

## APPLYING THE STRATEGIES OF DISAGREEMENT EXPRESSION IN THE MOVIE OF AARON SORKIN'S *A FEW GOOD MEN*

**Ahmad Febrianto Okem**

Alumni of Department of English  
University of 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

**N.K. Mirahayuni**

Department of English  
University of 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia  
Email: mirahayuni@untag-sby.ac.id

**Abstract.** This study talks about the forms and strategies of disagreement expressions used by the characters in in Movie Script Aaron Sorkin's *A Few Good Men*. The aims of this research are to find out the forms and types of disagreement strategies. The descriptive qualitative was used in this research and the data were the conversation among the characters. The analysis was based on Muntigl and Turnbull's (1998) for the types of disagreement strategies in disagreement expression and for the types of the form based on Liu's (2004). The study involves thirty (30) data taken from drama plays. The study found that (1) disagreement expression can be identified by the form to describe the type of the sentence, they are declarative form involves twenty three (23) data of disagreement expression which is found in all types of disagreement strategy, (2) Interrogative form involves four (4) data of disagreement expression which is found in challenge and counterclaims strategy. (3) Imperative form involves two (2) data of disagreement expression which is found in challenge strategy (4) Exclamative form involves one (1) data of disagreement expression which is found in contradict strategy. Second, the result of the analysis also shows that there are four types of disagreement strategies usually used by the characters: Irrelevancy Claims involves four (4) data, Challenge involves nine (9) data, Contradict involves nine (9) and Counterclaims involves eight (8) data.

**Keywords:** *disagreement strategies, linguistic forms of disagreement*

### INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves Yule (2006:1). Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. When doing an interaction or making an utterance, people should pay attention to the hearer. They have to treat the hearer in appropriate ways. It can be realized by speaking carefully in order to make others feel comfortable. Thus, they have to pay attention to other's expectation which

means that the speaker is doing politeness (Yule, 1996:3). In any utterances lies much meaning thus pragmatics serves as means to the study of meaning more specific than literal meaning (Steve Walsh, 2013:25). Pragmatics discusses about meaning of speaker and hearer in certain context and situation. Yule (2006:5) states, "the benefits of language learning through pragmatics is that one can speak about the meaning of words which meant people, their assumptions, intentions or their purpose, and the kinds of actions that they show when they speak."

Studies of speaker's meaning is related to the intended message of the speaker. Any utterance by a speaker will have three

elements: locutionary (the language being used), the illocutionary (the speaker's intended meaning) and the perlocutionary elements (the expected response from the listener).

(<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pragmatics>) Based on the intended meaning by the speaker, an utterance may be categorized to belong to a specific type of speech act, such as assertive, performative, verdictive, directive and others (Kreidler, 1998:183).

Furthermore, studies of the context and situation of language use is often related to what is considered as polite use of language. Politeness theorists have studied at length the strategies employed by a speaker to promote and maintain harmonious relations by displaying consideration for one's interlocutor's feelings. What has emerged is a host of politeness theories and paradigms that could constitute a sub-field of pragmatics by themselves. Mao, L. R. 1994 closely related to the study of politeness is the idea of power and maintenance of face. According to Liu (2004), the degree of politeness is a variable under the effects of social factors including gender and power (Liu, 2004:1). Power is the major player in the process of selecting strategies. Brown and Levinson (1987), for example, assert that "power is an asymmetrical social dimension of relative power" (1987:77). But for Liu (2004) power means status in which professors, administrators, and students are on a hierarchy from powerful to powerless.

One type of verdictive speech act is disagreement. Disagreement means an argument or a situation in which people do not have the same opinion (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/disagreement>). Disagreement appears when the speaker thinks that her/his hearer is wrong, misguided, or unreasonable about some issue (Brown & Levinson 1987)

Disagreement is the speech act which is considered as a face-threatening verbal behavior in which people can show their dissatisfaction or opposition; therefore, the application of politeness strategies is vital for maintaining face. Politeness that is a guide to determine the types of disagreement are then required to analyze the pragmatics point of disagreement. According to Liu (2004), disagreement is unavoidable in human interaction. It happens no matter how hard people try to avoid it; people face a very complicated condition when they try to avoid the unavoidable.

