

**ANGER EXPRESSIVE USED BY THE CHARACTERS IN
THE CHRONICLES OF NARNIA SERIES 1****Endar Septian Kusumawardhani^{1*}, Sigit Haryanto², Titis Setyabudi³**¹a320190117@student.ums.ac.id, ²sh288@ums.ac.id, ³ts157@ums.ac.idmail

UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA

ABSTRACT

The aims of this study are to investigate the pragmalinguistic forms of anger expressive and to describe the intentions of the anger expressions shown by the characters in the Narnia 1 movie. This research is qualitative research. The data from this study are all conversations that express anger in the Narnia Series 1. In collecting data, researchers used the documentation method. The data were analyzed using Madow's theory of pragmalinguistic forms of anger expressive and Leech's theory of speaking situations. The results of this study indicate that there are three pragmalinguistic forms of anger expressions used by the characters. The forms of the anger expressive are the direct form (26), the thinly veiled form (12), and the indirect form (1). The results of this study also show that there are eleven intention of anger expressions. They are questioning (5), asserting (11), commanding (5), criticizing (2), mocking (5), disbelieving (2), ordering (1), suggesting (1), disagreeing (2), warning (3), and declaring (2). Thus, it can be concluded that direct form of anger is the form that appears the most in Narnia movie and asserting is the most dominant intention used by the characters in Narnia movie.

Keywords: Anger, Expressive, Movie, Pragmatic, Speech Act

A. INTRODUCTION

In order to communicate with others, people utilize language. Language is utilized to transmit all messages and express ideas. People attempt to express those by creating utterances that comprise grammatical structures and words as well as by performing actions through those utterances. Language serves as a lens through which sociocultural processes in human existence can be seen. Additionally, language can be a means for people to express their emotional (Sabrian et al., 2019). The study of pragmatics examines the connection between language and the situation that gives language its meaning. According to Sina & Bram (2020), the study of pragmatics shows that beliefs can be expressed in ways other than verbally. As a result, it is more important to comprehend what others are saying than to just infer meaning from the words or phrases they use. Pakpahan & Manik (2020) adds that pragmatics is concerned with how the speaker employs and comprehends word acts. The term pragmatics basically refers to a rule for language use, namely, to select the appropriate linguistic form and ascertain its meaning in relation to the speaker's goal in light of the circumstances and context.

Speech acts are language-based actions that aim to alter the environment or the subject of the action. Speech acts are concentrated on situations as well as conversational utterances since a statement has meaning if it is connected to a situation or context. As a result, people cannot distinguish between activity, circumstance, and discourse while analyzing speech acts (Lestari & Hartati, 2020). Anger is a part of language. According to Mulianti (2017), when people are furious, agitated, or annoyed by other people or situations, they express their anger. Orally, the speaker employs both direct and indirect use of a high or low tone, strong voice, word stress, and harsh words. Anger is frequently sparked by what people consider to be unjust, being treated unfairly, disagreements with others, and troubles with another (Nissa, 2021). There are many diverse expressions of rage, including hate, annoyance, and anger. Additionally, there are various ways to express rage in speech. Either Direct Form, Thinly Veiled Form, or indirect form can be used to convey it. The reasons for the statements that show anger vary since they are affected by the situation that makes the speaker upset. The intentions include ordering, rejecting, challenging, etc. When expressing anger, people convey more than just the words that include fury; they also convey the assertion, plea, command, offer, promise, etc. that their utterance is intended to make.

Madow (in Tucker-Ladd, 1996) classified anger into three types: 1) direct forms such as verbal cruelty, critical, fault finding, name calling, accusing someone, hatred, insults, disgust, revengeful, less intense but clear; 2) thinly veiled forms such as distrustful, skeptical, argumentative, irritable, indirectly challenging, prone to sarcasm, cynical humors; and 3) indirect forms such as silence, little communication, depression, distracting. In addition, Leech (1985) suggests that there are thirteen intentions that make people say intentions of anger. It mentions, questioning intentions, asserting intentions, ordering intentions, commanding intentions, mocking intentions, disbelieving intentions, suggesting intentions, disagreeing intentions, warning intentions, declaring intentions, and criticizing intentions.

