



Jurnal Sastra Indonesia

<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jsi>



Contradictory Speech in the Dialogue of *Teddy Soeraatmadja's* *Lovely Man* Film

Sahrul Siyam¹, Rustono², Haryadi³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Negeri Semarang, Sekaran Gunungpati Kota Semarang Jawa tengah

Article Info

Article History

Submitted February 27, 2024

Accepted July 20, 2024

Publish July 30, 2024

Keyword

pragmatic, contradictory speech, film, *Lovely Man*, gender identity, social stigma

Abstract

This study examines the contradictory speech between the two main characters in the film "Lovely Man" through a pragmatic approach. The film tells the story of the relationship between a student and her father, who is a transvestite, showing differences in backgrounds and complex social conflicts. Through dialogue analysis, this study found that contradictory speech reflects social tensions, hidden feelings, gender identity issues, and social stigma. Contradictory speech not only serves as a means of communication but also as a reflection of the social and cultural background of its characters. This study uses a qualitative approach with a pragmatic analysis method to examine contradictory speech in the movie "Lovely Man." The data is taken from a fragment of dialogue between the two main characters, Cahaya and Ipuy, in the film. This study uses pragmatic matching methods and data analysis techniques in the form of observation and recording techniques. The methodological steps used in this study include data classification, analyzing data based on a theoretical framework, and drawing conclusions based on data analysis. This research provides in-depth insights into how social contexts affect verbal and non-verbal communication. This can benefit academics, communication practitioners, filmmakers, and the general public in understanding and managing complex social interactions.

*E-mail:

¹almathor176@students.unnes.ac.id

²rustono@mail.unnes.ac.id

³haryadihar67@mail.unnes.ac.id

©2024 The Authors. Published by UNNES. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

DOI 10.15294/jsi.v13i2.7258

P ISSN: 2252-6315 E-ISSN: 2685-9599

INTRODUCTION

Language is a tool to express thoughts, experiences, and situations based on the background of its users. Language skills consisting of listening, speaking, listening, and writing are considered very important in daily life (Devianty, 2017:226). In pragmatics, different linguistic characteristics relate to social contexts, time, place, atmosphere, education, and culture. Therefore, the meaning of speech in communication is greatly influenced by the context (Pande & Artana, 2020:32-38). Pragmatics has many topics that can be discussed, including speech acts. Speech is considered an individual symptom that is psychological, and its persistence is determined by the speaker's language ability in dealing with specific situations (Ilham Munandar, 2021:25-40). Pragmatics is linguistics that studies the intentions and objectives the speaker wants to convey to the other speaker. This linguistics is related to the analysis of what people mean by their speeches (Sagita, 2019:4). According to Gunarwan, pragmatics is a field of linguistics that studies the meaning of speech, not the meaning of the sentences spoken (Adriana, 2018:2-5). Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that concentrates on the conceptual meaning conveyed by the speaker or writer and interpreted by the opponent who acts as a listener or reader so that the meaning of the speech is known (Alfiansyah *et al.*, 2021:53-68). Communicative discourse in pragmatics is used to convey the message, duties, and needs of the speaker, the goals and communication, as well as to maintain the social relationship between the speaker and his interlocutor (Rohmadi, 2013:53-61). Speech has various types and functions. Likewise, novels contain multiple types of speech and have various pragmatic functions. There are many types of speech, and they can be analyzed based on practical studies. One of them is the type of directive speech; this type of speech is the speech intended by the speaker so that the speaking partner does what the speaker does (Yuliarti, 2015:58-78).

Speech acts are spoken by the speaker while performing specific, meaningful actions to obtain the expected response from the speaking partner. The choice of speech depends on several factors related to language function, namely informative, expressive, directive, aesthetic, and fatis functions. The function of speech acts is seen in the purpose and purpose (what the speech is conveyed for) (Widayanti & Kustinah, 2019:180-185).

In other words, it can be concluded that based on its function, this act of speech can be called a demand speech act, dividing the act of illocution

speech into five categories, including declarative, representative, expressive, directive, and commissive (Rahmadhani *et al.*, 2020:88-89). Speech is an individual symptom that is psychological, and its persistence is determined by the speaker's language ability in dealing with specific situations (Apriastuti, 2017:38-47). **Representative** is the act of speech responsible to the speaker for the validity of the speech spoken. Representative speech includes a type of speech that is used to explain something in the form of facts, statements, affirmations, descriptions, and conclusions that the speaker believes (Eva Wulandari, 2021:65-70). **Commissive**: The act of commissive speech is an act of speech that binds the speaker to carry out what is stated in his speech. For example, "Anyone caught cheating, I immediately give E" (Khoirurrohman, 2019:149). A **directive** is an act of speech carried out by the speaker with the intention that the opponent of the speech performs the actions mentioned in the speech, such as ordering, pleading, demanding, suggesting, and challenging (Mardian *et al.*, 2021:11-24). **A declaration is an act of speech that can bring about or change a situation, such as a baptism, confirmation, or decision.** For example, "Our brother declares that he graduated as a doctor." **Expressive** is an act of speech that responds to speech or actions and psychological states expressed with speech that contains human values. For example, "Sorry, sir, I'm late". Pragmatics has many topics that can be discussed, including speech acts. Speech behavior is an individual symptom that is psychological and sustainable in nature and is determined by the speaker's language ability in dealing with specific situations (Darmayanti, 2020:14-26).

Pragmatic itself is commonly defined as "the study of the relationship between symbols and interpretations." What is meant by symbols is a unit of speech either in the form of one or more sentences, which carries a specific meaning, which in pragmatics is determined by the results of the listener's interpretation (Amanda & Putri, 2021:162-176). Based on this speech, it can be concluded that each type of speech act has different characteristics and communicative goals, playing an essential role in understanding language interaction in social contexts. There are various types of speech, including directive (commanding), representative (stating facts), commissive (offering or rejecting), declarative (changing status), and expressive (expressing emotions). Each type has its communicative purpose and function.