Disagreement is the topic in this study. The writer aims to study expressions of disagreement. One related research to this topic is Liza Oktavia (2003) who studies types of disagreement strategies used by career women and housewives in Sidoarjo. She adopted Garcia's theory of disagreement and Beebe and Takashi's (1989) theory of social status. Her findings showed that career women tend to use confrontational strategies including strong denial while the house wives tend to use non-confrontational strategies including down toned, suggestion, giving reason, and the expression of willingness to cooperate.

Based on the background above, the study aims to deal with disagreement forms and strategies that are used in communication. For the purpose of the study, the data are taken from Aaron Sorkin's *A Few Good Men* (1992). The plays are chosen 50 data or less as data source for the topic of this study because after reading the script the writers finds that there were many disagreement expressions which are used by the characters. The characters in the play have their own different opinions, ideas, solutions.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research is using qualitative method. The data were open-ended. emerging data with the primary intent of developing themes from the data used are in form of words and sentences

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result from this research showed two elements of disagreement expression. The first is the form of disagreement expression. In the form of disagreement expression there are four forms, namely, interrogative, declarative, imperative and exclamation. Interrogative form is the most used in challenge disagreement and counterclaim expression. The data found using interrogative, declarative, imperative and exclamation are 4,23,2 and 1 respectively.

The second element is the strategies of disagreement expression. Expressions of disagreement strategy can be classified into four types: disagreement with irrelevancy claims, disagreement with counterclaims, disagreement with contradicts, and disagreement with challenge. Each type will be discussed in the following subsections.

### Irrelevancy Claims

Irrelevancy claims are meta-dispute-acts that comment on the conversational interactions. They show that a previous claim is not relevant to the discussion of the topic at hand. These are marked by words and expressions, like *that would be necessary*, *You're straying off the topic*, and *It is nothing to do with it*.

The study found (4) four data of disagreement using strategy irrelevancy claims. The data will be explained in the following part.

In data A-1, the character named Spradling speaks to Kaffee who plays a role as the people who is disagreeing. Both men have

a role as the Captain and the Lieutenant in the US NAVY.

(1) Spradling : Yeah, well your client thought it was marijuana.

Kaffee : My client's a moron, that's not against the law. (Data A-1)

The conversation takes place in a baseball field, in the law division of the US NAVY. This data is in declarative form. He declares that he's client is a moron to Captain Spradling that is indicated by *"My client's a moron"*. The context of this data is that Kaffee disagrees about the statement of Spradling because his client bought oregano that he claims is marijuana. This data uses Irrelevancy Claims strategy that is indicated by *That's not against the law* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee to Captain Spradling.

In the data A-5, the character Jo Galloway speaks to Kaffee who plays a role as the people who is disagree. Both people have a role as the Lieutenant and the Mayor in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place in baseball field in the law division in US NAVY. This data is in declarative form. She declares that the client has been in jail that is indicated by *"two guys have been in a jail cell since this morning"*. The context of this data is that Major Jo Galloway disagrees about the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee because the lead counsel was playing softball while the client had been in jail since morning. This data uses Irrelevancy Claims strategy that is indicated by : "I was wondering why two guys have been in a jail cell since this morning while their lawyer is outside hitting a ball."

In the data A-22 the character named Ross speaks to Kaffee who disagrees. Both people have a role as Captain and Lieutenant officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the military court room. This data is in declarative form

because he declares that Lieutenant Kaffee is impossible to bring in 4000 soldiers to testify about the clarity of the red code that is indicated by *"the witness can't possibly testify as to what 4000 other men would say"*. The context of the data is Captain Ross disagrees with the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee because his statement is irrelevant to be discussed but only an argument to raise an important point in the proceedings. The data uses Irrelevancy Claims that is indicated by *"We object to this entire line of questioning a argumentative and irrelevant badgering of the witness"* from the statement of Captain Ross.