The previous study from Ekawati & Ariatmi (2018) entitled *Pragmatic Analysis of Anger Expression Used by Netizens on Rohingya Refugees in Website*. This study looks at why people say angry things in comments, what those angry things mean, and how they break rules when they say angry things in comments from Washington post about Rohingya news. The researchers used the descriptive-qualitative research method, and the writing method was used to get the data. The information used comes from comments that show anger. The researchers used a tone analyzer and a website API to figure out how angry someone was. Then, the researchers analyzed the data using Yule's theory (1996) for the meaning of angry expressions, Grice's theory for the implicature of angry expressions, Cutting & Fordyce's theory (2002) for the maxim violation of angry expressions.

Another previous research conducted by Indrianingsing & Ariatmi (2017) with the title "Analysis of Anger Expressions in The Crime Movies". The results show that there are thirteen anger intentions used in the film. Although this study has similarities in expressing Anger's speech acts, this research is different from research related to subjects and data sources. This study focuses on expressions of anger, especially those that convey the form and intention of expressing anger that appears in certain scene situations. This research is important to do because this study can be a reference for further research in studying the expression of anger in pragmatics. In addition, the researchers hope that this study can provide insight to students about the various intentions conveyed in expressions of anger. They can clarify the meaning of expressions of anger used by them and their friends.

B. METHOD

In this study, the researchers used a qualitative research method. A qualitative approach is described in words and does not translate information into numbers (Ary et al., 2006). A qualitative strategy is required in this research since it uses a qualitative design to collect and analyze data from sources. The data from this study are utterances that are categorized as anger expressive utterances in Narnia films. The source of the data in this study was taken from the Narnia film and the script which was the Narnia film document script. The script was downloaded from the web. The researchers used documentation method to collect the data of the research as proposed by Carter et al., (2014). In scientific study, documentation is a technique used to gather data utilizing a list of document evidence. Documentation methods, which involve researchers looking for the required information through notes, transcripts, newspapers, magazines, and other sources (Violeta, 2019). Researchers used data validity triangulation to make data valid. According to Patton (1999), triangulation is the use of multiple data sources and methods to develop phenomenal results. Then, the data were analyzed by using Madow's theory (in Tucker-Ladd, 1996) to identify the pragma linguistics forms of anger expressions.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Pragmalinguistics Forms of Anger Expressions

As a result of this study, the researchers found that there are 39 data of anger expressions produced by the characters in the Narnia series 1 film. It contains direct form (26 utterances), Thinly Veiled Form (12 utterances), and Thinly Veiled Form (1 utterance). From all the data, the percentages can be seen as follows:

Table 1. Forms of anger expressions

No	Pragmalinguistics Forms	Total	Percentages
1	Direct Form	26	66.67 %
2	Thinly Veiled Form	12	30.77 %
3	Indirect Form	1	2.56 %
		39	100%

The table above shows that the most dominant pragmalinguistics forms of anger expressions produced by the characters in the Narnia series 1 film was direct form (66.67%). Madow (in Tucker-Ladd, 1996) explains that Direct forms include verbal harshness, criticism, fault finding, name calling, accusing someone, hostility, insults, disgust, and vengeance.

Direct From

In the direct form, expressions of anger are shown by asserting + accusing, by swearing, by criticizing + calling names, by ordering + calling names, by ordering, by refusing + calling names, by refusing, by questioning + calling names and by threatening + calling names and also takes the form of verbal cruelty, criticism, faultfinding, naming, accusing someone, hatred, insults, disgust, revenge, less intense but clear. In this direct form, there are 26 data out of 38 data in the Narnia film.

