting a fake ID. In this case, Frannie’s question is considered as a disagreement act because she tries to make Hazel not to talk about a fake ID anymore by changing the current topic of the conversation. Therefore, it can be concluded that Frannie’s reason of expressing her disagreement is to avoid the topic of conversation.
h. Criticizing the First Speaker’s Statement

The characters sometimes express their disagreements because they want to criticize what the first speaker said which is contrary with their opinions. This expression is often expressed by giving explanations of why they disagree with the initial statement. Datum 25 below shows the occurrence of this reason.

Frannie  : “This is not a pipe”. But it is a pipe.
Hazel   : But it’s not. It is a drawing of a pipe. See? A drawing of a thing is not the thing itself. Nor is a T-shirt of a drawing of a thing, the thing itself.

(Datum 25)

The dialogue happens when Frannie and Hazel are in their room in Oranje Hotel, Amsterdam. When Hazel is in the midst of preparing herself to meet Peter Van Houten in his house, Frannie notices that Hazel is wearing a cute T-shirt with a drawing of a pipe with a quote ‘This is not a pipe’ below the picture. It is a T-shirt that Anna, the main character in An Imperial Affliction, likes to wear as well. Frannie reads the quotation loudly and says her different opinion about it. She thinks that the picture is a pipe. Then, Hazel utters her disagreement by giving a rather long explanation of her opinion about the drawing of the thing which is not the thing itself. She criticizes what her mother has said by explaining her point of view in order to make her mother understand that what she has said is wrong. It can be concluded that Hazel’s reason in expressing her disagreement is to criticize the first speaker’s statement.

As a conclusion of the findings, the characters in the Fault in Our Stars movie tend to employ mitigated disagreement acts when they utter their different opinions to
other because the mitigated one is mostly used by them to save the other faces. It happens as they are aware of the effect of face threatening acts in disagreement acts that might interrupt their social relationship. As a result, the characters try to be polite by performing some mitigation devices in their expressions. Objective explanation is the main type of mitigation device that the characters use to deliver their disagreements. Meanwhile, the characters in this movie perform unmitigated disagreement acts mostly to threat other face. This strategy is mostly used by the characters when they disagree with someone whom they dislike. A short direct of opposite orientation is the main realization of unmitigated disagreement acts.

Regarding to the reason, the characters in *the Fault in Our Stars* movie produce disagreement acts mostly because they are refusing the first speaker’s judgment. It is their needs to deliver their disagreements of other speaker’s judgment which seems contradictory with their own opinions or realities.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

G. Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussions in the previous chapter, the researcher draws the conclusions as presented in the following points.

1. The first objective of the research is to describe the types of disagreement acts employed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. There are two types of disagreement acts found in the movie. They are mitigated disagreement acts and unmitigated disagreement acts. The mitigated disagreement acts become the main type of disagreement acts which are performed by the characters. They prefer to express their disagreements using mitigation tools because they want to emphasize their politeness strategies toward one another. It is due to the fact that they are aware of the effect of face saving act in disagreements that could maintain their social relationship.

2. The second objective of the research is to identify the way certain types of disagreement acts are expressed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. Each type of disagreement acts is realized in some ways. From ten realizations of mitigated disagreement acts, only nine realizations are performed by the characters. They are (1) the use of hedges, (2) the use of modal verbs, (3) question objection, (4) objective explanation, (5) personal emotion, (6) changing topic, (7) shifting responsibility, (8) in-group identity marker, and (9) token agreement. Objective
explanation becomes the most used realization by the characters because they want to minimize biased information in order to make the others believe in what they say. It appears as the speakers are aware of the need to defend their arguments. On the other hand, down-toning the effect of the statement does not appear in the movie because the characters in the movie often deliver their disagreements in order to show that the current speaker’s statement is wrong and its effect should not be down-toned.

