**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Background of the Research**

Undeniably, people understanding the circumstance situations are not always the same. The daily interactions are sometimes misunderstood between the speaker and the hearer because of the different understanding of the situation in interaction. The understanding of each participant in a conversation is defined as context. Context needs to ensure the communication runs well without any misunderstanding. As stated by Levinson (1983), Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. Concisely, a communication interaction needs an understanding of the context of a conversation. When the participants understand the situation of the conversation, there is no more misconception, and when the participants catch the context in every communication interaction there less misunderstanding. In contrast, when the participants are remiss in catching situations so, another understanding of language appears.

The interaction that occurs between people and society give chance to people to give or receive information. In addition, communication and spoken interaction can be established through simultaneous interaction. Pragmatically, a language used in human communication determines by the conditions of society. As stated by Yule (1996), Pragmatics is a study of the speaker's meaning. The meaning refers to the interpretations of what people mean in a particular context and how context influences what is said. Pragmatics phenomenon can be found in

daily communication interactions such as, in a family house. The conversation below happened in a house. The conversations started when the husband as the hearer arrived home and found the wife as the speaker had just finished cooking for dinner.

Wife : "I had just cooked grilled chicken and soup."
Husband : **"I have to go out with my friend for some business tonight."**
Wife **:** "Ok, no problem."

In the conversation, the speaker told the hearer that the speaker had just cooked grilled chicken and soup. The literal meaning of the speaker's statement referred to the speaker's intention to take dinner at home with the hearer. The speaker indirectly asked the hearer to take dinner together. The speaker and the hearer had a problem the day before because of miscommunication. The speaker wanted to fix the problem and talked with the hearer. The speaker on purpose cooked the hearer's favorite food grilled chicken and soup. The hearer realized what the speaker's intention and the hearer denied the speaker's and replied with **"I have to go out with my friend for some business tonight"**. The speaker and the hearer discovered the implied meaning of the conversation that occurred. Both speaker and hearer understand the context of their conversation. It is proven by the hearer and the speaker understanding to reply to the utterances. The conversations are considered normal conversation and both speaker and hearer are cooperative in the conversation. The hearer and the speaker understood the context, even though when both the speaker and the hearer indirectly provided the meaning of the utterances. Cooperative participants in a conversation produce a good conversation.

An uncooperative participant in conversation can compose a misunderstanding. The phenomenon of this case found in a conversation between Fiki Naki as the speaker and Afgant man as the hearer. The conversation appeared below.

> Fiki Naki: "hello."
> Afgant man: **"China people you are stupid!"**
> Fiki Naki: "I am."
> Afgant man: "Yes you are, you look like a stupid nerd."
> Fiki Naki: "Stupid nerd?"
>
> (Naki, 2022)

The conversations were found in Fiki Naki YouTube channel from minutes 2:41 – 3.23. The conversation started when the hearer met in an application named Ome TV. The hearer saw the speaker's face which was naturally an Asian face. The speaker had slanted eyes. The hearer started talking rudely to the speaker by saying "China people you are stupid!" and made the conversation between both uncooperative. The Gesture and the face's expression of the speaker showed an uncomfortable feeling. The conversation between the speaker and the hearer can be categorized as a misunderstanding in conversation. The hearer did not cooperate in a conversation.

All other forms of talk in interaction are thus derived from this basic form of talk (Paltridge, 2012). In fact, in every social interaction, people communicate through language, so people can share some things that need to be shared, such as their thoughts, knowledge, feelings, arguments, and other important things.

The understanding of conversation analysis is important to know how someone manages the turn in spoken interaction. As social beings, humans convey their thoughts through communication. Therefore people need a

communication tool in the form of language to communicate with each other interact, relate, and work together for the realization of the conversation's goal. A conversation is a spoken interaction that involves two or more participants who interact spontaneously. Thus, a conversation is not just a collection of utterances, but rather a collection of interactive utterances spoken by participants of a conversation. When people are engaged in a conversation, they have to respond actively to all signals given, both through words and gestures

The basic rule in conversation is that one person speaks at a time, after which they may nominate another speaker or another speaker may take up the turn without being nominated  (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). The statements means that conversation involve two or more people who talk simultaneously, and there found who has turn to be speaker and listener and there is turn exchange. This changing is called turn-taking that means there are management of the speakers involved in conversations.