To express themselves, people produce speech that contains words and grammatical structures and show action through that speech.

The speech act performed by a speaker includes three types that are interconnected:

The act of locution speech is an act of speech that states something in the sense of "saying" or an act of speech in the form of a sentence that is meaningful and understandable.

Illocution speech is speech that is identified with explicit performative sentences.

Perlocution speech often influences or affects those who listen to it. For example, "Your report card score is perfect," which can cause listeners to feel happy or sad.

Contradictory is a concept that has a vital role in logic and critical thinking. Daslam, the context of critical thinking understanding of contradictions allows it to recognize logical inconsistencies and filter information. This is related to the speaker's goal of achieving the real goal. Contradictions arise because of conflicts of thought that give birth to speech patterns as a representation of the true intention and purpose (Novri Susan & Ulyati Retno S., 2019:).

Dalam film tersebut, pencarian ayahnya oleh Cahaya dijelaskan. Setelah mencari, ayahnya ditemukan bekerja sebagai pekerja seks di Taman Lawang, yang mengejutkannya. Pertemuan antara Cahaya dan ayahnya, yang telah berganti nama menjadi Ipu, mengandung tuturan kontradiktif. Ipu merasa terganggu oleh kehadiran Cahaya yang berpakaian santun dan menanyakan nama aslinya. Pertentangan dalam dialog ini disebabkan oleh ketidaknyamanan dan kekesalan Ipu.

The topic of contradictory speech in communication, particularly in the movie "Lovely Man," is essential to research for various reasons. First, this research helps to understand the social and cultural contexts that influence communication. Second, pragmatic analysis uncovers the implicit meanings behind contradictory speech, such as hidden feelings and social tensions that are not explicitly visible. Third, this study adds insight into linguistics, especially pragmatics, by explaining the function and influence of contradictory speech in interactions. Fourth, this study raises social issues such as gender identity, family relationships, and social stigma.

Based on the background of the problem that has been described, the formulation of the problem in this study focuses on three main discussions, including contradictory speech in the movie "Lovely Man." The first question concerns the type of conflicting speech in the film's dialogue. Furthermore, this study also aims to understand the function of contradictory speech contained in the dialogue. Finally, this research will explore the effects of conflicting speech on the narrative and

character dynamics in the movie "Lovely Man." Thus, this study aims to identify, explain, and analyze these aspects in the context of contradictory speech in the film, which is the focus of the research. Research Benefits

Recent studies in linguistic pragmatics highlight various aspects of human communication in different contexts. Mei Ya Liang (2024) investigated emotional expressions and (non)agreements in students' online discussions on sociopolitical issues (Liang, 2024:1-24). Krifka (2024) explores the structure and interpretation of declarative sentences in German, while Villalba (2024) describes exclamatory sentence markers in Roman with a pragmatic and synthetic approach (Villalba, 2024:51-63). Trinh (2024) focuses his research on the differences in call forms in English and Vietnamese (Trinh, 2024:30), while Mereu (2024) analyzes multi-unit Backchannels in Italian Conversation (Mereu et al., 2024:1-16). Arita (2024) investigated using the Japanese final expression "Jan" as a form of social flirtation—Borchmann (2024) Examining the typical pragmatic features in Danish news headlines (Arita, 2024:57-71). And Lu (2024) examines audience design and pragmatic conceptions of gestures and voices while advising on Reddit (Lu, 2024:30-47). Research by Wonderen et al. (2023) concluded that exposure to multiple languages can improve children's pragmatic abilities (Wonderen et al., 2023: 101384). In addition, Oswald (2023) Explores the interface between argumentative theory and linguistic pragmatics (Oswald, 2023: 144-156), while Liu et al. (2023) explore new directions in second language pragmatics (Liu et al., 2023:222-226). A study by N. Lee (2022) deepens a pragmatic understanding of subject expressions in spoken Korean and research by Safar & de Vos (2022) (Safar & de Vos, 2022:7-22). He reveals the dynamics of language development in social interactions, especially in home signers (Chen & Brown, 2022:7-22). This study collectively illustrates the breadth of linguistic pragmatics and its application in various human communication contexts. Dewa Putu Wijana (2021), entitled "On Speech Acts" in the Journal of Pragmatics Research, aims to investigate more deeply speech acts in pragmatic contexts, focusing on the categories, classifications, and strategies of speech acts based on theories developed by J.L. Austin and John Searle. This research provides a solid theoretical foundation for understanding different types of speech (Wijana, 2021:14-27). In addition, Garda Arif Wicaksono (2018), in his study on "Analysis of Declarative Speech Act in the Movie My Lawyer, Mr Jo: Pragmatics Approach," uses a qualitative approach to identify the act of declarative speech in

the context of the film. Although the focus is only on declarative speech, this study shows significant relevance in the pragmatic linguistic context (Wicaksono, 2018:91). Furthermore, research by Putri Dinia and Fika Megawati (2018) in the journal *Research and Innovation* entitled "Deictic Expressions Used by Lera Boroditsky in TED Talks Channel" takes a descriptive-qualitative approach to analyze deictic expressions in Lera Boroditsky's speech at TED Talks (Ningsih & Megawati, 2022:15-23). Although different in the object of the study, the study also contributes to a pragmatic understanding with a broader focus on various types of speech in the context of film. Meanwhile, research by Akbar (2018) on "Analysis of Speech Acts in Interviews with Putra Nababan and the President of Portugal (Pragmatic Study)" explored locution, illocution, and perlocution speech in journalist interviews with Portuguese President Antonio Cavaco Silva, using a qualitative method with a statistical approach (Akbar, 2018:27-38). This comparison illustrates the variation of the methodology used in the pragmatic study, which can provide new insights into the analysis of speech acts in the dialogue of the film "Lovely Man."