The characters in the movie use unmitigated disagreement acts in three ways. They are (1) a short direct of opposite orientation, (2) sarcastic remark, and (3) a short rude question. A short direct of opposite orientation becomes the most used realization because the characters want to show their disagreements directly. Furthermore, this strategy is also the shortest and the most effective one among the others to deliver disagreement expression especially when the characters are arguing.

3. The third objective of the research is to reveal the reasons for using certain types of disagreement acts in The Fault in Our Stars movie. Based on the findings, there are eight reasons for performing certain disagreement act strategies in the movie. Those reasons are categorized by analyzing the setting and the situation of the conversations depending on their contexts. The reasons that can be found are because the character is (1) showing uncertainty about his/her own idea, (2) respecting the first speaker, (3) refusing the first speaker’s judgment, (4) showing off authorities, (5) prohibiting the first speaker to do an action, (6) making an
excuse of the initial statement, (7) avoiding the topic of conversation, and (8) criticizing the first speaker’s statement. The characters in the movie often express their disagreements because they are refusing the first speaker’s judgment as a result of entirely different arguments between two speakers or characters.

H. Suggestions

Based on the conclusions which are drawn above, the researcher proposes some suggestions for further research in the following points.

1. To Students of Linguistics

Students majoring in linguistics are suggested to conduct research about disagreement acts since the topic has other aspects beside the types, realizations, and reasons. They can also use their own theories in analyzing the reasons or functions to provide a deeper understanding. Besides, the students can enrich their knowledge about the topic in this research as a reference.

2. To Future Researchers

Other researchers who are interested in conducting a research about disagreement acts are suggested to investigate other aspects besides the types, realizations, and reasons such as functions and responses to disagreement acts. In order to enrich the analysis, future researchers are also suggested to provide different theories of categorization of disagreement acts or different approach in analyzing the data such as using politeness perspective in analyzing disagreement. Moreover, they can choose other subject of analysis such as novels that contain several problems that represent disagreement acts such as arguing, debating, and protesting.
3. To Readers in General

After reading this research, the readers are suggested to understand more about the aspects of disagreement such as awareness of disagreement acts toward themselves and how to deliver their disagreements in society. When the readers are aware of the occurrence of disagreement which is expressed by others, they will know how to respond them. Meanwhile, when the readers want to express their disagreements, they will know what strategy to be chosen so that they can maintain their politeness in society.
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## Appendix A. Data Sheet of Types, Realizations, and Reasons of Disagreement Acts

in *The Fault in Our Stars* Movie

### Notes:
- **No**: Datum Number
- **Types**
  - **MD**: Mitigated Disagreement
  - **UD**: Unmitigated Disagreement
- **Reasons**
  - **A**: Showing uncertainty of his/her own idea
  - **B**: Respecting the first speaker
  - **C**: Refusing the first speaker’s judgment
  - **D**: Showing off authorities
  - **E**: Prohibiting the first speaker to do an action
  - **F**: Making an excuse of the initial statement
  - **G**: Avoiding the topic of conversation
  - **H**: Criticizing the first speaker’s statement

### Realizations:
- **hg**: The Use of Hedges
- **mv**: The Use of Modal Verbs
- **qo**: Question Objection
- **oe**: Objective Explanation
- **pe**: Personal Emotion
- **ct**: Changing Topic
- **sr**: Shifting Responsibility
- **im**: In-group Identity Marker
- **de**: Down-toning the Effect of Statement
- **ta**: Token Agreement
- **oo**: A Short Direct of Opposite Orientation
- **scr**: Sarcastic Remark
- **rq**: A Short Rude Question

