

Arguing in *Toy Story* Movies

Ni Kadek Yunitha Kurnianty^{1*}, Luh Putu Laksminy.², Ni Luh Nyoman Seri Malini³

^[123]English Department, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University
¹[yunitha.kurnianty@gmail.com] ²[luhputulaksminy@yahoo.co.id]
³[kmsermalini@yahoo.com]
**Corresponding Author*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis komponen argumen dalam argumen yang merupakan tindakan ilokusi asertif yang diucapkan oleh karakter dalam perdebatan yang terdapat dalam film. Penelitian ini juga bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi makna tersirat yang terkandung dalam argumen yang merupakan tindakan ilokusi asertif tersebut.

*Data pada penelitian ini diambil dari film berjudul *Toy Story* dan dua sekuelnya yang berjudul *Toy Story 2* dan *Toy Story 3*. Dalam pengumpulan data, penelitian ini menggunakan metode dokumentasi dan pencatatan teknik. Data dianalisis secara kualitatif deskriptif. Teori dari Searle tentang tindakan ilokusi diaplikasikan untuk menganalisis makna tersirat yang terkandung dalam argumen yang merupakan tindakan ilokusi asertif, dan teori penggunaan argumen dari Toulmin diaplikasikan untuk menganalisis komponen argumen yang terkandung dalam argumen yang merupakan tindakan ilokusi asertif tersebut.*

Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada data yang mengandung semua komponen argumen. Pembicara akan menambahkan satu atau lebih komponen dalam argumennya tergantung pada situasi yang memicu perdebatan, bukti-bukti yang dimiliki pembicara, dan kekuatan klaim pada argumennya. Penelitian ini mampu menunjukkan makna tersirat dari argumen yang merupakan tindakan ilokusi asertif yang diucapkan oleh karakter dalam film ketika mereka sedang berdebat. Konteks dari situasi dapat digunakan untuk mengidentifikasi makna tersirat di dalam argumen yang merupakan tindakan ilokusi asertif tersebut.

Kata kunci: perdebatan, tindakan ilokusi asertif, argumen, komponen argumen, makna tersirat

1. Background of the Study

Communication is a requirement of human being in order to socialize and build a relationship in community. A speaker is not only uttering the sounds of the language for communicating but also performs the act of doing something. For instance, the act of asking, the act of giving advice, act of making promise and offering, act of giving order,

etc. In other words, one can do action by means of language. The action perform via utterances are generally called speech act (Yule, 2000: 47).

Searle (1969) said that pragmatically, there are at least three types of acts performed by the speaker when an utterance is produced, they are: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary acts are the acts of saying something, providing the hearer with the core information which infers that the speaker has uttered and identified sentence from the language with an identified prosody. Perlocutionary acts are the act of causing effect on the hearer and others. Illocutionary acts are the acts viewed in terms of the utterance significance within a conventional system of social interaction.

Illocutionary act is an interesting topic to be discussed. It is shown by several studies that have been done about this topic. Rarely found the study about assertive illocutionary acts, compared with the other types of illocutionary acts such as directive and commissive illocutionary acts. For that reason, this study focuses on the assertive illocutionary acts, especially the arguing which is a part of the assertive illocutionary acts. This study focuses on analyzing the components of argument contained in the arguing as part of assertive illocutionary acts; and determining the intended meanings of those arguing assertive illocutionary acts produced by the characters in *Toy Story* movies.

2. Problems of the Study

There are two problems formulated in this study based on the background:

- a. What components of argument are contained in the arguing as part of assertive illocutionary acts found in *Toy Story* movies?
- b. What are the intended meanings of arguing as part of assertive illocutionary acts found in *Toy Story* movies?

3. Aims of the Study

After formulating the problems of the study, the aims of the research are:

- a. To analyze the components of argument contained in the arguing as part of assertive illocutionary act found in *Toy Story* movies.

- b. To identify the intended meaning of arguing as part of assertive illocutionary acts found in *Toy Story* movies.

4. Research Method

There are three aspects of research method applied; they are data source, method and technique of collecting data, and method and technique of analyzing data.

4.1. Data Source

According to the need of analysis, the data were taken from three movies that were the trilogy of Toy Story, entitled *Toy Story*, *Toy Story 2*, and *Toy Story 3*. Toy Story is a 1995 American computer-animated buddy comedy adventure movie produced by Pixar Animation Studios and released by Walt Disney Pictures. The movies were chosen as the data source because they contain a lot of utterances indicating illocutionary acts, especially the arguing, as part of assertive illocutionary acts. In addition, the movie received three Academy Award nominations, including Best Original Screenplay, Best Original Score, and Best Original Song for "You've Got a Friend in Me", as well as winning a Special Achievement Academy Award. For that reason, the movie is worth discussing.

4.2. Method and Technique of Collecting Data

In order to obtain the necessary data and information as the main topic of discussion, this study used documentation method. The data were taken by note taking technique. The first step was observing the conversation between characters by watching the movies. The next step was downloading the subtitle of the movies from www.subscene.com, to see the transcription or the written form of the utterances in the movies. The utterances in the conversation as data related to assertive illocutionary acts were noted down. The data which had been classified into assertive illocutionary acts were further classified into arguing assertive illocutionary acts.