In the data A-29, the character named Ross speaks to Kaffee who disagrees. Both people have a role as Lieutenant officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the military court. This data is in interrogative form. Captain Ross is asking the judge whether the dialogue is relevant to discuss that is indicated by *is this dialogue relevant to anything in particular*. The context of the data is Captain Ross disagrees about Lieutenant Kaffee because he asked something irrelevant to discuss with the witness. This data uses irrelevancy claims strategy that is indicated by *Objection Please the Court, is this dialogue relevant to anything in particular?* from the statement of Captain Ross.

### Challenge

This second strategy type is preceded by reluctance markers that display disagreement with prior turn and typically have the syntactic form of interrogative with question particles such as *when, what, who, why, where and how*. This type does not make a specific claim (e.g. why or like who) like *"Tell me how ?"* (S8:121); it implicates that the addressee cannot provide evidence for his claim (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998:230). There are ninth (9) data of disagreement that are marked with

challenge strategy. The data analysis is presented in the following part.

In the data A-7, the character named Jo Galloway speaks to Kaffee, who disagrees. Both people have a role as the Lieutenant and the Mayor in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the baseball field in the law division in US NAVY. This data in declarative form. He declares that Major Jo Galloway will report Lieutenant Kaffee to the supervisor counsel that is indicated by *'i'm gonna speak to your supervisor'*. The context of the data is that Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about statement of Major Jo Galloway because Lieutenant Kaffee is a chosen attorney from his division. This data is used Challenges strategy that is indicated by *"I don't think you'll have much luck, though. I was assigned by Division, remember ?"* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee.

In data A-10, the character named Jo Galloway Speaks to Kaffee, who plays a role as a person who disagrees. Both people have a role as Mayor and Lieutenant in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the parking lot in the US NAVY Department of Law. This data is in declarative/interrogative form. She declares that both clients do not know why they had been arrested and are involved in the murder conspiracy that is indicated by *"I swear, he doesn't know where he is, he doesn't even know why he's been arrested"*. The context of the data is that Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about the statement of Major Jo Galloway because Major Jo Galloway has been talking to the client or suspect without having permission first to their Lead Counsel Lieutenant Kaffee. This data uses Challenges strategy indicated by Jo, *if you ever speak to a client of mine again without my permission, I'll have you disbarred Friends?* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee.

In data A-12, the character named Jo Galloway speaks to Jessep, who disagrees. Both people have roles as Mayor and Colonel in the US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the officer's garden dining hall. This data is in imperative form. She declares that the counsel wants the answer that the term of code red is still applicable in Marine Base Gantnamo, Cuba that is indicated by *"I need an answer to my question, sir"*. The context of the data is that Colonel Jessep disagrees about the statement of Major Jo Galloway because it exceeds the limits of authority in asking that Colonel Jessep stated term code red has been dismissed and the unofficial part of the infantry training in Cuba. This data is used Challenges strategy that indicates by *"Take caution in your tone, Commander, So don't for one second think you're gonna come down here, flash a badge, and make me nervous"* from the statement of Colonel Jessep.

In data A-13, the character named Kaffee speaks to Jessep who plays a role as a person who disagrees. Both people have a role as Lieutenant and Colonel in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at officer's garden dining hall. This data is in interrogative form. He asking for the file command shift from Headquarters to the private Santiago while Col. Jessep is told to ask politely and Lieutenant Kaffee was surprised by the words of Col. Jessep indicated by *"I'll just need a copy of Santiago's transfer order. Santiago's transfer order", But you have to ask me nicely, I beg your pardon?*. The context of the data is Colonel Jessep disagrees with Lieutenant Kaffee, he feels he must be respected, if he wants something from the supervisor officer's because he felt worthy of being honored and respected. The data uses Challenges strategy that is indicated by *What I want is for you to stand there in that faggoty white uniform, and with your Harvard mouth, extend me some*

*fuckin' courtesy. You gotta ask me nicely* from the statement of Colonel Jessep.