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MD/im/C/00:01:21</td>
<td>Frannie: She just eats like a bird, she barely leaves the house. Hazel: <em>I am not depressed, Mom.</em></td>
<td>MD: mitigate disagreement</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>The example in bold is categorized as mitigated disagreement which is realized by the use of in-group identity marker ‘Mom’ that Hazel addresses to her mother in her expression. By saying this, Hazel is expressing that she is refusing the first speaker’s judgment that, in this context, is uttered by her mother who gives explanation to the doctor about Hazel’s behavior which indicates that...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>UD/oo/C/</td>
<td>Dr. Maria: She’s depressed. Hazel: I’m not depressed!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:01:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>UD/oo/D/</td>
<td>Hazel: You cannot make me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:05:17</td>
<td>Michael: Of course we can. We’re your parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>MD/oe/D/</td>
<td>Hazel: You cannot make me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:05:17</td>
<td>Michael: Of course we can. We’re your parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>MD/oe/</td>
<td>Frannie: Come on, we’ve been through this. You need to go. You need to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | im/F/00:05:20| make friends, and be a teenager.  
Hazel: **Mom, if you want me to be a teenager, you don’t send me to support group. You gotta get me a fake ID so that I can go to clubs and drink gimlets and take pot.** |       | √  |         | This datum is categorized as mitigated disagreement which is realized in two forms; they are in-group identity marker which is marked by the expression ‘Mom’ and objective explanation which is marked by her long explanation following ‘Mom’. Through her long explanation, it can be concluded that Hazel wants to give an excuse for not willing to go the support group. |
| 6.  | MD/hg/sr/    | Hazel: **Mom, if you want me to be a teenager, you don’t send me to support group. You gotta get me a fake ID so that I can go to clubs and drink gimlets and take pot.**  
Michael: **Uh, you don’t “take” pot.** |       | √  |         | H           |
|     | H/00:05:25   |                                                                 |       |    |         | In this example, Michael, Hazel’s father, employs mitigated disagreement which is realized by the use of hedge ‘uh’ and shifting responsibility ‘you’. Michael knows that currently Hazel never consumes any kinds of drugs. Thus, when Hazel asks his father to make her a fake ID so she can freely take pot (a kind of marijuana), Michael gives additional information of what she has said. By saying this, he also criticizes Hazel’s statement that pot (drug) is not ‘taken’ to consume. |
| 7.  | MD/hg/       | Michael: Uh, you don’t “take” pot.  
Hazel: **Well, that is the** |       |    |         | F           |
<p>|     | mv/F/00:05:33|                                                                 |       | √  |         | This datum shows an occurrence of mitigated disagreement which is performed by the use of hedge and modal verbs. The use of hedge is marked by a preface ‘well’ while the use of modal verbs is marked by ‘the’. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kind of thing I would know with a fake ID.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb is marked by the expression ‘I would’. In addition, ‘well’ is also a preface indicating that Hazel will utter a statement of disagreement. In this context, Hazel expresses his disagreement as she tries to give an excuse of her own statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>MD/ct/G/</td>
<td>Hazel: Well, that is the kind of thing I would know with a fake ID.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:05:37</td>
<td>Frannie: Can you just get in the car, please?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This example in bold is categorized as a mitigated disagreement which is realized by changing the topic of conversation. Hazel tries to make an excuse that she needs a fake ID so she can do everything she wants as a teenager with that ID. Meanwhile, Frannie does not want to discuss the fake ID any further. She only wants Hazel to come to the support group. Therefore, she expresses her disagreement in order to avoid the topic of conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>MD/oe/H/</td>
<td>Augustus: Yeah. You see, I intend to live an extraordinary life. To be</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:09:15</td>