4.3. Method and Technique of Analyzing Data

The collected data were analyzed using the descriptive qualitative method. This study analyzed the components of arguments contained in the arguing assertive illocutionary acts using the theory proposed by Toulmin (1958) and determined the intended meaning of the arguing assertive illocutionary acts using the theory proposed by Searle (1969).

5. The Analysis of Arguing in *Toy Story* Movies

5.1 Claim

Claim is one of the basic components of an argument. Claim is the conclusion that the speaker wishes the listener to accept.

Toy Story - (00:28:06 – 00:28:20)

Mr. Potato Head : “He’s saying that this was no accident.”
Ms. Peep : “What do you mean?”
Mr. Potato Head : ”I mean Humpty – Dumpty was pushed. By woody!”: “Wait a minute. You... You don’t think I mean to knock Buzz out the window. Do you? Potato Head?”
Mr. Potato Head : **“That’s Mr. Potato Head to you, you back-stabbin’ murderer!”**

The conversation occurred when the twilight came; in Andy’s room when Buzz fell down from the window. Mr. Potato Head, Ms. Peep, and Woody, were the participants of the conversation. Almost all of the toys became the listeners.

In Mr. Potato Head’s argument, the only component that can be found is the claim. It is “you back-stabbin’ murderer!”. He produced the claim to conclude the situation that has been told by RC and also to make the listener believe that Woody was the one who made Buzz fall down from the window. Mr. Potato Head only put a claim in his argument, without any data, warrant, backing, qualifier, or rebuttal which can make his argument stronger. His argument is less trustworthy.

Mr. Potato Head’s claim contained intended meaning. Woody asked him “Wait a minute. You... You don’t think I mean to knock Buzz out the window. Do you? Potato Head?”, and he answered by “That’s Mr. Potato Head to you, you back-stabbin’ murderer!”. His answer has an intended meaning that is he actually wanted to say “Yes”. He wanted to say to Woody and the other listeners that he did think Woody knocked Buzz out the window.

5.2 Data

Data is the statement added to be the foundation of the claim. In other words, it is the evidence that can support the claim. Data is also one of the basic components of an argument.

Toy Story - (00:18:26 – 00:18:32)

Rex : “Oh, uh, Mr. Lightyear, uh, now, I’m curious. What does the space ranger actually do?”

Woody : **“He’s not a space ranger! He doesn’t fight evil or... or shoot laser or fly!”**

The conversation occurred when Buzz entered Andy’s room as his new toy. The participants of the conversation were Buzz, Woody, Rex, Mr. Potato Head, and the other toys of Andy. Data is important to make the claim valid. It is the speaker’s belief to be the truth on which the claim is based. The second sentence of Woody’s argument is the data. The claim said that Buzz is not a space ranger in order to make it valid, he said that Buzz does not fight any evil or shoot laser or fly. Woody’s argument contains two sentences; it is a claim and the data. He does not add any warrant, as well as the backing. There are no rebuttal and qualifier in his argument. Woody’s argument contained intended meaning. In his argument, he actually meant to say that he was tired hearing the entire compliment about Buzz. He wanted to hide his envy and actually wanted to ask the other toys in the room to stop praising Buzz.

5.3 Warrant

Warrant is the sentence added in the argument with the purpose of linking the claim and the data.

Toy Story 3 - (00:13:03 – 00:13:08)

Lotso : “Why don’t you come on back, join our family again?”

Jessie : **“This isn’t a family! It’s a prison! You’re a liar and a bully! And I’d rather rot in this dumpster than join any family of yours”**

The conversation occurred near the dumpster when Woody and his friends tried to escape from Sunny Side. The participants of the conversation were Jessie and Lotso, meanwhile Woody, Buzz, Mr. Potato Head, Barbie, Bullseye, Hamm, Rex, Big Baby, and the Octopus were the listeners. The conversation was about Jessie’s disagreement towards Lotso’s invitation that asked her and the other toys of Andy to join the family of Sunny Side.

Jessie’s argument contains four components; warrant is one of the components that are found in her argument. Warrant is added in an argument in order to be the link

between the claim and the data. In order to win the arguing, Jessie added a warrant to support her claim and her data into her argument. The warrant is “And I’d rather rot in this dumpster than join any family of yours”. This warrant linked to the claim and the data produced by Jessie. She said that she would rather rot in the dumpster because she claimed that the place was a prison and she did not want to get back there where Lotso who was a liar and bully lived.

The intended meaning of Jessie’s utterance is that the dumpster was better than the Sunny Side, since none of the toys would be treated badly by Lotso. It was better than any place where Lotso belonged to. Her utterance showed how bad Sunny Side and Lotso were.

5.4 Backing

Backing is the sentence added to support the warrant of the argument. Backing is important if the warrant cannot be accepted or believed by the listener of the argument.

Toy Story - (00:32:41 – 00:33:14)

Woody : “Oh, yeah? Well, if you hadn’t shown up in your stupid little cardboard spaceship and taken away everything that was important to me...”

