THESIS

POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN JOHN GRISHAM'S NOVEL
"THE CLIENT"

By:
YULI FITRIYANA
02320107

ENGLISH LETTERS AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT
HUMANITIES AND CULTURE FACULTY
THE STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF MALANG
2007

POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN JOHN GRISHAM'S NOVEL
"THE CLIENT"

THESIS

Presented to

The State Islamic University of Malang
in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Sarjana Humaniora

Advisor
Drs. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd

By:
YULI FITRIYANA
02320107

ENGLISH LETTERS AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT
HUMANITIES AND CULTURE FACULTY
THE STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF MALANG
2007

APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that Sarjana thesis of Yuli Fitriyana entitled ***Politeness Strategies in John Grisham's novel "The Client"*** has been approved by the advisor for further approval by the board of examiners.

Malang, April 17, 2007

Approved by,   Acknowledged by,

Advisor   The Head of English Letters
and Language Department

<u>Drs. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd</u>   <u>Dra. Hj. Syafiyah, MA</u>
NIP. 150 327 259   NIP. 150 246 406

Acknowledged by,
The Dean of Humanities and Culture Faculty

<u>Drs. H. Dimjati Ahmadin, M.Pd</u>
NIP. 150 035 072

LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Sarjana thesis of Yuli Fitriyana entitled ***Politeness Strategies in John Grisham's novel "The Client"*** has been approved by the board of examiners as the requirement for the degree of Sarjana in English Letters and Language Department, Humanities and Culture Faculty, The State Islamic University of Malang.

Malang, April 18, 2007

The board of examiners: Signatures:

1. Dr. H. A. Habib, MA   1. (_____)
    (Chairman)   NIP. 130 902 073

2. Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si 2. (_____)
    (Main Examiner)   NIP. 150 244 741

3. Drs. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd   3. (_____)
    (Advisor)   NIP. 150 327 259

Acknowledged by,
The Dean of Humanities and Culture Faculty

Drs. H. Dimjati Ahmadin, M.Pd
NIP. 150 035 072

MOTTO

لن ترجع الايام التي مضت

DON'T WAIT TILL TOMORROW WHAT YOU CAN DO TODAY

DEDICATION

My thesis is proudly dedicated to:

My dearest parents

H. Abdul Madjid Marwan and Hj. Nadliroh

My beloved brothers and sisters

Maman, Fika, Ninik, Nufus, and Yayan

My beloved family

Mas Azis, De' Lia, Mbak Mil, Mbak Aris, Cak Bah

My little friends in Elementary and Junior High School PP. Karangasem

My friends in al-Mawaddah Boarding School

And all my friends in English Letters and Language Department UIN Malang

For their Endless love, Sacrifices, Prayers, Supports, and Advices

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

5. My parents and my beloved family for their continual moral and material supports, especially my parents, brothers, and sisters whose prayers never cease for my success.

6. My friends in English Letters and Language Department of UIN Malang.

7. My friends in PKLI '06, *Alfi, Indi, Mak nyak, Jamil, Faiq, Haqi, Faiz, Dewi, Mbo'de*. Thank you for your discussion, support, kindness, and joke. I will never forget you.

8. My friends in Wisma Flamboyan, *Berta, Juju', Dijes, Yanti, Bilqis, Arin, Lila, Edis* and still many others that I can not mention all. Thanks for the discussion, kindness, and familiarity so I can complete my thesis.

9. My friends in Elementary School and Junior High School Pondok-Pesantren Karangasem, and all my friends in al-Mawaddah Boarding School, you are my motivation to finish my thesis as soon.

Finally, I truly realize that this thesis still needs the constructive criticisms and suggestions from the readers in order to make it perfect and hopefully it can be useful for the readers, especially for the language and letters students.