Data 1

“Susan : Stop, Peter! Maybe we should listen to him!
 Maugrim : Smart girl.
 Mr. Beaver : **Don't listen to him! Kill him! Kill him now!**

Maugrim : Oh, come on. This isn't your war. All my Queen wants is for you to take your family and go."

The above conversation shows the battle between Maugrim and Peter. Peter wanted to save Edmund who was kidnapped by them, while Susan convinced Peter that Peter should listen to Maugrim. However, Mr. Beaver showed anger to Peter "Don't listen to him! Kill him! Kill him now!" includes a sense of anger, even though the word "anger" is not explicitly mentioned. The intensity and urgency of his words, combined with the exclamation marks, convey his strong emotions, which could be described as anger. This is part of the direct speech he utters in the scene. Mr. Beaver made it clear to Peter that he had to kill Maugrim for kidnapping Edmund. From this sentence, it can be seen that this form of anger is Direct form. Peter and Mr. Beaver want revenge on Maugrim and the White Witch for influencing Edmund.

Thinly veiled Form

In the thinly veiled form, the expression of anger is shown by disbelief + annoyance, by stating + cynical humor, by disagreeing + argumentation and by suggesting + argumentation. Thinly veiled forms like disbelief, skepticism, argumentative, irritability, indirectly challenging, given to sarcasm, cynical humor. In this Thinly Veiled Form there are 12 data contained in the movie Narnia. It can be seen from the following data:

Data 2

*"Mr. Beaver : But he's just got back! And he's waitin' for you near the Stone Table!
Lucy : He's waiting for us?
Mr. Beaver : You're blooming joking! They don't even know about the prophecy!
Mrs. Beaver : Well, then...
Mr. Beaver : Look. Aslan's return, Tumnus' arrest, the secret police, it's all happening because of you!"*

The Sentences that are included in the Thinly Veiled Form are in the dialogue Mr. Beaver, "You're blooming joking! They don't even know about the prophecy!" includes a thinly veiled expression of anger. The phrase "blooming joking" can be seen as a mild expletive, and his incredulous response indicates frustration or annoyance. So, in this case, there is a sense of thinly veiled anger in his words. The purpose of the sentence is the satire of anger carried out by Mr. Beaver to Peter and his brother. Mr. Beaver taunts them because they didn't know about the rumors of Aslan waiting for Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy to fight the white witch.

Indirect Form

Indirect forms of anger expression are shown by asking + suppressing and by suppressing + stating. Indirect forms such as silence, little communication, depression, distracting activities, and crying. This Indirect Form has only one datum found in Narnia Series 1.

Data 3

*"Peter (to Edmund) : You... You saw the faun? (Edmund shakes his head)
Lucy : Well, he didn't actually go there with me. He... What were you doing, Edmund?"*

Edmund : *I was just playing along. I'm sorry, Peter. I shouldn't have encouraged her, but you know what little children are like these days. They just don't know when to stop pretending.*
(Sits on his bed looking smugly at Lucy)
(Lucy starts to cry and runs out of the room. Susan runs after her and so does Peter, shoving Edmund over)
Edmund : *Ow!"*

The scene above shows that Lucy shows Indirect Form. Lucy's response to Edmund's comment could be interpreted as displaying indirect anger. While the text doesn't explicitly state that she's angry, her reaction of crying and running out of the room can be seen as a response to feeling hurt, betrayed, or frustrated by Edmund's behavior. These emotions could be rooted in a form of anger, albeit not explicitly expressed. Lucy had repeatedly convinced Peter, Edmund and Susan that she had found the Faun in the cupboard but they still didn't believe her. And in the end Edmund also found another life in the cupboard, but Edmund didn't want to be honest with Peter and Susan. This made Lucy very angry and disappointed in Edmund. Lucy ran out of the room and she cried without saying a word.