<td>remembered. So, I’d say if I have any fears, it would be to not do that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel expresses her disagreement using mitigating device that she uses by delivering objective explanation. She does not agree with Augustus’ assessment saying that his biggest fear is oblivion. Then, Hazel gives some long explanation related to oblivion as preface. She explains that all humans will die in a specific time then there will be no one left to remember one another. In the end, she makes a conclusion of his long speech saying that oblivion is inevitable and Gus’ reason for having fear of that does not make sense. By saying this, in this context, Hazel is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a time when all of us are dead. There was a time before humans and there's gonna be a time after. It could be tomorrow, it could be a million years from now. And when it does, there will be no one left to remember Cleopatra or Muhammad Ali or Mozart let alone any of us. Oblivion's inevitable. And if that scares you, then I suggest you ignore it. God knows it's what everyone else does.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>criticizing Augustus’ statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MD/hg/ta/A/00:10:15</td>
<td>Augustus: I enjoy looking at beautiful people. See, I decided a while back not to deny myself the simpler pleasures of existence. Particularly, as you so astutely pointed out, we're all gonna die pretty soon.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The expression in bold is categorized as mitigated disagreement in the form hedge ‘well’ and token agreement. The token agreement can be seen by the occurrence of ‘Okay...but’. In addition, Hazel uses ‘well’ as a preface to give an indication to Augustus that all she will say to him is a disagreement. This preface indicates that Hazel is in doubt in saying her idea. That is why she uses this strategy because she herself is uncertain about her own idea that she is not beautiful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel: Okay, well, that’s great. But I am not beautiful.</td>
<td></td>
<td>hg</td>
<td>mv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MD/hg/ oe/F/ 00:18:01</td>
<td>Augustus: Wait, your hands are so cold. Hazel: Well, they’re not so much cold as just under-oxygenated.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MD/ta/A/ 00:23:49</td>
<td>Hazel: Yes. I’m so glad that you liked it. Augustus: Yes, I did. But the ending.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MD/hg/ qo/ta/H/ 00:23:53</td>
<td>Hazel: I know. It is rather abrupt. Augustus: “Rather abrupt”? Are you kidding? It’s evil! I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mean, I understand that she dies but there’s an unwritten contract between author and reader. And I feel like ending your book in the middle of a sentence violates that contract, don’t you think?</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>MD/hg/oe/st/ta/F/00:23:56</td>
<td>Augustus: “Rather abrupt”? Are you kidding? It’s evil! I mean, I understand that she dies but there’s an unwritten contract between author and reader. And I feel like ending your book in the middle of a sentence violates that contract, don’t you think? Hazel: Okay, yes. I know what you mean but, to be completely honest, I think it’s just so truthful. You know, you just die in the middle of life. You die</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>MD/pe/C/</td>
<td>Hazel: It was actually a really fun trip!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:31:14</td>
<td>Augustus: That’s the saddest thing I’ve ever heard my entire life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>UD/scr/C/</td>
<td>Dr. Simmons: It would increase some risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:41:25</td>
<td>Hazel: But so does going to the mall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>MD/oe/E/</td>
<td>Hazel: But they have oxygen on airplanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:41:31</td>
<td>Dr. Simmons: You’re stage four.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hg</td>
<td>mv</td>
<td>qo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>MD/mv/oe/B/00:41:33</td>
<td>Dr. Simmons: You’re stage four.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel: This is an opportunity that I may never get again. Ever. If the medication is working, I don’t understand why…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>MD/oe/pe/im/E/00:41:35</td>
<td>Hazel: This is an opportunity that I may never get again. Ever. If the medication is working, I don’t understand why I can’t…</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Maria: Perhaps there’s a scenario…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Simmons: No, I don’t know any other way to say this, Hazel. You’re just too sick. I’m sorry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>UD/oo/C/00:46:20</td>
<td>Hazel: No, you don’t understand. Augustus: I do understand.</td>
<td>hg</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>MD/hg/oe/im/00:46:24</td>
<td>Augustus: Hazel, I’m saying I wouldn’t mind. It’d be a privilege to have my heart broken by you. It’s a… Hazel: Gus, I’m a grenade. One day I’m gonna explode and I’m gonna obliterate everything in my wake and… I don’t know, I feel like it’s my responsibility to minimize the casualties.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>MD/pe/F/00:47:55</td>
<td>Augustus: No. No. Hazel: No? I like it.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hg</td>
<td>mv</td>
<td>qo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>MD/hg/oe/E</td>