In data A-14, the character named Kaffee speaks to Dawson and Downey who disagree. Both people have a role as Lieutenant and Corporal in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the interrogation room. This data is in declarative form because he declares to Dawson who, does not want to be called sir, indicated by *"Don't say sir like I just asked you if you cleaned the latrine"*. The context of the data is Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about Corporal Dawson statement because Dawson is calling Kaffee by saying *Sir* and Kaffee does not want to be called *Sir* because Dawson has been saying *sir* to Kaffee for many times. The data uses Challenges Strategy that is indicated by *"Don't say sir like I just asked you if you cleaned the latrine. You heard what I said. Did Lt. Kendrick order you guys to give Santiago a code red?"* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee.

In data A-16, the character named Dawson speaks to Kaffee who disagrees. Both people have a role as Corporal and Lieutenant in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the interrogation room. This data is in Declarative Form because he declares to Lieutenant Kaffee Because Corporal Dawson could not accept a lighter punishment offer from a Lieutenant Kaffee statement that is indicated by *"we can't do that sir"*. The context of the data is that Corporal Dawson disagrees with Lieutenant Kaffee statement because Corporal Dawson does not feel guilty about murder but he just follows orders from superiors. The data uses Challenges Strategy indicated by *"We did nothing wrong, sir. We did our job. If that has consequences, then I accept them. But' I won't say I'm guilty, sir"*. From the statement of Corporal Dawson.

In data A-18 the character named Kaffee speaks to Ross and Stone who disagrees. Both people have a role as Lieutenant, Captain and Major officer in US NAVY

The conversation takes place at the military court. This data is in Declarative form because he declares that Major Dr Stone statement was speculating indicated by *"The witness is speculating"*. The context of the data is Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about statement Major Dr Stone because His statements are lacking and speculation can be expressed. The data uses Challenges strategy indicated by *"Your Honor, we object at this point. The witness is speculating"* then Captain Ross disagrees about statement Lieutenant Kaffee because he knows Dr Stone is an expert in the medical field and his statement cannot be a speculation. The data used Challenges strategy indicated by *Commander Stone is an expert medical witness, in this courtroom his opinion isn't considered speculation* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee and Captain Jack Ross.

In the data A-21, the character named Ross speaks to Kaffee who disagrees. Both people have a role as Captain and Lieutenant officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the bar. This data is in Declarative form because he declares that Captain Ross cannot be equated with the other two high-ranking officers because of the same uniform that is indicated by *"Don't you dare lump me in with Jessep and Markinson and Kendrick because we wear the same uniform"*. The context of the data is Captain Ross disagrees as a marine officer and as a friend he defends Lieutenant Kaffee because the Captain Ross does not think the Lieutenant Kaffee's client is guilty since he only represents the United States government as the elected government lawyer. The data uses a Challenge strategy that is indicated by *"I'm your friend, Danny, and I'm telling you, I*

*don't think your clients belong in jail. But I don't get to make that decision. I represent the Government of the United States. Without passion or prejudice"* from the statement of Captain Ross.

In the data A-26, the character named Jo Galloway speaks to Jo Kaffee who disagrees. Both people have a role as Lieutenant and Major officer in the US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at Lieutenant Kaffee apartment room. This data is in Declarative form. She declares that Lieutenant Kaffee could call every department in the Pentagon to bring witnesses to the trial. The context of the data is Major Jo Galloway disagrees about statement Lieutenant Kaffee that Major Jo Galloway thinks that Lieutenant Kaffee does not ask for a transfer letter and Major Jo Galloway only wants Colonel Jessep to attend at the military court as the last witness. The data uses Challenges strategy that is indicated by *You didn't want the transfer order. You wanted to see Jessep's reaction when you asked for the transfer order. You had an instinct. And it was confirmed by Markinson. Now damnit, let's put Jessep on the stand and end this thing!* from the statement Major Jo Galloway.

### **Contradict**

In the third type, a speaker contradicts with uttering the negated proposition expressed by the previous claim. Contradictions are often marked by *negative particles like "no" or "not" i.e. (No, I don't)*, indicating that the contradiction of the prior claim is true such as *"No, It is not from the last term"* (S17'27).

There are (9) nine data of disagreement that are marked with contradict strategy. The data analysis will be explained in the following part.

In the data A-6, the character named Jo Galloway speaks to Kaffee, who disagrees.

Both people have a role as the Lieutenant and the Mayor in US NAVY.