Malang, March 17, 2007

The Researcher

ABSTRACT

People tend to choose the strategies for polite conversation in the purpose of achieving their final goal by maintaining other's face. Politeness is the power-distance relationship of the interactants and the extent to which a speaker imposes on or requires something from their addressee. However, politeness phenomena can also be appeared in literary text such as dialogues in a novel which provides the language of people interacting each other within the novel through the portrayed characters, so the story is easy to be understood. Therefore, the researcher chooses politeness strategies to investigate politeness phenomena in John Grisham's novel "*The Client*".

In this study, the researcher analyzes the portrayed of utterances of the politeness strategies toward four politeness strategies, namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record strategies.

The descriptive qualitative is used to conduct this research. The reason is to describe and to explain the politeness phenomena in the novel of "*The Client*" writen by John Grisham. In addition, this study presents the data in the forms of words or utterances rather than numbers which rely very much on the rich narrative description.

The result of the study shows that four strategies are applied by the portrayed characters in their dialogues. First, Bald on record strategy which is used in the situation in which S wants to achieve the maximum efficiency of his utterance. Second, Positive Politeness Strategy which is used in the condition in which S tries to minimize the distance between expressing friendliness and solid interest. Third, Negative Politeness Strategy which is used in the situation in which S has the main focus on assuming that he may be imposing and intruding on H's space. Fourth, off Record Strategy which is used in the condition to take some pressures off the hearer.

This study can lead other researchers to conduct research on politeness strategies in the other form of literary works such as poetry and drama in the purpose of enriching the discourse studies. It is also hoped that the study on politeness involves language other than English; so, it can broaden the knowledge in applying linguistic aspects in various languages.

TABLE OF CONTENT

REFERENCES

Aini, Lailatul. 2003. *A Study of Politeness Strategies Used by Nurses in Therapseutic Communication in RSUD Pare Kediri.* Unpublished Thesis. Malang: English Letters and Language Department, UIN Malang

Alwasilah, A. Chaedar. 1993. *Pengantar Sosiologi Bahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa

Azza, Istikhonul. 2004. *Politeness Strategies in Rahmania arunita's Eiffel...I'm in Love.* Unpublished Thesis. Malang: English Letters and Language Department, UIN Malang

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. Discourse Analysis. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1987. Politeness: Some Universal In Language Usage. Online www.users.evi.net.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1978. Politeness: Some Universals In Language Usage, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P and S.C. Levinson. 1978. *Universal in Language Phenomena.* In Esther N. goody (ed), Question and Politeness: Strategies in Social *Interaction,* pp. 56-289. Cambridge University Press.

Chaer, Abdul & Leonie Agustina. 1995. *Sociolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Chaika, Elanie. 1982. *Language as the Social Mirror*. London: Newburry House Publishers

Dufon A. and Wahab, A. 1994. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora dan Sains*. Malang: PPS. IKIP Malang

Goody, Esther N. 1996. *Question And Politeness*. Cambrige: Cambridge University

Green. 1994. *Conversational Interaction.* www.google.com

Grisham, John. 1994. *The Client*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group

Grundy, Peter. 2002. *Doing Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, Janet. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistik*. England: Longman Group UK.

Kitao, Kanji. 1998. *Politeness Strategies Used in Request-A Cybernetic Model*

Kitamura, Noriko. 2000. *Adapting Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness to the Analysis of Casual conversation*

Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman

Levinson, C.S. 1983. *Pragmatic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mukarromah, Nayyarotin. 2002. *Politeness and Sex Difference on Andalus FM Broadcasters.* Unpublished Thesis. Malang: English Letters and Language Department, UIN Malang

Mustai'in, Ahmad. 2005. *Studies on Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies used in Caricature Published in Jakarta Post*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: English Letters and Language Department, UIN Malang

Morand, David A & Rosalie J Ocker. *Politeness Theory and Computer-Mediated Communication: A socilonguistic Approach to Analyzing Relational Messages.* http://www.uni-Saarland.de/fak 4/norrick/introduction/linguistic%20 politeness%20 strategies.pdf