Previous research may have yet to explore speech's emotional and psychological impact on movie characters. This research can investigate how the speech acts used in the dialogue of the film "Lovely Man" affect the emotional and psychological dynamics between the characters and how this affects the audience. In addition, this study can further explore the perlocution effect of speech in conversation, namely how spoken words influence the actions and attitudes of other characters in the film. Understanding this perlocution effect could provide more insight into how verbal communication affects social interaction and character perception. Finally, the movie "Lovely Man" may have a complex dialogue not found in formal interviews or other, more straightforward films. This research could explore how such complexity affects the communication strategies used by characters and how these reflect or challenge existing pragmatic conventions.

Recent studies in linguistic pragmatics reveal various aspects of human communication, including contradictory phenomena. Mei Ya Liang's (2024) research on emotional expressions and (dis)agreements in online discussions highlights how participants use speech that can appear to agree but express disagreement, reflecting contradictions in online interactions. On the other hand, Akbar's (2018) research on speech acts in formal interviews shows that language can often imply contradictions depending on its pragmatic context. This study concludes that understanding

contradictions in linguistic pragmatics helps us understand the complexity of using language to convey sometimes conflicting meanings, depending on the communicative context and the purpose of communication.

Overall, these studies show diversity in the use of speech theory to analyze various forms of communication, be it in the context of education, media, and other social interactions. This research, which focuses on the dialogue in the film "Lovely Man," seeks to develop a deeper understanding of different types of speech in various contexts, including cultural and social, in using and interpreting different types of speech in films. This analysis can be enriched by further exploring other types of contradictory speech and dimensions that have yet to be covered in depth in previous studies. Considering the differences in methodology, there is an opportunity to develop new analytical methods that provide a more prosperous or different perspective on understanding the complexity of speech in film dialogue.

RESEARCH METHOD

A qualitative approach was used in the study. Qualitative methods produce results that statistical procedures or quantitative methods cannot obtain. Qualitative research also explains the aspects that are the focus of attention and will be discussed further. Qualitative research is a multi-method approach that focuses on participatory interpretation, a naturalistic approach to the material and topic being researched (Pradokok, 2017:1). Qualitative data is data that is described in the form of words, sentences, or images (Kurniawan, 2018:33). Qualitative research has two main objectives, namely description and discovery and the second objective, namely description, and explanation.

In the study, several techniques were used to collect data, and the data collection techniques used were as follows—techniques to look at and take notes. The listening technique is a method that is used to listen entirely to the object being studied. This technique is almost the same as observation or observation in the social sciences. The listening technique is manifested in power according to the tools needed, such as tapping, recording, or recording. (Zaim, 2014:89). Sudaryanto stated that listening to the research object was done by tapping. In other words, the practical method of viewing is done by tapping. The simak method with the basic tapping technique can be carried out with four advanced techniques, which will be described as follows (Sudaryanto, 2015:25). Analysis involves working with data, compiling and breaking it down into aspects to be addressed (Ezmir, 2012:34). In

this study, the matching method is used. According to Sudaryanto (1993:13), "the matching method is a method whose determinants are outside, detached and not part of the language (*langue*) concerned. In this study, the matching method is used. According to Sudaryanto (1993:13), the matching method is a method whose determinant is outside, detached, and not part of the language (*langue*) concerned. The matching method is divided into several types based on the determinant tool.

The subtype of the method used in this study is a pragmatic matching method, with the determinant being the speech partner. The pragmatic matching method is used to determine the identity of a language based on the response or reaction that occurs in the speaking partner when the speech is delivered (Sudaryanto, 2015:26). According to Rustono (1999:18) Pragmatic analysis is a language analysis based on a practical point of view. From a pragmatic point of view, it is sought that in communicating, the speaker finds the intention of the speaking partner, whether expressed explicitly or implicitly, behind a speech. Pragmatic analysis is used to examine the meaning of speech in certain situations. The data are classified according to the criteria of contradictory speech, the function of contradictory speech, and the effects of its speech.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study include the types of contradictory speech, the function of contradictory speech, and the effects of contradictory speech.

Contradictory Speech in the Dialogue of *the Movie Lovely Man*

CONTEXT: MEETING OF CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

IPUY : Woy, heh. Woy Perempuan,
 CAHAYA : siapa luh nyari-nyari gue?
 IPUY : Bukan siapa-siapa maaf
 CAHAYA : Terus ngapain nyari-nyari
 IPUY : gue?
 Enggak, enggak maaf. Maaf
 enggak maksud ganggu.
 Tadi lu bilang nyari-nyari
 gue, siapa lu? Eh, denger ya
 kuntilanak siapa lu? Siapa?

The conversation contains various speech functions that show the dynamics between Ipu and Cahaya. Directive speech is found in statements such as "*Woy, heh. Woy Perempuan, siapa luh nyari-nyari gue?*" and "*Diem gak usah berisik.*" Ipu used this speech to ask for information and give orders to Cahaya, who directed the

conversation and affirmed his authority and desires. Representative speech used by Cahaya to provide information about its identity and purpose, such as in "*Aku cuma mau ketemu sama bapak gak bilang sama ibu*" and "*Aku cuma pengen ngasih ini ko buat bapak,*" which helped Ipu understand the situation and the reason for his arrival.