The conversation take place at baseball field in the law division in the US NAVY. This data is in declarative form. He declares that the Lieutenant Kaffee would be replaced by another lawyer indicated by *"I don't think you're fit to handle this defense"*. The context of the data is that Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about the statement of Major Jo Galloway because she does not know and underestimates Lieutenant Kaffee as a lead counsel. This data uses Challenges strategy that is indicated by *"You don't even know me"* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee.

In data A-2, the character named Jo Galloway speaks to Kaffee who disagrees. Both persons have a role as Major Jo Galloway and Lieutenant Kaffee an Officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes places in Major Galloway Law Department Office US NAVY. This data is in declarative form. She declares that the client won't need a defence of Lieutenant Kaffee. The context of this data is that Major Jo Galloway disagree about the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee because that the client needed a lawyer in the military courts. This data uses Contradicts strategy that is indicated by *No. They'll need a lawyer* from the statement of Major Jo Galloway.

In the data A-4, the character named Markinson speaks to Jessep and Kendrick. who disagrees. The three men have a role as Lieutenant Kendrick, Lieutenant Colonel Markinson and Colonel Jessep were officers in the US Marine of Guantanamo Gulf, Cuba.

The conversation takes place in Colonel Jessep Office Room at the US Marine Guantanamo Gulf, Cuba. This data is in exclamatory form. He claims that interrupt to Lieutenant Kendrick that is indicated by *"I'm still your superior officer!"* The context of this data is that Lieutenant Colonel Markinson disagrees about the statement of Lieutenant

Kendrick because he will explain about the case of Private William Santiago similar to Curtis Bell Case in the Marine Base Guantanamo Gulf, Cuba and that would be handled by Lieutenant Kendrick thus Lieutenant Colonel Markinson before finish to explain Lieutenant Kendrick interrupted that statement. This data uses Contradicts strategy indicated by *"Don't interrupt me colonel."*

In data A-9 the character named Ross speaks to Kaffee, who plays a role as a person who disagrees. Both people have a role as the Captain and Lieutenant in the US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at hall office in the US NAVY Law Department. This data is in imperative Form. He terms that both suspects had committed a murder conspiracy indicated by *"They plead guilty to manslaughter, I'll drop the conspiracy."* The context of the data is that Captain Ross disagrees about the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee because he wants of both suspects to be given a relief of postponement custody. This data uses Contradicts Strategy indicated by *Can't do it , I don't care if they called the Avon Lady, they killed a marine* from the statement of Captain Ross.

In data A-11, the character named Sam speaks to Kaffee, who disagrees. Both people have roles as Lieutenant in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the street park. This data is in Declarative form. He declares that Cuba has a hot climate more than in US indicated by *'it's hot down there'*. The context of the data is that Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about Lieutenant Sam Weinberg statement because he does not like the white uniform that they have to wear to Cuba for mission. This data uses Contradicts strategy that is indicated by *I don't like the whites* from the statement of Lietenant Kaffee.

In data A-15, the character named Jo Galloway speaks to Jack Ross who disagrees.

Both people have roles as Mayor and Captain in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the indoor hall basketball court. This data is in Declarative Form because she declares to Jack Ross that Jo Galloway consider submitting appeal to the jury court that indicated by *"we're going to a jury"*. The context of the data is Major Jo Galloway disagrees about Captain Ross statement because the defendant was sentenced for premeditated murder but the evidence is not strong enough to be tried. The data used Contradicts Strategy by *"No deal, we're going to a jury"* from the statement of Major Jo Galloway.

In data A-19 below the character named Jo Galloway speaks to Kaffee who disagrees; both people have roles as Lieutenant and Mayor officer in US NAVY

The conversation takes place at dining hall restaurant. This data is in Declarative form because she declares the speaker makes statement that Lieutenant Kaffee was a gifted lawyer in the court indicated by *"I think you're an exceptional lawyer"*. The context of the data is Major Jo Galloway disagrees about the statement by Lieutenant Kaffee Because he was not quite skilled at the trial but Mayor Jo Galloway assumed that he is a talented and fluent lawyer who made the witness and the jury notice him. This data uses Contradicts strategy indicated by *"No you dont. I watch the jurors, they respond to you, they like you. I see you convincing them. I think Dawson and Downey are gonna end up owing their lives to you"* from the statement of Major Jo Galloway.