<td>Hazel: Yeah, no, it’s just a metaphor. He puts the killing thing in his mouth but he doesn’t actually give it the power to kill him.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:54:08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flight Attendant: <strong>Well, that metaphor, it’s prohibited on today’s flight.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24. | MD/mv/C    | Hazel: Maybe there is no point.  
Augustus: **I won’t accept that.** | √     | C       |       | Augustus uses modal verb to perform mitigated disagreement which is marked by the occurrence of ‘I won’t’ as a strategy to say his disagreement. In expressing this, Augustus’ reason is to refuse Hazel’s judgment saying that there is no point in believing the afterlife which he totally believes. |
|     | 01:03:01   |                                                                           |       |         |      |                                               |
| 25. | MD/oe/H    | Frannie: **“This is not a pipe”. But it is a pipe.**  
Hazel: **But it’s not. It is a drawing of a pipe. See? A drawing of a thing is not the thing itself. Nor is a T-shirt of a drawing of a thing.** | √     | H       |       | This conversation happens when Hazel and Frannie discuss Hazel’s shirt with a drawing of a pipe along with a sentence ‘This is not a pipe’ on it. Hazel performs mitigated disagreement using objective explanation. She wants to reveal her opinion which is in contrast with her Mom by giving a little knowledge in her explanation to make her Mom believe in her. She says this because she criticizes |
<p>|     | 01:05:21   |                                                                           |       |         |      |                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the thing itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>MD/oe/H/</td>
<td>Peter: Nothing happens! They’re fiction! They cease to exist the moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>The datum shows the occurrence of mitigated disagreement which is realized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:12:16</td>
<td>the novel ends.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by the use of objective explanation by Hazel. Hazel expresses her disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel: But they can’t! I get it in a literary sense or whatever, but… it’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>toward Peter Van Houten through her rather long explanation because she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>impossible not to imagine what…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wants to criticize what Peter has stated about the novel they discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>UD/oo/D/</td>
<td>Hazel: I do not want your pity!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>This conversation happens when Peter Van Houten is mad at Hazel who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:12:32</td>
<td>Peter: Of course you do! Like all sick kids, your existence depends on it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demands too much at the ending of his novel. He thinks that Hazel is only a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You are fated to live out your days, as the child you were when diagnosed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cancer girl who needs some pity from the adults. When Hazel says that she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A child who believes there is a life after a novel ends. And we as adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>does not want his pity, he directly utters his unmitigated disagreement by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you pity this. So we pay for your treatments, your oxygen machines. You</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stating a short direct of opposite orientation of ‘I do not’ which is ‘You do’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are a side-effect to an evolutionary process that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In saying this, Peter shows his authorities that he is the adult who has a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>higher position in that place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cares little for individual lives. You are a failed experiment in mutation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 28. | MD/oe/D/ 01:12:32 | Hazel: I do not want your pity!  
Peter: Of course you do! Like all sick kids, your existence depends on it. You are fated to live out your days, as the child you were when diagnosed. A child who believes there is a life after a novel ends. And we as adults, we pity this. So we pay for your treatments, your oxygen machines. You are a side-effect to an evolutionary process that cares little for individual lives. You are a failed experiment in mutation. |       | √  |    | D       | This is also a conversation that happens which setting is the same with the previous one. In this context, Peter employs two kinds of strategies of disagreement acts; the first one is using unmitigated disagreement, which has been discussed in the previous datum, and the later is using mitigation disagreement in the form of objective explanation. Peter gives a very long explanation that supports his opinion to defeat Hazel, explaining that Hazel is only a sick kid who needs the best care from the adult like him. Peter shows his authorities that he is the adult who has a higher position in that place. |