In addition, expressive speech appears when Cahaya expresses his remorse and desire not to interfere through statements such as "Bukan siapa-siapa maaf" and "*Aku enggak maksud bikin keadaan jadi enggak enak pak.*" This speech shows how the speaker's feelings are conveyed through words. Commissive speech was found when Ipu said "Makasih" to Cahaya, which shows the acceptance and acknowledgment of Cahaya's gift.

This conversation also showed a significant speech effect, reflecting the intense and tense interaction between Ipu and Cahaya. Ipu opens the discussion with a direct and abusive confrontation, showing suspicion and anger, while Cahaya responds defensively and humbly, trying to defuse the situation. Tensions escalated as Ipu continued to press with questions that showed distrust, and Cahaya tried to explain his good intentions. In the end, although Ipu dominated the conversation with a controlled tone, the situation eased slightly with a brief reception from Ipu after Cahaya explained the purpose of his arrival.

CONTEXT: QUARREL CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

IPUY : Beda Cahaya.
 CAHAYA : Ya apa sih sebenarnya
 IPUY : masalahnya pak.
 CAHAYA : Ibu kamu tau kalo bapak
 IPUY : kerja seperti ini
 Ya katanya kuli bangunan.
 : Itukan kalo siang kalo
 malem ya sepeti ini Cahaya,
 gimana sih. Bapak juga gak
 ngarepin kamu tau.
 Sebenarnya kamu mau
 ngapain kesini? Pengen tau
 gue seperti apa? Ngapain
 sih mesti nangis.

Speech "*Ya apa sih sebenarnya masalahnya Pak.*" It is a contradictory speech: Cahaya asked in a tone of frustration or confusion about the problem that Ipu was facing. The speech shows that Cahaya may need to fully understand or be aware of the reasons behind the behavior or situation that causes conflict between Ipu and himself.

Speech "***Bapak juga gak ngarepin kamu tau. Sebenarnya kamu mau ngapain kesini? Pengen tau gue seperti apa?***" It is contradictory: IpuY shows his disapproval of the presence of Cahaya and his desire to know what happened. This contradicts his original stance, which he affirmed, that he did not want Cahaya into his life again. He asked why Cahaya came back and wanted to know more about the situation that caused Cahaya to cry.

CONTEXT: QUARREL CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

CAHAYA : Emangnya bapak shalat?
 IPUY : Siapa bilang, caranya aja : udah lupa. Lu sendiri emang
 CAHAYA : shalat?
 IPUY : Akukan anak pesantren.
 CAHAYA : Terus kenapa emang kalo
 IPUY : anak pesantren?
 Akukan pake jilbab?
 CAHAYA : Hah...jilbab dibuntingin,
 IPUY : ngakulah udah, udah berapa
 CAHAYA : bulan? Udah berapa lama
 usia kandunganmu.
 Delapan minggu?
 Ibu lu tau enggak?
 Belum.

Speech "***Emangnya bapak shalat?***" answered by IpuY "***Siapa bilang, caranya aja udah lupa. Lu sendiri emang shalat?***" It's a contradictory statement: IpuY first asked if Cahaya's father was praying, but IpuY immediately replied with a back question about his habit of praying with Cahaya.

Speech "***Akukan anak pesantren?***" answered by IpuY "***Terus kenapa emang kalo anak pesantren?***" It is a contradictory speech: Cahaya asked that he was a student of the Islamic boarding school, but IpuY asked again why it was a problem if, indeed, Cahaya was a child of an Islamic boarding school.

Speech "***Akukan pake jilbab?***" answered by IpuY "***Hah...jilbab dibuntingin, ngakulah udah, udah berapa bulan? Udah berapa lama usia kandunganmu.***" It is a contradictory speech: Cahaya asked that he be a student of the Islamic boarding school Cahaya and use the hijab as a characteristic, but IpuY immediately switched to a different topic, namely pregnancy Cahaya.

In a conversation between Cahaya and IpuY, contradictory speech patterns are interesting to analyze. First, IpuY often responds to questions or statements from Cahaya by back-asking or switching topics. This creates a mismatch between what Cahaya expects and the response Cahaya gives. For example, when Cahaya Asked about

prayer habits Cahaya, IpuY asked again about IpuY's prayer habits as if changing the direction of the conversation.

Function of Contradictory Speech in *Lovely Man* Movie Dialogue

CONTEXT: QUARREL CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

IpuY : Woy, heh. Woy Perempuan,
 Cahaya : siapa luh nyari-nyari gue?
 IPUY : Bukan siapa-siapa maaf
 CAHAYA : Terus ngapain nyari-nyari
 IPUY : gue?
 Enggak, enggak maaf. Maaf
 CAHAYA : enggak maksud ganggu.
 IPUY : Tadi lu bilang nyari-nyari
 CAHAYA : gue, siapa lu? Eh, denger ya
 kuntulanak siapa lu? Siapa?
 IPUY : Cahaya
 CAHAYA : Ngapain luh kesini,
 CAHAYA : ngapain? Mana ibu luh?
 IPUY : Mana!
 IPUY : Aku Cuma mau ketemu
 CAHAYA : sama bapak gak bilang sama
 ibu.
 Enggak perlu, naik apa lu?
 Kereta.
 Aku enggak maksud...
 Diem gak usah berisik
 Diem...
 Aku gak maksud bikin
 keadaan jadi enggak enak
 pak, aku Cuma pengen
 ngasih ini ko buat bapak.
 Makasih.

Directive Speech

IpuY: "Woy, heh. Woy Perempuan, siapa luh nyari-nyari gue?"

Explanation: IpuY gave the order to Cahaya to explain his identity. This is a directive speech act because IpuY asked Cahaya to provide information.

IpuY: "Terus ngapain nyari-nyari gue?"