Turn taking is a basic subject studies in conversation. The roles of speaker and listener in manage the turn on spoken interaction is the basic knowledge of conversation. The roles affects with how conversations carries out in order to achieve goals of conversation itself. According to Levinson (1983), a conversation is characterized by turn taking. This means that in a conversation is happen because of turn-taking. The conversation runs well if participants in the conversation take their own turn. When the turn-taking in a conversation manage based on the rules, structure of conversation work well and achieve the goals.

The phenomenon of turn taking exists in human daily communications. This phenomenon found like when people talking with partner, boss, teacher, parents, and other relations. The phenomenon was found from the researcher experienced when the researcher talked with the researcher's friend in class. The conversation showed below.

Melly : "Rinta, I would like to ask you something, may I?"
Rinta : "Yes, please."
Melly : "**Emmmm,** wait I forgot about the things that I would ask to you."

The conversation started when Melly as the speaker suddenly talked to Rinta as the hearer. The context of the conversation was happened when both speaker and hearer were in class. The speaker wanted to started talk to the hearer by saying wanted to ask the hearer about something. But, after the hearer saw the hearer's face expression, the speaker suddenly forget what things that the speaker wanted to asked the hearer. The conversation above shows the phenomenon of turn-taking. The first speaker asked the hearer, then the hearer answer the question by saying "yes". The example shows that the second speaker applied an uptake expression to the first speaker. The turn-taking flowed well before the first speaker cannot continue the conversation because of forgot about the things that the speaker question to the interlocutor. The irregularity of turn-taking also shows in the example. The speaker distracted the structure of conversation by saying "emmmmm". The speaker's expression was categorized as **starting up strategy**. The speaker forgot about the questions that she should ask to the interlocutor that cause the conversation did not run smoothly. Instead of missed the turn, the hearer used the expression **to take the turn**.

The phenomenon of turn-taking can be found in You Tube. The phenomenon of turn taking showed in a YouTube channel. The conversation appeared below was the conversation between Steve Harvey as the speaker and Tommy Johnston as the hearer.

Steve Harvey: "Do you have a girlfriend?"
Tommy Johnston: "**Emmm, well** Jack has one and her name is Daviene."

The conversation found in Steve TV Show You Tube. The conversation appeared from minutes 0:02 – 0:10. The speaker and the hearer had a different age. The speaker is an adult and the hearer is a child. The speaker deliberately joked with the hearer by asking about the hearer's girlfriend even though the speaker knew that the speaker was still a child. The speaker started to talk to the hearer and the hearer replied with "Emmm, well Jack has one and her name is Daviene." The hearer's started to answer and took the turn in speaking by saying **"Emmm, well".** The hearer's statement had not good preparation at the beginning of the conversation. It makes the hearer used a hesitant start such as filled pause, likes "Emmm" to show that the hearer was preparing what to say next to give the real answer. Turn-taking exist in this conversation and categorized as starting up strategy.

The phenomena of turn-taking can be found in the data sources of this research. The phenomenon of turn-taking appeared from data sources was found in the conversation between Hank Palmer and Kattan showed below.

Kattan: Stop, you meant to do that.
Palmer:                             **=Did that just happened?**
Kattan: No, you startled me. Yeah, you meant to do that.
Palmer:                             **=No, I do not think I did.**

The conversation above found in the beginning of The Judge 2014 movie at 00:02:22-0:03:40 minutes. The conversation occurred between Kattan as the speaker and Palmer as the hearer. Both speaker and hearer is lawyer. The conversation happened in the toilette when the trial had just finished. Kattan as the speaker came to the speaker suddenly and was mad because of some problem that was happened in the trial. The speaker tried to talk to the hearer but the hearer purposely peed on the speaker's shoes. The speaker asked the hearer to stop. The speaker said to the hearer to stop and said that the speaker was purposely peed on his shoe. The speaker did not admit it. The hearer cut off the speaker's statement by saying "did that just happened?" to the hearer's statement.