<p>| 29. | UD/oo/C/ 01:14:20 | Hazel: So sorry that I spent your Wish on that asshole. |       |    | √  | C       | This datum represents an unmitigated disagreement which uses opposite orientation. Hazel says that she has spent Augustus’ wish on Peter Van Houten |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustus: You did not spend it on him. You spent it on us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel: Probably don’t have time to do everything, but...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frannie: You’re just gonna have to come back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel: Could you just not be ridiculous right now, please?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>UD/scr/H/01:24:39</td>
<td>Hazel: Probably don’t have time to do everything, but...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frannie: You’re just gonna have to come back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel: Could you just not be ridiculous right now, please?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>MD/oe/im/B/01:28:34</td>
<td>Augustus: I don’t suppose you can just forget about this. You know, just treat me like I’m not dying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel: I don’t think you’re dying, Augustus. You’ve just got a touch of cancer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This conversation happens when Hazel, Augustus, and Frannie are having breakfast in their hotel in Amsterdam before leaving for Indiana. Hazel wants to go to somewhere for hours before they leave but Frannie says that Hazel just have to come back to their home in Indiana, U.S. Then, Hazel responds by delivering he disagreement toward her Mom. She employs mitigated disagreement in the form of sarcastic remark. She mocks her Mom not to be ridiculous for showing that she dislikes what her Mom has said and she criticizes her statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hg</td>
<td>mv</td>
<td>qo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>ct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sr</td>
<td>im</td>
<td>de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>scr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>MD/hg/ct/</td>
<td>Hazel: So how are your eyes, Isaac?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B This conversation happens when Hazel, Isaac, and Augustus are in Augustus’ room after coming back from Amsterdam. When Hazel asks Isaac about his eyes, Isaac answers that his eyes are not in his head; this is the only problem he got. However, Gus does not agree with Isaac’s opinion that having no eyes is a problem. Thus, he delivers his disagreement using mitigation devices; they are hedge ‘it appears’, changing topic, and in-group identity marker ‘dude’ that refers to Isaac. He changes the topic to be ‘he is the one whose whole body is made of cancer’ to make Isaac forget about his eyes and focus on him who is worse. Thus, his reason in expressing this is because he wants to respect Isaac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>im/B/01:30:16</td>
<td>Isaac: They’re good. They’re not in my head is the only problem. Besides that…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustus: Well, umm, it appears my entire body is made out of cancer now. So, sorry to one-up you, dude.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>MD/oe/pe/</td>
<td>Hazel: Gus, I think we should wait until dark.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H There are three kinds of realization of mitigated disagreement that Isaac uses in responding Augustus. First, he uses in-group identity marker ‘dude’ in addressing Gus. Secondly, he delivers his objective explanation that can be shown through his real condition of his blindness to show his disagreement toward Augustus’ statement. Lastly, he applies his personal emotion ‘I do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustus: It’s all dark to Isaac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac: Dude, I’m not deaf. I’m just blind. So I can hear when you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>make fun of my disability. And I don’t love it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>love it’ when Augustus makes fun of his blindness. In applying those mitigating devices, Isaac shows that he criticizes Augustus’ judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>MD/mv/E</td>
<td>Hazel: Gus, I have to call somebody.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/01:35:23</td>
<td>Augustus: No, no. Please don’t call 9-1-1. Please. Don’t call my parents or 9... I will never forgive you if you call them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The expression in bold is categorized as mitigated disagreement which is realized by the use modal verb ‘I will’. Hazel tries to call somebody but Augustus does not want anybody to come and see his current unwanted condition. For that case, Augustus expresses his disagreement to prohibit Hazel to do an action, in this context, which is calling Gus’ parents or 9-1-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>MD/sr/ta/</td>