Explanation: IpuY asked Cahaya to explain its purpose. This is a directive speech act because it asks for action in the form of an answer from Cahaya.

IpuY: "Tadi lu bilang nyari-nyari gue, siapa lu? Eh, denger ya kuntulanak siapa lu? Siapa?"

Explanation: IpuY once again asked for Cahaya's identity in a more pressing tone. This is a directive speech act.

IpuY: "Ngapain luh kesini, ngapain? Mana ibu luh? Mana!"

Explanation: IpuY asked Cahaya why he came and asked about his mother's whereabouts. This is a directive speech act.

IpuY: "Diem gak usah berisik."

Explanation: IpuY ordered Cahaya to be silent. This is a directive speech act.

IpuY: "Diem..."

Explanation: IpuY repeated his order to Cahaya to quiet. This is a directive speech act.

Representative Speech

Cahaya: "Bukan siapa-siapa maaf."

Explanation: Cahaya declares that he is nobody. This is a representative act of speech because it conveys information.

Cahaya: "Enggak, enggak maaf. Maaf enggak maksud ganggu."

Explanation: Cahaya reveals that he did not intend to disturb. This is a representative act of speech.

Cahaya: "Aku Cuma mau ketemu sama bapak gak bilang sama ibu."

Explanation: Cahaya stated that the purpose of the complication came. This is a representative act of speech.

Cahaya: "Kereta."

Explanation: Cahaya answers IpuY's question about his means of transportation. This is a representative act of speech.

Cahaya: "Aku gak maksud bikin keadaan jadi enggak enak pak, aku Cuma pengen ngasih ini ko buat bapak."

Explanation: Cahaya explains the purpose of his arrival. This is a representative act of speech.

Expressive Speech

Cahaya: "Bukan siapa-siapa maaf."

Explanation: Cahaya apologizes, shows remorse, or apologizes for actions that may be perceived as disturbing. This is an expressive act of speech.

Cahaya: "Enggak, enggak maaf. Maaf enggak maksud ganggu."

Explanation: Cahaya reiterated his apology. This is an expressive act of speech.

There is no clear example of declarative speech in this conversation because there is no change in status or condition that results directly from the statement made by the speaker. Based on these speeches, it can be concluded that this conversation is dominated by directive speech, where IpuY gives orders and asks for information

from Cahaya. Cahaya Most responded with representational speech, providing information and explanations, and expressive speech when apologizing.

CONTEXT: QUARREL CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

CAHAYA : Emangya gak ada kerjaan

IPUY : lain di Jakarta?

CAHAYA : Ini juga kerja gue lu piki gue

IPUY : ngapain?

Enggak, maksudnya kerja betulan.

Gue kerja betulan, duit yang

CAHAYA : gue dapet juga duit betulan

IPUY : bukan duit monopoli. Dan duit yang gue hasilin lebih

CAHAYA : besar dari hasil nyuci atau

IPUY : nyupir, dan asal lu tau ya

duit yang gue hasilin buat biaya lu sekolah.

Tapi sekarang aku gak perlu biaya sekolah lagi pak.

Maksudmu apa? Jadi setelah

lu tau bapak lu kerja gini lu gak mau terima uangku lagi?

Bukan begitu pak.

Jangan lu piker gue kerja begini karena terpaksa ya

gue seneng ko kerja begini.

Gue bilang juga apa, lu itu persis kayak ibu lu. Nanya melulu.

Namanya juga anaknya.

Directive Speech

"Emangya gak ada kerjaan lain di Jakarta?"

Explanation: Cahaya asked IpuY for information about other possible jobs. This is an act of speech that asks for clarification or explanation.

"Enggak, maksudnya kerja betulan."

Explanation: Cahaya clarifies his previous question, showing his desire to understand better. Cahaya uses directive speech to ask questions and clarify IpuY's work. This shows his curiosity and desire to understand his father's situation better.

Expressive Speech

"Tapi sekarang aku gak perlu biaya sekolah lagi pak."

Explanation: Cahaya expresses his feelings about the need for tuition fees that are no longer relevant.

"Bukan begitu pak."

Explanation: Cahaya said he did not intend to refuse money because he knew his father's work.

"Jangan lu pikir gue kerja begini karena terpaksa ya gue seneng ko kerja begini."

Explanation: IpuY expresses his feelings about his work, indicating that he does his job with volunteerism and pleasure.

"Gue bilang juga apa, lu itu persis kayak ibu lu. Nanya melulu."

Explanation: IpuY expressed his frustration and views on the nature of wondering Cahaya, who is similar to his mother. Cahaya and IpuY use expressive speech to express their feelings. Cahaya revealed that he no longer needs tuition fees, while IpuY expresses his feelings about his job and the nature of wonder Cahaya.

Representative Speech

"Ini juga kerja gue lu pikir gue ngapain?"

Explanation: IpuY stated that his work was real work, providing information about his perception.

"Gue kerja betulan, duit yang gue dapet juga duit betulan bukan duit monopoli."

Explanation: IpuY asserts that his work makes real and legitimate money, emphasizing the reality and validity of his work.

"Dan duit yang gue hasilin lebih besar dari hasil nyuci atau nyupir, dan asal lu tau ya duit yang gue hasilin buat biaya lu sekolah."

Explanation: IpuY provides information about his income being more significant than other jobs and his contribution to school fees in Cahaya. IpuY uses representative speech to provide information and explain his work to Cahaya. It includes an explanation of the validity of his work and his contribution to education in Cahaya.

Commissive Speech

"Maksudmu apa? Jadi setelah lu tau bapak lu kerja gini lu gak mau terima uangku lagi?"

Explanation: IpuY is committed to inquiring about Cahaya's intentions and has affirmed his openness about the source of the money he made. IpuY also used commissive speech when emphasizing his transparency about the source of funds and asking for Cahaya's willingness to receive the money even though they knew the source.