2. Intention of Anger

The data showed that the intentions of anger were found in characters in the Narnia series 1 film. The results show that there are eleven anger intentions used in the film. Two intentions were not found, namely Swearing and Refusing. The data can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Finding of intentions of expressing anger

No	Pragma linguistics Forms	Total
1	Questioning	5
2	Asserting	11
3	Commanding	5
4	Mocking	5
5	Disbelieving	2
6	Ordering	1
7	Suggesting	1
8	Disagreeing	2
9	Warning	3
10	Declaring	2
11	Criticizing	2
		39

The data showed that only eleven intentions found in the film. The data found that there are 5 data questioning intentions, 11 data asserting intentions, 5 data commanding intentions, 5 data mocking intentions, 2 data disbelieving intentions, 1 data ordering intentions, 1 data suggesting intentions, 2 data disagreeing intentions, 3 data warning intentions, 2 data of declaring intention, and 2 data of criticizing intention.

Questioning Intention

The use of interrogative statements or questions to indicate anger or displeasure towards someone is referred to as questioning intentions in rage speech acts. When people are furious, they may use questioning intents to challenge or confront the person they are addressing's behavior, motives, or beliefs. In rage speech acts, questioning intentions can have a variety

of functions. They may attempt to express incredulity, demand answers, or elicit a response that justifies or defends the individual being addressed's behavior. The tone and manner in which the inquiries are posed frequently show the speaker's annoyance or displeasure. The questioning data contained in Narnia Series 1 is 5 out of 39 data.

Data 1

Edmund : *Yeah, of course! Didn't I tell you about the football field in the bathroom cupboard?*

Peter : ***Will you just stop? You just have to make everything worse, don't you?***

Edmund : *It was just a joke!"*

The dialogue above shows that Peter was angry with Edmund, the intention of anger from Peter was Questioning. "Will you just stop? You just have to make everything worse, don't you?" Peter wonders why Edmund keeps making noise and he's making things worse. In this sentence it is clear that it is an angry question sentence uttered by Peter. The phrase "don't you?" at the end of the sentence there is a direct question posed to Edmund. Peter seeks confirmation or approval from Edmund regarding their tendency to make things worse.

Asserting Intention

When experiencing anger, asserting intentions in angry speech acts refers to the explicit statement or expression of one's desires, demands, or expectations in a powerful and authoritative manner. When people are furious, they may use forceful language to express themselves clearly, establish their viewpoint, or demand their rights. In angry speech acts, asserting intentions can comprise forceful and specific words, as well as a tone that expresses the speaker's determination and dissatisfaction. Its purpose is to convey authority and assert control over the circumstance or person being addressed. Asserting intention has 11 data obtained from the Narnia 1 series.

Data 2

Lucy : *But what about Mr. Tumnus?*

Susan : *If he was arrested just for being with a human, I don't think there's much we can do.*

Lucy : ***You don't understand, do you? I'm the human!!! She must have found out he helped me!***

Peter : *Maybe we could call the police."*

The assertion of anger above is shown in Lucy's dialogue, "you don't understand, do you? I'm the human!!! She must have found out he helped me!" The meaning of the anger uttered by Lucy is asserting. In the sentence "I'm the human!!!" Lucy was asserting to Susan that she was human and Mr. Tumnus is a human half horse, Lucy believes that she can help Mr. Tumnus. Lucy also asserting that Mr. Tumnus had helped Lucy, so Lucy had to help Mr. Tumnus. Lucy emphasizes her identity as a human being, perhaps to assert her authority or to establish a perspective as valid and important. The assertion of intent in this sentence served to reinforce Lucy's position and confirm her belief that Susan and Peter did not understand the situation. By stating her humanity, Lucy emphasizes her uniqueness and potentially implies that Lucy's understanding or perspective should be given more weight.

Commanding Intention

Commanding intentions comprise the explicit and strong delivery of commands or directives to someone. When people are upset, they may use commanding intentions to establish control, demand quick obedience, or express authority over the situation or the person they are addressing. Commanding intentions in angry speech acts are distinguished by a direct and authoritative tone, which is frequently accompanied by forceful vocabulary and an expectation of obedience. The speaker wishes to force their will on the receiver and expects them to obey without question. In anger speech acts, commanding intents can be viewed as aggressive or domineering, since they show a desire to exert control and assert dominance over the circumstance or the person being addressed. This is a commanding anger purpose; speakers will display fury for authoritative intentions. The data from the commanding intention is 5 of the 39 data in the Narnia film.