<td>Hazel: You are special, Augustus.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>The example in bold is categorized as mitigated disagreement which is realized by two kinds of strategies; they are the use of shifting responsibility in the expression ‘You know’ and token agreement in the expression ‘Yeah, I know. But... you know what I mean.’ By saying this, Augustus is expressing that he himself is uncertain about his own idea whether he feels special or not. Although Hazel finds that Augustus is special for her, he expects more. He wants to be special to everyone in the World.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A/01:41:24</td>
<td>Augustus: Yeah, I know. But... you know what I mean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>UD/oo/C</td>
<td>Frannie: Hazel, you have to be hungry. You didn’t even eat lunch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In this datum, there is a type of the disagreement acts of unmitigated disagreement in the form of a short direct of opposite orientation. When Frannie judges Hazel that she must be hungry because she has not had lunch, Hazel totally disagrees with her mother’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/01:44:04</td>
<td>Hazel: I’m just not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment by directly stating that she is not hungry. She wants to say to her Mom that she is totally fine and wants to go only. The reason that Hazel utters her disagreement using opposite orientation is refusing the first speaker’s judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>MD/mv/im/E/01:44:07</td>
<td>Hazel: I’m just not hungry. Michael: Hazel, you cannot not eat.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Michael performs mitigated disagreement using a modal verb ‘you cannot’ and in-group identity marker ‘Hazel’ which is addressed to Hazel. Michael, who is Hazel’s father, expresses his disagreement to prohibit Hazel to do an action, in this context, is to leave the house before having dinner first. The setting of the conversation is the same with the previous datum; it happens when Hazel is arguing with Michael and Frannie when she is about to leave the house without having dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>MD/pe/H/01:44:08</td>
<td>Michael: Hazel, you cannot not eat. Hazel: I’m aggressively un-hungry!</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>The setting of the conversation is still the same as the two previous data. Michael agrees with Frannie, thinking that Hazel needs to eat first. Meanwhile, Hazel has undeniably opinion that she is not hungry even she adds her argument using ‘aggressively’. In this example, Hazel performs personal emotion in her mitigated disagreement as she utters her real emotion or feeling inside her toward her parents to refuse her father’s judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>MD/oe/im/B/</td>
<td>Hazel: I’m aggressively un-hungry!</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>This datum shows an occurrence of mitigated disagreement which is performed by the use of objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frannie: Hazel, I know Gus is sick, but you got to take care of yourself.</td>
<td>md</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>explanation and in-group identity marker. The use of objective explanation is marked by the expression ‘You got to take care of yourself’, representing that every human needs to eat well to stay healthy. Meanwhile, the use of in-group identity marker is shown when Frannie addresses her daughter using her name ‘Hazel’ directly. In saying this, Frannie is expressing that she respects Hazel who really loves Augustus and wants to take care of him so much as he is dying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>MD/ct/G/</td>
<td>Frannie: Hazel, I know Gus is sick, but you got to take care of yourself.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Hazel employs mitigated disagreement since she uses changing topic as a strategy to deliver his disagreement toward Frannie. At first, Frannie asks Hazel to have dinner before leaving for Augustus but Hazel refuses to eat and they start to fight. Then, Frannie tries to comfort Hazel saying that she understands Augustus’ condition. Hazel responds by stating that she won’t eat not because of Augustus. Of course, Hazel delivers her objection and opinion because she wants to avoid the topic of conversation about Augustus. She does not want to eat because of her own willing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:44:10</td>
<td>Hazel: This has nothing to do with Gus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frannie: Well, then you’ve got to stay healthy. Come on, just eat something, honey.</td>
<td>md</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>This datum shows how Hazel performs mitigated disagreement by giving objective explanation in responding Frannie’s statement. Hazel’s utterances ‘I’m not healthy, and I’m gonna die’ and ‘you are not gonna have anyone to look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>UD/rq/H/01:44:14</td>