Buzz : “Don’t talk to me about importance. Because of you the security of this entire universe is in jeopardy!”

Woody : “What? What are you talking about?”

Buzz : “Right now, poised at the edge of the galaxy, Emperor Zurg has been secretly building a weapon with a destructive capacity to annihilate an entire planet! I alone have information that reveals this weapon’s only weakness. And you, my friend, are responsible for delaying my rendezvous with Star Command!”

Woody : “**You are a toy! You aren’t the real Buzz Lightyear! You’re a... Uh, you’re an action figure! You are a child’s plaything!**”

The conversation occurred under the truck at the gas station. It was in the evening when Woody and Buzz fell from Andy’s car and being left by Andy. The participants of the conversation were Woody and Buzz. There were no other listeners in that place.

The argument produced by Woody contains backing. The backing added in the last sentence of Woody’s argument, which said “You are a child plaything!”. Backing is the additional information added in order to support the warrant in an argument. The warrant of Woody’s argument is in the third sentence which said “You’re an action figure”. In order to support what is called as an action figure, Woody added that an

action figure is a child plaything as the backing of the warrant. Warrant is the link between the claim and the data in an argument. The claim of Woody's argument is "You are a toy!". Claim is added in an argument to be the conclusion that the speaker wishes the listener to accept. Woody added a claim in his argument in order to make Buzz accept the truth that he was a toy. After adding a claim, Woody added the data of the argument in order to explain the claim that he made. The data in his argument is "You aren't the real Buzz Lightyear". It explained the reason why Woody claimed Buzz as a toy. The reason is because Buzz was not a real Buzz Lightyear. The argument produced by Woody contains almost all of the components of the argument. It contains claim, data, warrant, and backing. However, it does not contain rebuttal and qualifier.

Woody's argument has an intended meaning. By saying the argument "You are a toy! You aren't the real Buzz Lightyear! You're a... Uh, you're an action figure! You are a child's plaything!", Woody actually meant to say "You speak non sense. Stop talking about something strange that cannot even be understood by anybody". Through his argument, Woody tried to tell Buzz to think more realistic.

5.5 Rebuttal

Rebuttal is a counter argument. It shows the disagreement of the speaker towards the argument of whom the speaker talked to.

Toy Story - (00:17:57)

Buzz : "Ah, ah, ah, ah! Please be careful. You don't want to be in the way when my laser goes off."
Mr. Potato Head : "Hey, a laser! How come you don't have a laser, Woody?"
Woody : **"It's not a laser. It's a... It's a little light bulb that blinks."**

The utterance was produced when Buzz, the new toy of Andy, got inside Andy's room where the other toys of Andy lived. All the toys are gathered to get to know about Buzz. The curiosity of all the toys towards Buzz is the field of the conversation. The participants of the conversation were all the toys in Andy's room.

From the conversation above, it can be seen that Woody gives a rebuttal to Mr. Potato Head's argument which said "Hey, a laser!". His rebuttal is "*It's not a laser.*"

The rebuttal showed the disagreement of Woody towards the argument of Mr. Potato Head that said Buzz has a laser. Beside rebuttal, the argument produced by Woody also contains another component which is a claim. Woody said that the thing is not a laser, and then he claimed that the thing is a little light bulb that blinks. He added the claim in order to influence and convince the listener to believe him that the laser is not real, although it is not being proved and the listener may not agree with or believe it. Woody's argument only contains two sentences; they are the rebuttal, and the claim. There is no data and warrant found in his argument, because of that, there is no backing either. Neither does he add any qualifier.

Woody's argument has an intended meaning. He actually meant to say to the other toys that "Buzz does not have a laser". Instead of saying it directly, he preferred to give a rebuttal to Mr. Potato Head by saying "It's not a laser. It's a little light bulb that blinks". He wanted to hide his envy to Buzz. He tried to make Buzz looked ordinary just like the other toys in Andy's room.

6. Conclusion

Based on the data analysis, there are some conclusions that can be summarized as follows. From the analysis discussed, there were none of the data which contained *qualifier* in it. None of the data has the complete components of argument. Most of the data were only containing *claim*, meanwhile the other components of argument such as *data*, *backing*, *warrant*, and *rebuttal* were used occasionally. The speaker would add one or more components in his or her arguments depending on the situation that triggered the arguing, the evidences that the speaker have, and the strength of the claim.

Most of the conversations in the *Toy Story* movies were the arguing between characters in it, some of the arguing contain intended meaning. This study could show the intended meaning of those arguing assertive illocutionary acts. In other words, this study could show what actually the speaker wanted to say to the listener and what were the speaker's purposes of uttering those arguing assertive illocutionary acts. The context of situation could be used in determining the intended meaning. It explained the situation surrounding the speakers when they uttered the arguing assertive illocutionary acts.

7. Bibliography

- Eemeren, Frans H. Van and Grootendorst, Roob. 2004. *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grundy, Peter. 2000. *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Hodder Arnold Publication.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. 1989. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspect of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Searle, J.R. 1969. *Speech Act: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Searle, J.R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Toulmin, S. 1958. *The Uses of Argument* (Updated Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, George. 2000. *Pragmatic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.