Data 3

“Peter : Edmund! There's too many! Get out of here! Get the girls and get them home!
Mr. Beaver : You heard him! Let's go! (Starts to drag Ed away. Ed sees the Witch Advance towards Peter who is oblivious and starts to go back.)
*Mr. Beaver : **Peter said get out of here!***
Edmund : Peter's not king yet.”

Conversation between Peter, Mr. The Beaver and Edmund are taking place during the war. The dialogue that shows anger, the intention to command, is the dialogue Mr. Beaver “*Peter said get out of here!*” Peter had told Edmund that he had to go with Susan and Lucy because the situation during the war was very chaotic, but Edmund didn't care what Peter said so Mr. Beaver Orders Edmund again to get him out of the war. Mr. Beaver relays command from Peter and expects Edmund to follow them without question or hesitation. commanding intent can vary in tone and intensity. In this sentence, the commanding intent is straightforward and direct, leaving little room for negotiation or discussion.

Mocking Intention

Mocking intents entail the use of sarcasm, scorn, or derision to communicate displeasure towards someone. When someone are upset, they may use mocking intentions to belittle or degrade the person they are addressing, sometimes by using sarcastic or exaggerated words. Mocking intentions in rage speech acts can be used to show contempt, derision, or to emphasize perceived flaws or absurdities in the recipient's behavior or views. sarcastic intentions are often sarcastic or disdainful in tone and delivery, and they intend to elicit a reaction from the person being addressed. There are 5 Intention mocking data found in speech acts in Narnia Film.

Data 4

“Lucy : The sheets feel scratchy.
Susan : Wars don't last forever, Lucy. We'll be home soon.
Edmund : Yeah, if home's still there.
Susan : Isn't time you were in bed?
*Edmund : **Yes, MUM**”*
Peter (to Edmund): Ed!”

The dialogue above is a dialogue between Lucy, Susan and Edmund. Mocking intention is found in Edmund's dialogue “*Yes, MUM!*” Edmund was annoyed because Susan told him to

sleep, so Edmund mocked Susan as "MUM" because Susan was similar to her mother who often managed. The sentence "MUM" is said in a sarcastic or impolite tone, it shows mocking intent. Edmund used tone to belittle or make fun of Susan and Edmund could potentially show a lack of respect or a desire to undermine their authority.

Disbelieving Intention

Disbelieving intentions in angry speech acts involve expressing doubt, skepticism, or incredulity about the person being addressed's assertions or behavior. When people are furious, they may use unbelieving intentions to challenge or question the legitimacy, honesty, or sincerity of the other person's words or actions. In this disbelieving intention, there are 2 data found in Narnia Series 1

Data 5

Mr. Beaver : Further in. (Mr. Beaver scurries off, Susan grabs Peter by the arm)
Susan : What you are doing?!
Edmund : She's right. How do we know we can trust him?
Peter : He said he knows the faun.
Susan : **He's a beaver. He shouldn't be saying anything!**
Mr. Beaver : Everything all right?
Peter : Yes. We were just talking"

In the dialogue above, it shows that the intention of anger in disbelief is directed at Susan's dialogue "He's a beaver. He shouldn't be saying anything!" Susan was angry with Peter because she didn't believe Mr. Beaver who can speak, Susan doesn't understand what she just heard. The statement implies skepticism or disbelief in the idea that otters, as animals, should have the ability or authority to speak or express thoughts. The phrase "He's a beaver" establishes the identity of the subject, emphasizing that it is a species of animal. The following statement "He shouldn't have said anything!" expresses the speaker's disbelief that beaver able to communicate verbally. The disbelief in this sentence is evident from Susan's suggestion that beavers should not have the ability to speak, indicating skepticism of the possibility.

