

**THE OBEDIENCE DEGREE OF CHEMICAL LABORATORY
EMPLOYEES TOWARDS WARNING SIGNS IN PT SEMEN PADANG**

A THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Sarjana Sastra

ZAINAL ARIFIN RENALDO

04185049



**ENGLISH DEPARTEMENT
FACULTY OF LETTERS
ANDALAS UNIVERSITY
PADANG
2008**

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research

Language is one of important elements in human life. When we talk about language, of course, we must deal with our communication system. Sapir (1921) stated that "Language is a purely and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols." From this definition, we can see how language plays a very important role in human's life.

Dealing with communication, it is commonly held that the conscious and subconscious minds, communicated by the use of sign or symbol. Sign is defined as the way of signifying something. In some ways, the use of sign is considered more effective in conveying information. Looking at this phenomenon, we may question in our mind, why the use of sign or symbol is considered more effective. In other way, we can say that the use of language has many limitation compared to the use of signs or symbols. According to Vaughan (2007), "language is an artificial series of symbols created by human kind to communicate ideas to one another. Unfortunately, language is incapable of fully communicating thought, as it is limited, by its rules, syntax, and structure." Therefore, the use of sign is considered more effective since it has ability in giving a broader explanation.

As stated before, people use sign to convey information since it has ability in giving broader explanation. Sign can be found in many aspects in human life. It inevitably exists in education, art, business, medical, sciences, including industries and companies. It comes to our surrounding directly or indirectly.

A chemical laboratory in a company, for example, has many regulations in running activities. There must be several warning signs dealing with either its safety system or another general regulation. We can find many signs in a laboratory. Most of them are warning signs which are aimed at evoking the employees to stay alert toward the safety. The management of a company, undoubtedly, wants the employees obey everything dealing with safety and effectiveness of working. That is why a regulation is made. But, in term of obeying the rules, the employees, inevitably, must understand the order. Moreover, in a chemical lab, there are so many harmful chemical substances. Once a human error is made, it will cause a fatal result.

Epistemologically, sign is defined as something that signifying something. Distinctively, we make meaning through our creation and interpretation of "sign". According to Peirce in Chandler, "we think only in signs". Signs can be delivered in the form of words, images, odors, flavors, acts or objects. But those things cannot be considered as sign except if we invest them with meaning. "Nothing is a sign unless it is interpreted as a sign", Peirce (ibid, 2.172). Anything can be a sign as long as we interpret it as a 'signifying' something.

Pierce offered a triadic model of the sign; the representamen, an interpretant, and an object. Within Peirces model of the sign, a 'No Smoking sign'

will consist of: a crossed cigarette sign (the representamen); people do not smoke (the object) and the idea that seeing that kind of sign indicates that nobody is allowed to smoke. From this example, the biggest expectation from the user of this sign is all people who are in a room in which this sign exists do not smoke their cigarette.

Seeing this phenomenon, the writer is interested in exploring more deeply about sign and its relationship with our life. Since we live in a world surrounded by signs, it is very interesting to study the sign in a deeper way. In this thesis, the writer wants to analyze the level of obedience in the employees towards the warning signs in PT Semen Padang.

1.2. Identification of the Problem

For observing the effect of warning signs toward the employees in term of rule obedience, the most significant problem is:

1. What is the degree of obedience of Chemical Laboratory employees in PT Semen Padang towards the warning signs?

1.3. Objective of the Research

This research is conducted for one objective, that is, to analyze the degree of obedience of Chemical Laboratory employees in PT Semen Padang towards the warning signs.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

4.1. Conclusion

After conducting the research of the obedience degree of Chemical Laboratory employees towards the warning sign in PT Semen Padang, the writer finds out that the degree of obedience is determined by the employees' knowledge about security. It deals with their understanding towards the risk that they experience if they disobey the warning sign.

The warning sign is issued by the company to make the employees always obey the rule. That is why; analyzing warning sign and its effect towards the employees must cover the understanding of the sign itself and the exploration of behavior of the employees chosen as the informants.

From the analysis, there are some conclusions that can be drawn as follows:

1. The warning signs that exist in the surrounding area of PT Semen Padang Chemical Laboratory are composed by linguistic sign and non-linguistic sign. The relationship between linguistic sign and non linguistic sign help the reader understand the information conveyed more clearly
2. The information from the warning signs which exist around the chemical laboratory are mostly in the form of an order to obey the rule.
3. The obedience of a rule depends on the employees understanding toward the warning sign.

Bibliography

- Amir Piliang, Yasraf. *Hipersemiotika: Tafsir Cultural Studies atas Matinya Makna*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.2003.
- Antilla, Raimo. *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. NY: The Macmillan Company.1972.
- Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics: The Basic*. NY: Routledge.2002.
- Crystal, David (1987) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press. Bloominton.1979.
- Eco, Umberto. *Semiotics, and the philosophy of language*. HK: The Macmillan Press LTD.1985.
- F.Sherry, Jr, John. *Marketing and Semiotics: New Direction in the Study of Signs for Sale*. Journal of Business Ethics.2008. Available from: <http://www.nd.edu/~jsherry/vita.pdf> cited on february 23rd 2008.
- Friedman, Ted. *The World of the World of Coca Cola*. Atlanta, Georgia.1992. Available from: <http://theory.eserver.org/world-of-coca-cola.html>, Cited on February 23rd 2008.
- Hawkes, Terence. *Structuralism and Semiotics*. NY: Routledge.2003.
- <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/635965/warning-sign>
- <http://www.brainyquote.com/words/ob/ruleobedienc/195278.html>
- Keller, Rudy. *A theory of Linguistic Signs*. NY: Oxford University Press. 1998.
- Leech, Geoffrey. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Ltd.1983
- Moriarty. *Visual Semiotics and Production of Meaning in Advertising*. Journal of Visual communication Division of AEJMC. Washington, DC.1995. Available at <http://spot.colorado.edu/~moriarts/vissemiotics.html>, Cited on April 14th 2008.
- Rochayah and Suharyati. Siti (Trans). *Saussure*. Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Jakarta.1996.