Nafi'ah, M. 2003. *An Analysis on the Elemant and Types of Setting in the "Robinson Crussoe" Novel by Daniel Dafoe*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: English Letters and Language Department, UIN Malang

Ohoiwutun, Paul. 1994. *Sociolinguistik.* Jakarta. Visipro

Patz, E. 1992. *Language, Culture and Society.* University of Canberra

Renkema, Jan.1993. *Discourse Studies: An Introductory Text Book*. Philadelphia/ Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company

Stubbs, Michael. 1993. *Discoures Analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stainback, Susan & William Stainback. 1988. *Understanding & Conducting Qualitative Research.* Iowa: Kendal Hunt Publishing Company

Tyson. *2004. The Client by John Grisham's:* Essay. www.echeat.com

Uhlenbeck, E. M. 1978. *Kajian Morfologi Bahasa Jawa.* Jakarta. Djambatan

Wardhaug, Ronald. 1986. *An Introduction To Sociolinguistics.* New York: Basil Blockwell Ltd.

Yuliana, Diana. 2003. *Politeness Strategies of Madurese and Javanese in Cross-Cultural Interaction in Probolinggo.* Unpublished Thesis. Malang: English Letters and Language Department, UIN Malang

APPENDIX

LIST OF APPENDIXES:

1. THESIS GUIDANCE SCHEDULE

2. CERTIFICATE OF THESIS' AUTHORSHIP

3. CURRICULUM VITAE

4. JOHN GRISHAM'S NOVEL *"THE CLIENT"*

5. BIOGRAPHY OF JOHN GRISHAM

Appendix 1

DEPARTEMEN AGAMA
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI (UIN) MALANG
FAKULTAS HUMANIORA DAN BUDAYA
Jl. Gajayana No.50 Malang, Telp (0341) 551354 Fak (0341) 572533

BUKTI KONSULTASI

Nama : **Yuli Fitriyana**
NIM : **02320107**
Judul Skripsi : **Politeness Strategies In John Grisham's Novel "*The Client*"**
Pembimbing : **(1). Drs. Langgeng Budianto, M.Pd**
   (2). Burhanuddin Syaifullah, SS

JADWAL KONSULTASI

No	Tanggal/Bulan/Tahun	Materi	Paraf
1.	27 Maret 2006	Pengajuan Judul Proposal Skripsi	
2.	29 Maret 2006	ACC Proposal	
3.	3 April 2006	Seminar Proposal	
4.	21 April 2006	Pengajuan Bab 1,2, & 3	
5.	17 Agustus 2006	Revisi Bab 1,2, & 3	
6.	27 Oktober2006	ACC Bab 1,2, & 3	
7.	1 Januari 2007	Pengajuan Bab 4 & 5	
8.	3 Februari 2007	Revisi Bab 4 & 5	
9.	13 Maret 2007	ACC Bab 4 & 5	
10	17 Maret 2007	ACC Keseluruhan	

Malang, March 17 2007
Dekan,

Drs. Dimjati Ahmadin M, Pd
NIP. 150 035 072

Appendix 2

CERTIFICATE OF THESIS' AUTHORSHIP

Name   : Yuli Fitriyana

ID Number   : 02320107

Address   : Jl. Simpang Gajayana No: 03 Merjosari Malang

Hereby, certify the thesis I wrote to fulfill the requirement for Sarjana entitled ***Politeness Strategies in John Grisham's Novel "The Client"*** is truly my original work. It does not incorporate any materials previously written or published by another person, except those indicated in quotations and bobliography. Due this fact, I am the only person responsible for this thesis if there are any objections or claims from others.

Malang, March 17 2007

Yuli Fitriyana

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with background of the study, problem of the study, objective of the study, scope and limitation, significance of the study, and definition of the key terms.