Ordering Intention

When expressing anger, ordering intentions relate to the desire or intention to offer commands, instructions, or directions to someone. When people are upset, they may issue instructions or demand particular acts from others to show their feelings. These ordering intents are frequently accompanied by a commanding tone, specific language, and a desire to assert authority or control over the circumstance or the individual to whom the order is directed. in this ordering intention there is only one data found on the film.

Data 6

(Edmund just looks at her)
Peter : **Say you're sorry!** (Peter steps up to him)
Edmund : All right! I'm sorry.
Lucy : That's all right. Some little children just don't know when to stop pretending."
Edmund : Oh, very funny."

In the dialogue, it can be seen that Peter is giving directions to Edmund and Lucy, Edmund makes a mistake which requires him to apologize to Lucy. The sentence of ordering's anger intention is found in Peter's dialogue "*Say you're sorry!*" Peter was angry by showing his ordering intention to Edmund that Edmund had made a mistake and he had to apologize.

Suggesting Intention

A suggesting intention refers to the speaker's aim to subtly or indirectly propose an idea, course of action, or possibility to the listener. It involves influencing the listener's thoughts, decisions, or behaviors without explicitly stating or commanding them to do something. The speaker uses various linguistic cues, context, tone, or non-verbal cues to imply or hint at the intended suggestion. Suggesting intentions are often employed to influence or guide others while allowing them to maintain a sense of autonomy or freedom in their choices. By suggesting rather than commanding or demanding, the speaker can encourage the listener to consider an idea or course of action while leaving room for their own interpretation or decision-making. In this suggesting intention there is only one data found on the film.

Data 7

White Witch : *Beyond these woods, you see those two hills? My house is right between them. You'd love it there, Edmund. It has whole rooms simply stuffed with Turkish delight.*

Edmund : *Couldn't I have some more now?*

White Witch : *No! ... *smiles* Don't want to ruin your appetite. Besides, you and I are going to be seeing each other again very soon, aren't we?*

Edmund : *I hope so, Your Majesty."*

The conversation above shows that the White Witch is talking to Edmund. The sentence included in Suggesting's angry intentions is in the White Witch dialogue "*No! ... *smiles* Don't want to ruin your appetite. Besides, you and I are going to be seeing each other again very soon, aren't we?*" the sentence implies a suggestion or expectation of a future meeting or a meeting between the White Witch and Edmund. The White Witch indirectly suggests or hints at the idea that they will meet again in the near future. The use of the word "*Besides*" indicates that the statement offers additional information or a different perspective, leading to suggestions.

Disagreeing Intention

Disagreeing intentions in anger speech acts involve expressing a strong difference of opinion or opposing viewpoint towards the statements, actions, or beliefs of the person being addressed. When individuals are angry, they may employ disagreeing intentions as a means of asserting their disagreement and asserting their own perspective forcefully. In anger speech acts, disagreeing intentions can serve to challenge or refute the other person's statements, actions, or views. The tone and delivery of disagreeing intentions are often assertive and confrontational, emphasizing the speaker's opposition and frustration.

Data 8 (*Peter starts to run after Edmund but Mr. Beaver grabs him by the sleeve of his coat*)

Mr. Beaver : *No!*

Peter : *Get off me!*

Mr. Beaver : *You're playing into her hands.*

Susan : ***We just can't let him go!***

Lucy : *He's, our brother!*

Mr. Beaver : *He's the bait! The Witch wants all four of ya!"*

Susan shows angry intent Disagree in the dialogue above. "We just can't let him go" The statement expresses clear opposition or disagreement with the idea of releasing it. This shows a strong belief or determination not to let Edmund be captured by the White Witch. The intention to disagree can be seen from Susan's statement that they cannot let Edmund be left alone, implying that there are different opinions or perspectives among the characters involved. The sentence highlights a conflicting viewpoint or stand on what to do in the situation. Susan did not agree with what was said by Mr. Beaver that Mr. Beaver orders them to leave the palace, while Peter and Susan want to save Edmund who is being kidnapped by the White Witch. Susan was angry with Mr. Beaver and she didn't want to leave Edmund alone.