In the conversation, the turn-taking happened in conversation is not run well. Palmer as the speaker Interrupted the hearer's statement, even though the speaker had not finished utterance yet. The hearer broke the speaker's turn and replied "**did that just happened**". The equal sign (=) in the hearer's statement symbolized the hearer cut the speaker turn. This case categorized as interrupting strategy. Stenström (1994) interrupting happens when the current speaker takes the turn without waiting the current speaker finish the turn. The hearer forced the speaker to stop talking and blamed him. The function of the interrupting strategy did by the hearer was **to take the turn**.

This research had been conducted by two previous researches. Hasan, Sumarsih, & Masitowarni, (2020) discovered the turn-taking strategies used by participants in Ellen Talk Show. The data were from the utterances of the

participants that showed the performance of turn-taking that were conveyed by the speakers. The result of this research showed three basic kinds of turn taking strategies, named taking the floor, holding the floor and yielding in that conversation.

The second research was examined by Region (2021). The aims of this research was explored the essential of turn-taking in conversations based on analytical point of view. The researcher analyzed talk interaction performed in Kurdish casual conversation. The researcher applied the theory of (Stenström, 1994). The result of the research explored that participants sometimes constantly tried to switch the turn and change turn roles as speaker or hearer. Participants also interrupted to take turn and some waited until the current speaker finished their talk.

Related to the previous research, it was clear that the previous research different with the present research. The similarity found in the previous research and the present was on the theory used Stenström (1994) as the main theory. The differences of both researches were the data sources. The researcher was interested in learning more about the turn-taking due to the phenomena found by the researcher in the real life and in other social media and informative platforms. The phenomena of turn-taking are closely related to daily activities and always carries out by human. The researcher studied more about turn-taking in other data sources that different from the previous research. The focus of this research was found out the turn-taking strategies and its function. The researcher wanted to find something new that had not found by the previous research. Due to those several

reasons, the researcher conducted this research with entitled **"Analysis of Turn-taking used in The Judge 2014 Movie: Pragmatics Approach".**

## 1.2 Identification of the Problem

1. The importance of context understanding in daily spoken interaction.

2. The misunderstanding context of conversation in social media interaction.

3. The performance of turn-taking strategies in social media.

4. The types of turn-taking strategies used in The Judge 2014 movie.

5. The function of turn-taking strategies used in The Judge 2014 movie.

## 1.3. Limitation of the Problem

1. The strategies of turn-taking expressed by characters in The Judge 2014 movie.

2. The functions of turn-taking strategies expressed by characters in The Judge 2014 movie.

## 1.4 Formulation of the Problem

1. What strategies of turn-taking are expressed by characters in The Judge 2014 movie?

2. What functions of turn-taking strategies are expressed by characters in The Judge 2014 movie?

## 1.5 Objectives of the Research

1. To find out the strategies of turn-taking expressed by character in The Judge 2014 movie.

2. To find out the function of turn-taking strategies expressed by characters in The Judge 2014 movie.

## 1.6 Significance of the Research

1. **Theoretical significance**

   The product of this research is intended to provide contribution to English language students who learn about linguistics. This research is provided can give a new knowledge about the new interesting topic in linguistics. The result of this research is expected to be a reference for future researcher, who will discuss about conversation analysis, especially turn-taking. Finally, this research result is expected to be new information about variation in linguistics major. The result can be provided to enrich the knowledge of the reader.

2. **Practical significance**

   The study is intended to provide a new knowledge to the researcher and readers. This research hopefully can give good impact to the researcher and the reader to practice it in daily spoken interaction. This research is expected can be as guidance for the reader and the researcher to know how to manage the structure of conversation especially in turn taking based on rules in order to achieve good communications.

**1.7 Definition of Key Terms**

**Pragmatics:** Pragmatics comprehension includes not just interpreting the meanings of conversation, but also understanding the definition of the utterances (Yule, 1996).

**Turn-taking:** Turn-taking is a basic knowledge in spoken interaction which the aim is to manage the turn of each participant followed the rules in spoken interaction. The turn-taking is a basic a fundamental rules in conducting a conversation (Sacks et al., 1974).

**Turn-taking strategies:** The way participants in a conversation, the speaker and the hearer manage turn and their roles in a conversation (Stenström, 1994)