In the data A-25, the character named Kaffee speaks to Jo Galloway who disagrees; both people have roles as Lieutenant and Major officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at Lieutenant Kaffee apartment room. This data

is in Declarative Form he declares that the Lieutenant Kaffee did not want to attend to the court by bringing in a colonel Jessep. The context of the data is Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about Major Jo Galloway wants Colonel Jessep to be a witness in court, but the filing is too late and Lieutenant Kaffee recommends a new replacement lawyer. The data uses Contradicts strategy that indicates by *"No. I won't listen to you and I won't hear you out. Your passion is comforting, Jo. It's also useless. Private Downey needed a trial lawyer today"* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee.

In the data A-28, the character named Ross speaks to Kaffee who plays a role as person who disagrees both people have a role as Lieutenant officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the military court. This data is in Declarative form he declares that Colonel Jessep does not need to be appear in the military court just to confirm the info. The context of the data Captain Ross disagree about statement Lieutenant Kaffee that the statements of death of Colonel Markinson do not need to be confirmed to Colonel Jessep during a military court. This data uses Contradicts strategy indicated by *Colonel Jessep doesn't need to appear in this courtroom to confirm that information* from the statement of Captain Ross.

### Counterclaims

Counterclaims tend to be preceded by *pauses, prefaces, and mitigating devices*, like *"Yeah, but its still not."*(S3:18). With counterclaims, speakers propose an alternative claim that does not directly contradict or challenge others' claim. They allow further negotiation of the previous claim. There are (8) eight data of disagreement that are marked with

counterclaims strategy. The data analysis is presented in the following part.

In the data A-3, the character named Markinson speaks to Jessep and Kendrick who disagrees. Both men have a role as Lieutenant Colonel Markinson and Lieutenant Kendrick was an officer in the US Marine of Guantanamo Gulf, Cuba.

The conversation takes place in Colonel Jessep Office Room at US Marine Guantanamo Gulf, Cuba. This data is in declarative Form. He declares that it won't be necessary to Lieutenant Colonel Markinson indicated by *"I'll handle the situation."* The context of this data Lieutenant Kendrick disagrees about the statement of Lieutenant Colonel Markinson because the problem about the decease of Private Santiago in US Marine base in Guantanamo, Cuba can be solved by Lieutenant Kendrick. This data uses Counterclaims strategy that is indicated by *"That won't be necessary, Colonel, I'll handle the situation"* from the statement of Lieutenant Kendricks.

In data A-8, the character named Harold speaks to Kaffee, who disagrees. Both people have a role as the Corporal and the Lieutenant in the US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the prison room in US NAVY base. This data is of Declarative form. He declares that Corporal Dawson does not seem to commit a certain act to Private Santiago that is indicated by *Because he broke the chain of command, sir*. The context of the data is that Corporal Dawson disagrees about statement of Lieutenant Kaffee because Private Santiago does not follow the orders and rules from his senior division. This data uses Counterclaims Strategy that is indicated by *Because he broke the chain of command sir, He went outside his unit, sir. If he had a problem, he should've spoken to me, sir* from the statement of Corporal Dawson.

In data A-17, the character named Dawson speaks to Kaffee who disagrees. Both people have a role as Corporal and Lieutenant in the US NAVY.

The conversation takes place in the interrogation room. This data is in Declarative Form because he declares to Lieutenant Kaffee that he did not want to vilify the corps name, the unit and did not intend to betray him because Dawson felt innocent that is indicated by *"We joined the corps 'cause we wanted to live our lives by a certain code. And we found it in the corps. And now you're asking us to sign a piece of paper that says we have no honor. You're asking us to say we're not marines. If a judge and jury decide that what we did was wrong, I'll accept whatever punishment they give"*. The context of the data is Corporal Dawson disagrees about statement Lieutenant Kaffee because Corporal Dawson did not want to sign a military punishment sentence because he felt right to take action on the orders of superiors that required him to commit the persecution resulting in death. The data used Counterclaims Strategy indicated by *"you're asking us to sign a piece of paper that says we have no honor. You're asking us to say we're not marines. If a judge and jury decide that what we did was wrong, I'll accept whatever punishment they give. But I believe I was right, sir. I believe I did my job. And I won't dishonor myself, my unit, or the Corps, so that I can go home in six months"*. From the statement of Corporal Dawson.