Warning Intention

In the context of anger speech acts, the warning intention refers to the speaker's intention to issue a warning or threat to the listener. The warning intention in an anger speech act is aimed at alerting the listener to potential negative consequences or actions that may result if their behavior does not change. The warning intention can vary in intensity, ranging from a mild cautionary statement to a more severe threat. It serves as a way for the speaker to communicate the seriousness of their anger and the potential consequences that may follow if their demands or expectations are not met.

Data 9

Fox : *This is what becomes of those who cross the Witch*
Mr. Beaver : ***You take one more step, traitor, and I'll chew you to splinters!***
Fox : *Relax. I'm one of the good guys*
Mr. Beaver : *Yeah? Well, you look an awful lot like one of the bad one"*

The dialogue shows that Mr. Beaver was talking to Fox who was blocking Mr. Beaver. Waring's angry intentions are shown in Mr. Beaver dialogue "You take one more step, traitor, and I'll chew you to splinters!" Mr. Beaver showed war anger directed at Fox because Fox had gotten in his way. The use of strong language and the threat to "chew you to splinters" indicates a clear warning of physical harm or retaliation if the Fox takes another step. The warning intention in this sentence serves to caution the Fox against proceeding further or engaging in actions that Mr. Beaver perceives as betraying or harmful. It emphasizes the Beaver firm stance and the seriousness of the potential consequences. The angry intent of the warning can vary in tone and intensity. In this sentence, the warning is direct and powerful, conveying a strong message about Mr. Beaver to protect himself or his interests.

Declaring Intention

In the context of anger speech acts, declaring intention refers to the speaker's explicit expression of their intentions or desires in a forceful or assertive manner. Declaring intention in an anger speech act can involve making statements that express the speaker's determination, assertiveness, or resolve. It serves as a way for the speaker to clearly and forcefully state what they want or expect from the listener or the situation.

Data 10

The three children stare horrified.
Susan : ***This is all your fault!***
Peter : *My fault?*

Susan : *None of this would have happened if you had just listened to me in the first place!*
Peter : *Oh, so you knew this would happen?"*

Susan and Peter were fighting because Susan said "*This is all your fault!*" Susan's dialogue shows Declaring's angry intentions, Susan states that this all happened because Peter did not listen to Susan and the other siblings. The declaring intention in this sentence serves to assert or declare that the responsibility for the situation or problem lies with Peter. By stating "*This is all your fault,*" Susan is making a definitive statement, attributing the cause of the situation to Peter's actions or decisions. Intention behind the declaration is to hold Peter accountable and communicate a belief that he is solely responsible for the negative outcome. Susan is asserting her perspective and expressing her conviction that Peter's actions are to blame for the current situation. In these sentences, the statement of intent is accusatory and highlights Susan's strong belief in Peter's responsibility. The goal is to communicate a clear and direct message regarding the perceived guilt.

Criticizing Intention

Criticizing intention refers to the speaker's intention to express disapproval, dissatisfaction, or negative judgment towards the listener or their actions. When someone is angry, they may resort to criticizing as a way to voice their discontent or to highlight perceived faults or shortcomings. The criticizing intention in an anger speech act involves making statements that point out perceived flaws, mistakes, or undesirable qualities in the listener or their behavior. The purpose is to express the speaker's dissatisfaction and to convey their negative judgment of the listener's actions.