In the conversation, Cahaya uses directive and expressive speech actions to express curiosity and the current situation. IpuY uses representative speech to explain his work, commissioner to ask for intentions Cahaya about receiving money, and expressive to express his feelings about his work and characteristics Cahaya. This conversation shows the dynamics of their relationship, where

Cahaya tries to understand, and IpuY tries to explain and affirm his position.

CONTEXT: QUARREL CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

IPUY : Lu sebenarnya inget gua

CAHAYA : enggak sih?

IPUY : Inget pak masih inget.

CAHAYA : Apa yang lu Inget apa?

Kalo sebelum tidur aku suka inget main hujan-hujan tapi

IPUY : lupa ama siapa cuma inget

CAHAYA : keadaannya aja terus ibu suka marah-marrah tapi lupa

IPUY : marah marah sama siapa.

Ya sama elu lah dari

CAHAYA : dulukan lu suka hujan-

IPUY : hujanan.

CAHAYA : Enggak maksudnya seinget aku bapak suka nyanyi tapi suaranya jelek.

Eits...suara eke bagus, gak percaya? Coba pinjem ukulelenya dong atau gitarnya.

Bapak mau nyanyi?

Lu pikir gue mau joget! Lu suka lagu apa?

Bintang kecil pak.

Bintang kecil bintang gede gue bisa semua.

Directive Speech

"Lu sebenarnya inget gua enggak sih?"

Explanation: Cahaya asks for information and asks if IpuY remembers it.

"Coba pinjem ukulelenya dong atau gitarnya."

Explanation: IpuY asked Cahaya to lend him a musical instrument, giving instructions indirectly. Cahaya uses directive speech to ask for information and clarification about IpuY's memory. IpuY uses directive speech to ask for musical instruments indirectly.

Representative Speech

"Inget pak masih inget."

Explanation: Cahaya gives information that she still remembers IpuY.

"Kalo sebelum tidur aku suka inget main hujan-hujan tapi lupa ama siapa cuma inget keadaannya aja terus ibu suka marah-marrah tapi lupa marah marah sama siapa."

Explanation: Cahaya explains her memories of the past, giving an idea of her memories.

"Ya sama elu lah dari dulukan lu suka hujan-hujan."

Explanation: Ipu explained that Cahaya had memories of playing in the rain with him.

"Eits...suara eke bagus, gak percaya? Coba pinjem ukulelenya dong atau gitarnya."

Explanation: Ipu disagrees with Cahaya's opinion about his voice and offers proof by borrowing a musical instrument.

"Bintang kecil bintang gede gue bisa semua."

Explanation: Ipu provides information about his ability to sing various songs, emphasizing that he can sing all types.

Cahaya and Ipu use representative speech to provide information about their memories. Cahaya depicts his memories, while Ipu adds detail and clarification.

Expressive Speech

"Eggak maksudnya seinget aku bapak suka nyanyi tapi suaranya jelek."

Explanation: Cahaya expresses his memory of the sound of Ipu's singing, which he considers ugly. It is an expression of feelings that reflects his subjective view.

"Lu pikir gue mau joget! Lu suka lagu apa?"

Explanation: Ipu expresses a sense of humor and mocks lightly, showing his relaxed attitude towards the situation. Cahaya expresses his views on Ipu's singing voice, while Ipu expresses his sense of humor and disagreement with Cahaya.

Commissive Speech

"Bapak mau nyanyi?"

Explanation: Cahaya asks about Ipu's intentions, and in the following answer, Ipu indicates that he is committed to singing if given a musical instrument. Ipu shows his commitment to singing by borrowing musical instruments, although this also serves as an expression of humor.

In the conversation, Cahaya uses directive and representative speech to explore her memories with Ipu and express her views on the past. Ipu uses representative speech to provide additional information and clarification, directives to ask for musical instruments, commissive to show his intention to sing, and expressive to convey humor and disapproval. These conversations show an interaction full of nostalgia and light humor, reflecting their complex yet intimate relationship.

The Effect of Contradictory Speech in the Dialogue of the Movie Lovely Man

CONTEXT: QUARREL CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

IPUY : Lu udah kelas berapa sekarang?
 CAHAYA : Baru lulus SMA.
 IPUY : Terus mau nerusin kuliah apa ker
 CAHAYA : Belum sih, lagi kursus Bahasa i
 biayayanya.
 IPUY : Jadi lu kesini mau minta uang?
 CAHAYA : Eggak ko pak!

"Lu udah kelas berapa sekarang?"

In effect, Cahaya felt asked about her educational status and answered the question.

"Baru lulus SMA"

As a result, Ipu gets information about Cahaya's education status.

"Terus mau nerusin kuliah apa kerja?"

The effect is that Cahaya feels asked about her plans and explains.

"Belum sih, lagi kursus Bahasa Inggris aja belum ada biayayanya"

As a result, Ipu gets more information about the complicated situation that Cahaya is going through.

"Jadi lu kesini mau minta uang?"

The effect is that Cahaya feels accused that his arrival is only to ask for money.

"Eggak ko pak!"

The effect is that Cahaya feels that her accusation of asking for money is invalid.

In the conversation, the speaker and speaking partners (Ipu and Cahaya) carried out several speech acts, including questions, providing information, explanations, accusations, and denials. Each speech act in the conversation contains different aspects of illocution and perlocution that reflect the speaker's intention and the effects caused by the speaker and the speaking partner.