In the data A-20, the character named Kaffee speaks to Ross who disagrees; both people have roles as Lieutenant and Major officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the bar. This data is in declarative form because he declares that Lieutenant Kaffee did not accept the advice of Captain Ross who told us of about consequences of casting high-ranking

officers. The context of the data is Lieutenant Kaffee disagrees about statement Captain Ross because Letnant Kaffee understands the risks he receives if he accuses high-ranking officers without sufficiently strong evidence and ignores the honor code that exists on the Captain Ross. The data uses Counterclaims strategy indicated by *"Thanks, Jack. And I wanna tell you that I think the whole fuckin' bunch of you are certifiably insane"* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee.

In the data A-23, the character named Kaffee speaks to Kendricks who disagrees; both people have a role as Lieutenant officer in the US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the military court room. This data is in declarative form because he declares that Corporal Dawson does not obey orders, and besides that is not an important command that should take precedence that indicated by *"Yeah, but it wasn't a order, was it? After all, it's peacetime. He wasn't being asked to secure a hill... or advance on a beachhead"*. The context of the data is Lieutenant Kaffee disagree about statement of Lieutenant Kendricks

According to Lieutenant Kaffee corporal Dawson does not obey orders because he knows to distinguish important command from unimportant command, corporal Dawson moves follow his instincts as a member of the military. The data uses Counterclaims strategy indicated by *"He wasn't being asked to secure a hill... or advance on a beachhead. I mean, surely a marine of Dawson's intelligence can be trusted to determine on his own, which are the really important orders, and which orders might, say, be morally questionable Lt. Kendrick?"* from the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee.

In the data A-24, the character named Markinson speaks to Kaffee who disagrees.

Both people have a role as Colonel and Lieutenant officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at the Motel Room. This data is in Declarative form because he makes statement Because there are flights in Guantanamo Bay to the Andrews Airforce Base. The context of the data is Colonel Markinson disagrees about statement Lieutenant Kaffee that there was no flight out at eleven o'clock. The data is used Counterclaims strategy that indicates by *"There was no flight out at eleven o'clock"* from the statement of Colonel Markinson.

In the data A-27, the character named Ross speaks to Kaffee who plays a role as a person who disagrees; both people have a role as Lieutenant officer in US NAVY.

The conversation takes place at military court. This data is in declarative form he declare that Captain Ross wanted to ask the essence of the Lieutenant Kaffee's question. The context of the data is Captain Ross disagrees about statement Lieutenant Kaffee because Captain Ross is confused with the statement of Lieutenant Kaffee who gave an indirect question on the intent. The data uses Counterclaims strategy that indicates by *Objection. I'd like to know just what defense counsel is implying?* From the statement of Captain Ross.

In the data A-30, the character named Ross speaks to Kaffee who disagrees; both people have a role as Lieutenant officer in US NAVY.

The conversation take places at military court. This data is in declarative form. Captain Ross declares that Lieutenant Kaffee offends indirectly to the witness to elicit an error that is indicated by *"it's obvious that Lt. Kaffee's intention this morning is to smear a high ranking marine officer in the desperate hope that the mere appearance of impropriety will win him points with the jury"*. The context of the data that Captain Ross disagrees with

indirect statement of allegations from Lieutenant Kaffee to high-ranking officers who wanted to generate points of error from witnesses and ordered Lieutenant Kaffee and court apologized directly. The data used counterclaims strategy that is indicated by "Object. Your Honor, it's obvious that Lt. Kaffee's intention this morning is to smear a high ranking marine officer in the desperate hope that the mere appearance of impropriety will win him points with the jury. It's my recommendation, sir, that Lt. Kaffee receive an official reprimand from the bench, and that the witness be excused with the Court's deepest apologies" from the statement of Captain Ross.