Data 11

*"Susan: Wait! Will you just think about this for a minute?
Peter : We don't have a minute.
Susan : I'm just trying to be realistic.
Peter : **No, you're trying to be smart. As usual."***

The conversation above is data from angry intentions to criticize. The dialogue that shows the intention to criticize is in Peter's dialogue, "*No, you're trying to be smart. As usual.*" Peter is expressing disapproval or criticism towards Susan's behavior or motives. The criticizing intention in this sentence serves to critique Susan's actions or intentions. By stating "*you're trying to be smart,*" Peter is accusing Susan of attempting to appear intelligent or clever in a way that he finds objectionable or irritating. The intention behind the criticism is to undermine Susan's input or suggestions by implying that her motives are driven by a desire to appear smart rather than genuinely contribute to the situation.

D. CONCLUSION

Based on Madow's theory, the researchers examined pragma linguistic types of rage expression in the film Chronicles of Narnia Series 1. In theory, rage can be classified into three types: Direct sign, thinly veiled indications, and indirect signs. The direct version is characterized by verbal brutality and angry remarks like as, Will you just stop? You idiots; Get off me. The thinly veiled form is stated by employing angry terms, such as ridiculing words, but the words are not quite severe, such as, you're blooming joking; They don't even know about the pledge. The indirect form is communicated through limited communication, and the speaker does not reveal his anger, as if to say, I don't want to talk; why does this

always happen to me? The researchers discovered 26 data as direct forms, 12 data as thinly veiled forms, and 1 datum as indirect forms based on the research findings. The direct form is the most common kind of pragma linguistic anger expression. From the analysis of 39 data, the researchers found eleven types of intention to express anger in Chronicles of Narnia Series 1. The researchers found 5 data that were questioning intentions, 11 data that were asserting intentions, 5 data that were commanding intentions, 5 data that were mocking intentions, 2 data that were disbelieving intentions, 1 data that were ordering intentions, 1 data that were was suggesting intentions, 2 data were disagreeing intentions, 3 data were warning intentions, 2 data was declaring intentions, and 2 data were criticizing intentions. The most dominant intention to express anger shown by the characters in the film is asserting intention.

E. REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). Introduction to research in education: Thomson Wadsworth. *Belmont, CA*.
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., Dicenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545–547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547>
- Cutting, J., & Fordyce, K. (2020). *Pragmatics: a resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Ekawati, R., & Ariatmi, S. Z. (2018). *Pragmatic Analysis of Anger Expression Used by Netizen On Rohingya Refugees In Website* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).
- Indrianingsih, E., & Ariatmi, S. Z. (2017). *A pragmalinguistics analysis of anger expressions in the crime movies* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).
- Leech, (1985). Principles of pragmatics. *Journal of Linguistics*, 21(2), 459-470.
- Lestari, T., & Hartati, E. (2020). A Pragmatics Analysis of Speech Act in Thor Movie. *ELTICS: Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 4(2), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.31316/eltics.v4i2.524>
- Mulianti, E. S. (2017). *Pengembangan media pembelajaran Pop-Up Book pembelajaran matematika kelas II MI Ma'arif BEGO Maguwoharjo sleman Yogyakarta* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta).
- Nissa, R. (2022). An Expressive Speech Acts Analysis on Anger Expression Found in Comment to Puan Maharani's Account Instagram.
- Pakpahan, S. D., & Manik, D. A. T. (2020). Analysis of Speech Act in the Film Fumiko No Kokuhaku By Hiroyasu Ishida. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Jepang Undiksha*, 6(2), 203. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbj.v6i2.26149>
- Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health services research*, 34(5 Pt 2), 1189.
- Sabrian, R., Sastra, G., & Revita, I. (2019). Women's Speech In A State of Anger: A Neuropragmatic Study. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 6(1), 15-27.
- Sina, M. W., & Bram, B. (2020). Expressive speech acts of the main character in Harry Potter movie as teaching materials for EFL learners. *PARAFRASE: Jurnal Kajian Kebahasaan & Kesastraan*, 20(1), 2580–5886.
- Tucker-Ladd, C. (1996). *Psychological self-help*. Clay Tucker-Ladd.
- Violeta, R. (2019). *Speech acts analysis of the main character in maleficent movie script by Jane Mctee* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Raden Intan Lampung).
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford university press.