CONTEXT: QUARREL CAHAYA WITH SYAIFUL

CAHAYA : Aku kesini Cuma mau ketemu sama bapakku aja aku terakhir ketemu mungkin waktu umurku
 IPUY : empat tahun, sekarang aku udah Sembilan belas tahun masu sampe kapan
 CAHAYA : enggak ketemu.
 IPUY : Eh denger ya setiap bulan gue ngasih uang ke ibu kamu, stahun ada berapa
 CAHAYA : bulan? Dua belas bulankan enggak pernah telat sekalipun.
 Ya tapi bukan itu aja pak, aku juga pengen kenal

sama orang yang udah ngasih duit
 Terus lu maunya apa?
 Mau sandiwara terus gini kaya bapak sama anak?
 Jangan harap dah!
 Iya pak, aku juga belum tau mau kemna?
 Lu tuh persis kaya ibu lu persis, keras kepala.

"Aku kesini cuma mau ketemu sama bapakku aja aku terakhir ketemu mungkin waktu umurku empat tahun, sekarang aku udah sembilan belas tahun masu sampe kapan enggak ketemu"

The effect is that Ipuy feels moved or touched by Cahaya's desire to meet his father.

"Eh denger ya setiap bulan gue ngasih uang ke ibu kamu, setahun ada berapa bulan? Dua belas bulankan enggak pernah telat sekalipun"

The effect is that Ipuy feels reminded or affirmed about the financial responsibility that he has fulfilled.

"Ya tapi bukan itu aja pak, aku juga pengen kenal sama orang yang udah ngasih duit"

The effect is that Ipuy feels that Cahaya wants to build a closer and more personal relationship with herself.

"Terus lu maunya apa? Mau sandiwara terus gini kaya bapak sama anak? Jangan harap dah!"

The effect is that Cahaya feels challenged or questioned about her intentions in the relationship.

"Iya pak, aku juga belum tau mau kemana?"

The effect is that Ipuy feels sympathy or understands Cahaya's confusion.

"Lu tuh persis kaya ibu lu persis, keras kepala"

The effect is that Cahaya feels offended or angry because she is compared to her mother and is called stubborn.

In the conversation, Cahaya and Ipuy, as the perpetrators of the speech, carried out several speech acts that included requests, affirmations, the desire to get to know each other better, frustration, confession of confusion, and accusations.

COVER

Through a pragmatic approach, this study examines contradictory speech in the film "Lovely Man" by Teddy Soeriaamadja. Based on the analysis, it was found that the dialogue between the main characters, Cahaya and Ipuy, contained various contradictory speeches that reflected the different backgrounds, social values, and cultures shared by each character. This contradictory speech has a variety of functions in communication, including a representative function that reveals facts or provides information that is contrary to the

interlocutor's beliefs, a commissive function that indicates a commitment or promise that is contrary to previous behavior, a directive function that gives commands or requests that are contrary to the interlocutor's wishes, and an expressive function that expresses feelings or emotions that are contrary to the interlocutor's beliefs existing situation. The emotional effects of this contradictory speech also vary, ranging from sadness, joy, anger, disappointment, and tension to guilt.

This research shows that contradictory speech not only serves as a communication tool but also reflects the social and cultural background of the characters. Contradictions in speech reflect the complexity of human interactions influenced by various social, cultural, and emotional factors. Based on these findings, it is recommended that further research be conducted to deepen the understanding of contradictory speech in other communication contexts, such as everyday interactions or social media. The findings can also be used in communication education and training to help individuals understand and manage contradictory speech effectively and in filmmaking and media to create more realistic and in-depth characters and storylines. In addition, this research can raise awareness about social issues such as gender identity and social stigma and help develop social intervention programs that aim to reduce stigma and increase empathy between individuals from different backgrounds. This research contributes to the development of communication and pragmatic theory by providing empirical data on the influence of social context on verbal interaction, which is expected to help design more effective and empathic communication strategies in various social contexts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adriana, I. (2018). *Pragmatik*. Pena Salsabila.
- Akbar, S. (2018). Analisis Tindak Tutur Pada Wawancara Putra Nababan Dan Presiden Portugal. *Sebasa: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(1), 27–38.
- Alfiansyah, M. A., Sufyan, A., Ilmu, F., & Universitas, B. (2021). Analisis Kesopanan Tindak Tutur Direktif Dalam Pembelajaran Daring Kajian: Pragmatik. *Literasi: Jurnal Ilmiah, Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 11(2), 53–68.
- Amanda, D., & Putri, W. (2021). Widya Accarya : Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Fkip Universitas Dwijendra Vol 12 No 2 , Oktober 2021 P Issn : 2085-0018 E-Issn : 2722-8339 Available Online At [Http://Ejournal.Undwi.Ac.Id/Index.Php/Widyaaccarya/Index](http://Ejournal.Undwi.Ac.Id/Index.Php/Widyaaccarya/Index) Widya Accarya : Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Fkip. *Widya Accarya*, 12(2), 162–176.
- Angga Sekarsany, Nani Darmayanti, T. S. (2020). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi Pada Proses Kelahiran Dengan