## CONCLUSION

Analysis of disagreement expressions in the characters of movie script Aaron Sorkin's *A Few Good Men* involves thirty (30) data to find out the types of disagreement strategies, based initially on Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) types of disagreement strategies.

The result of the analysis can be summarized in the following points. First, the writer finds the disagreement expressions can be identified by their sentence forms, they are: (1) Declarative form involves 23 data of disagreement expression which is found in all types of Disagreement Strategy, (2) Interrogative form involves 4 data of disagreement expression which is found in Challenge and Counterclaims Strategy. (3) Imperative form involves 2 data of disagreement expression which is found in Challenge Strategy (4) Exclamative form involves 1 data of disagreement expression which is found in Contradicts Strategy. Second, the result of the analysis also shows that there are four types of disagreement strategies usually used by the characters: Irrelevancy Claims involve four (4) data, Challenge involves nine (9) data, Contradicts

involve nine (9) and Counterclaims involves eight (8) data.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Creswell, John W. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches I. 2nd ed., in Michael Devitt and Richard Hanley, eds., 2003, *Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Language*. London Longman
- Leech, J. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Liu S (2004). *Politeness strategies and power relations in disagreement*. City International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning.
- Liu, S. 2004. *Pragmatic Strategies and Power Relations in Disagreement: Chinese Culture in Higher Education*. New York: Universal Publishers.
- Locher, Miriam. (2004). *Power and Politeness in Action. Disagreements in Oral Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mao, L. R. 1994. 'Beyond politeness theory: 'Face' revisited and renewed.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 451-86.
- Muntigl, P., & Turnbull, W. (1998). Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29, 225-256. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(97\)00048-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)00048-9).
- Muntigl, Peter and William Turnbull. 1997. Conversational Structure and Facework in Arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29 (1998), 225-256.
- Oktavia, Liza. 2013. A study disagreement strategies produced by career women and housewives in Sidoarjo.

Undergraduate Thesis, Petra Christian University.

Vanderveken, D. 1990. *Meaning and Speech Acts*. Vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, Steve (2013). *Classroom Discourse And Teacher Development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Yule, George (1996). *Pragmatics, Oxford Introduction to Language Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Internet sources :

[http://eprints.ums.ac.id/22965/16/PUBLICATION\\_JOURNAL.pdf](http://eprints.ums.ac.id/22965/16/PUBLICATION_JOURNAL.pdf), accessed: 17 April 2017.

<http://rachmatutomo.blogspot.co.id/2013/11/tindak-tutur-dan-pragmatik.html>, accessed : 2 January 2017.

<http://repository.usu.ac.id/bitstream/123456789/33519/4/Chapter%20II.pdf>, accessed : 25 March 2017.

<http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/GIONzkwM/Gyllenhaal.pdf>, accessed: 1 January 2017.

<http://www.slideshare.net/anthonysalinas98/pragmatics-george-yule>, accessed: 26 December 2016.

[https://books.google.co.id/books?id=dB4rBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA10&lpg=PA10&dq=Levinson+\(1983:+5\)&source=bl&ots=E3iL43SoH&sig=sC4drXTUqFuNuP3vKxPWVwdiOKw&hl=id&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjb0qCv1ZnRAhXMgl8KHa1cCQAQ6AEI\\_ZTAJ#v=onepage&q=Levinson%20\(1983%3A%205\)&f=falseiversity](https://books.google.co.id/books?id=dB4rBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA10&lpg=PA10&dq=Levinson+(1983:+5)&source=bl&ots=E3iL43SoH&sig=sC4drXTUqFuNuP3vKxPWVwdiOKw&hl=id&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjb0qCv1ZnRAhXMgl8KHa1cCQAQ6AEI_ZTAJ#v=onepage&q=Levinson%20(1983%3A%205)&f=falseiversity), accessed : 23 February 2017

[https://www2.leeward.hawaii.edu/hurley/Ling102web/mod4-3 semantics/4mod4.3.5 speechacts.htm](https://www2.leeward.hawaii.edu/hurley/Ling102web/mod4-3%20semantics/4mod4.3.5%20speechacts.htm), accessed : 28 April 2017.