<td>Okay, I’m not healthy, and I’m gonna die. Do you realize that? I’m dying, and you’re gonna be here and you’re not gonna have anyone to look after, or hover around and you’re not gonna be a mother anymore, and I’m sorry but there’s nothing I can do about that. So, can I please go?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 42  | UD/rq/H/01:44:14 | Frannie: Well, then you’ve got to stay healthy. Come on, just eat something, honey. Hazel: “Stay healthy”? Okay, I’m not healthy, and I’m gonna die. Do you realize that? I’m dying, and you’re gonna be here and you’re not gonna have anyone to look after, or hover around and you’re not gonna be a mother anymore, and I’m sorry | | |     | | The utterances in bold are categorized as unmitigated disagreement in the form of short rude questions. Firstly, Hazel shows her disagreement by repeating her mother’s utterance in the form of question. It indicates that Hazel criticizes her mother’s statement. Secondly, Hazel accuses her mother by questioning whether she realizes that Hazel will be going to die. These questions are considered as rude, considering the high intonation that Hazel uses when she utters the questions to her mother. Hazel performs this type of strategy for expressing that she criticizes Frannie’s initial statement. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>MD/im</td>
<td>but there’s nothing I can do about that. So, can I please go?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/C/</td>
<td>Hazel: That is my biggest fear, Mom. When I am gone, you’re not gonna have a life anymore. You’re just gonna sit and you’re just gonna stare at walls or you’re gonna off yourselves or… Michael: Hazel, honey. We’re not gonna do that.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The expression in bold is categorized as mitigated disagreement in the use of in-group identity marker. It can be seen by the occurrence of ‘Hazel’ and ‘honey’ that Michael addresses to his daughter. He wants to make sure to Hazel that all the things Hazel has thought are not right. It indicates that Michael refuses Hazel’s assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>MD/im</td>
<td>Isaac: “Augustus Waters was a cocky son of a bitch. But we forgave him. Not because of his superhuman good looks or because he only got 19 years when he should’ve gotten way more.” Augustus: 18 years, buddy.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This conversation happens when Augustus asks Isaac to make a eulogy for his own funeral. When Isaac says something about him including his age, Augustus makes a correction by saying his own real age. In expressing his real age, he performs mitigated disagreement which is realized by the use of in-group identity marker ‘buddy’ that he addresses to Isaac. He utters this way to refuse Isaac’s assessment who thinks that he is 19 instead of 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>UD/oo/C/01:59:25</td>
<td>Hazel: I’m very sorry for your loss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>MD/ct/G/01:59:47</td>
<td>Peter: Hazel, I’m trying to explain something to you. I’m trying to give you what you wanted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>UD/oo/C/02:00:00</td>
<td>Peter: You’ll want to read this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Types</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>read anything. Can you just get out of my car?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contrary with ‘You will want to read this’ that is stated by Peter. The reason why Hazel states her disagreement is because she wants to refuse Peter’s statement. Peter states that Hazel will want to read the letter he has brought to Hazel. However, in fact, she does not want to read it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>UD/oo/C/02:02:49</td>
<td>Isaac: It was annoying. He talked about you so much. Hazel: I didn’t find it that annoying.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The datum shows the occurrence of unmitigated disagreement which is realized by the use of a short direct of opposite orientation by Hazel. Hazel expresses her disagreement toward Isaac who has said that Augustus is annoying for talking about Hazel for many times because she refuses Isaac’s judgment. She never thinks that Augustus is annoying when he talks about herself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>MD/oe/C/02:03:17</td>
<td>Hazel: Yeah, well, I’m over it. I have no interest in reading another word of that asshole’s again. Isaac: No, he didn’t write it. Gus wrote it.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In this datum, there is a type of mitigated disagreement in the form of objective explanation. When Hazel states that she does not want to read any kinds of letter from Peter anymore, Isaac tells his disagreement by directly telling Hazel that it was Augustus who wrote the letter as he knows the truth. He only tells the objective explanation of the truth toward Hazel to make her believe and read the letter. The reason that Isaac utters his disagreement is for refusing Hazel’s judgment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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