- Teknik Hipnosis (Hypnobirthing): *Jurnal Metahumaniora*, 10(April), 14–26.
- Apriastuti, N. N. A. A. (2017). Bentuk, Fungsi Dan Jenis Tindak Tutur Dalam Komunikasi Siswa Di Kelas Ix Unggulan Smp Pgri 3 Denpasar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, 1(1), 38–47.
- Arita, Y. (2024). Teasing About Epistemic Transgressions: The Use Of The Japanese Utterance-Final Jan. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 227, 57–71.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.05.002>
- Borchmann, S. (2024). Headlines As Illocutionary Subacts: The Genre-Specificity Of Headlines. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 220, 73–99.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.12.007>
- Chen, X., & Brown, L. (2022). Second Language Knowledge Of Pragmatic Meanings: What Do Learners Of Korean Know About The Korean Pronouns Ce And Na? *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 202, 7–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.10.010>
- Devianty, R. (2017). Bahasa Sebagai Cermin Kebudayaan. *Jurnal Tarbiyah*, Xxiv(1).
- Eva Wulandari, A. P. Y. U. (2021). Jurnal Sastra Indonesia Analisis Tindak Tutur Representatif Dalam Video “ Trik Cepet Jawab Soal. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 10(1), 65–70.
<https://doi.org/10.15294/jsi.v10i1.45120>
- Ezmir. (2012). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif* (8th Ed.). Pt Rajagrafindo.
- Ilham Munandar, N. D. (2021). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi dalam Pidato Ridwan Kamil Pada Acara Bukataalks: Suatu Kajian Pragmatik. *Jurnal Metabahasa*, 3, 25–40.
- Khoirurrohman, T. (2019). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi dan Implikatur Konvensional dalam Proses Perkuliahan Bahasa Indonesia Jurusan Pgsd (Suatu Kajian Pragmatik) Taufiq. *Jurnal Dialektika Jurusan Pgsd*, 9(1), 149.
- Kurniawan, A. (2018). *Teori dan Praktik Penelitian Tindak Kelas* (1st Ed.). Eduvision.
- Liang, M. Y. (2024). Contingent (Dis)Agreement And Emotional Expressiveness In Online Responsive Discourse. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 219, 58–68.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.11.007>
- Liu, Y., Huang, Q., & Li, X. I. (2023). *Australian Journal Of Applied Linguistics Second Language Pragmatics*. 6(3), 222–226.
- Lu, R. (2024). Audience Design and Pragmatic Conceptions Of Moves And Upvotes During Advice-Giving On Reddit. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 219, 30–47.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.11.006>
- Rohmadi, (2013). *Tindak Tutur Persuasif Dan Provokatif Dalam Wacana Spanduk Kampanye Pilkada Jawa Tengah Tahun 2013*.
- Mardian, S., Sulastriana, E., & Uli, I. (2021). Analisis Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Novel Orang- Orang Biasa Karya Andrea Hirata. *Eduindo: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(1), 11–24.
- Mereu, D., Cangemi, F., & Grice, M. (2024). Backchannels Are Not Always Very Short Utterances. The Case Of Italian Multi-Unit Backchannels. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 228, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.05.003>
- Ningsih, P. D., & Megawati, F. (2022). Deictic Expressions Used By Lera Boroditsky In Ted Talks Channel. *Reila: Journal Of Research And Innovation In Language*, 4(1), 15–23.
<https://doi.org/10.31849/Reila.V4i1.4951>
- Novri Susan&Ulyati Retno. (2019). *Sosiologi Konflik: Teori-Teori dan Analisis*. Prenadamedia.
- Oswald, S. (2023). Pragmatics For Argumentation. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 203, 144–156.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.12.001>
- Pande, & Artana, N. A. (2020). Kajian Pragmatik Mengenai Tindak Tutur Bahasa Indonesia dalam Unggahan Media Sosial Instagram @Halostiki. *Alfabeta: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pembelajarannya*, 3(1), 32–38.
<https://doi.org/10.33503/Alfabeta.V3i1.766>
- Pradokok, S. (2017). *Paradigma Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Uny Press.
- Rahmadhani, F. F., Purwo, A., Utomo, Y., Semarang, U. N., & Semarang, U. N. (2020). Analisis Tindak Tutur Ekspresif dalam Novel Hujan Bulan Juni Karya Sapardi Djoko Damono. *Bahtera Indonesia : Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indoneisa*, 5(2), 88–96.
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik* (Cetakan Pe). Cv. Ikip Semarang Press.
- Safar, J., & De Vos, C. (2022). Pragmatic Competence Without A Language Model: Other-Initiated Repair In Balinese Homesign. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 202, 105–125.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.10.017>
- Sagita, V. R., Setiawan, T., Pascasarjana, P., & Yogyakarta, U. N. (2019). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi Ridwan Kamil dalam Talkshow Insight Di Cnn Indonesia. *Lensa : Jurnal Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 9(2), 4.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa* (Cetakan Pe). Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Trinh, T. (2024). Forms Of Address, Performative Prefixes, And The Syntax-Pragmatics Interface. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 228, 17–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.05.001>
- Van Wonderen, E., Mulder, K., Rispens, J., & Verhagen, J. (2023). Learning How To Communicate: Does Exposure To Multiple Languages Promote Children’s Pragmatic Abilities? A Meta-Analytic Review. *Cognitive Development*, 68(October), 101384.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2023.101384>
- Villalba, X. (2024). Romance Exclamative Markers At The Syntax-Pragmatics Interface: A Compositional Approach To Exclamativity. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 226, 64–77.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.04.004>
- Wicaksono, G. A. (2018). An Analysis Of Declarative Speech Act In The Movie My Lawyer, Mr Jo: Pragmatics Approach. *Journal Of English Language Studies*, 3(1), 91.
<https://doi.org/10.30870/jels.v3i1.2384>
- Widayanti, S. R., & Kustinah. (2019). “Analisis Pragmatik

pada Fungsi Tindak Tutur dalam Film Karya Walt Disney." *Prasasti: Jurnal Of Linguistics*, 4(2), 180-185.

Wijana, I. D. P. (2021). On Speech Acts. *Journal Of Pragmatics Research*, 3(1), 14-27. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v3i1.14-27>

Yuliarti, Et Al. (2015). Tindak Tutur Direktif Dalam Wacana Novel Trilogi Karya Agustinus Wibowo. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 4(2), 78-85.

Zaim, M. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa Pendekatan Struktural*. Fbs Unp Press.