1.1. Background of the Study

Language has a social function as a tool to make connection between human beings. Without language, it seems impossible for people to interact with others in their daily life because language can express people's feeling, willing, opinion, etc (Chaer and Agustina, 1995: 19). In short, language is the oral symbols that represent meaning as they are related to real life situation and experience.

In case of communication, the speakers will choose the strategies to have polite conversation. People use politeness strategies in order to get their conversation run well and go smoothly. Brown and Levinson (1978) state that recognizes what people are doing in verbal exchange (e.g. requesting, offering, criticizing, complaining, etc) not so much by what they overtly claim to be doing as in the fine linguistics details of utterances. It means that not only speaking in fine linguistics but also considering other's feeling are important. In other word, speaking politeness involves taking account of the other's feeling and being polite person means that he should make others feel comfortable.

Being polite is complicated matter in any language. It is difficult to be learned because it involves understanding not only the language but also the social and the cultural values of the community. And language can not be separated from the community who use it. Moreover, using language must be appropriate with the social context of the speaker. The important characteristics of the social context is the context of the person spoken to, and in particular, the role relationships and relative status of the participants in a discourse (Grundy, 2000: 146). The speech between individual or unequal rank (due to status in organization, age, social class, education, or some other factors), for example, is likely to be less relaxed and more formal than between equals. Moreover, the speech will be relaxed whenever it happens between individuals with the same or equal ranks.

Being polite means to act with consideration of norm applied in the society. We can show our feeling toward other. Solidarity power, distance, respect intimacy, and etc, and our awareness of social customs. Such awareness is also shown through the general "politeness" with which we use language (Wardhaugh, 1986: 267). Politeness itself is socially prescribed. This does not mean, that we must be polite. Impoliteness, then, depends on the existence of standards, or norms of politeness. It means that the determination of whether someone is considered polite or impolite depends on to whom one communicates or converses. The society will possibly consider whether he or she is polite or impolite. In this case, politeness is socially prescribed. The society's norms and rules will determine whether one is polite or impolite.

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) stated that politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer's "face". Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and the maintaining of "self esteem" in public or in private situations. In this case, usually the speakers try to avoid embarrassing other person, or making him feel uncomfortable.

Brown and Levinson (Grundy, 2000: 156) work with Goffman's notion of 'face'. Face comes in two varieties, positive face and negative face. Brown and Levinson (2000) state that positive face is a person with to be well thought of. Its manifestations may include the desire to have what we want to be admired by others and the desire to be treated as a friend and confidence. Negative face is our wish not to be imposed on by others and to be allowed to go about our business unimpeded with our right to be free and self determined action intact. While Goffman states that positive face is the need to be appreciated and negative face is the need not to be disturbed (Renkema, 1993:13). Negative face is familiar as the formal politeness that the notion 'politeness' immediately conjures up. But positive face and its derivate forms of positive politeness are less obvious. Next definition of positive face is adequate only if certain interpretations are born in mind (Goody, 1996: 67-68).

Politeness strategies are used by people to ensure a smooth communication and harmonious *interpersonal* relationship in non-hostile social communication. Those strategies are used for calling forms of oral and written communication. People can communicate in written by many kinds of medium; one of them is in novel form.

Politeness phenomena do not only occur in an ordinary language but also in an extra-ordinary language which is mainly used in literary texts. Novel, as one of literary works, is a literary text that is valued by its culture that used special language and that effects people with emotions that bring them into the imaginary world, as mentioned by Cunning (in Nafi'ah, 2003). Moreover, she says that a literary text is also a piece of language and all languages have design, so it is obvious that literary language is rather different from an ordinary language. Literary text has a certain reputation on linguistic pattering that can effect its readers emotionally according to the way those readers perceive it, so the language has the possibilities on making the literary text memorable.

It is interesting to choose novel as a literary work to be investigated by using pragmatics studies on politeness strategies. The reasons why the researcher chooses novel as one of literary works has the uniqueness that is not owned by other literary works, like poem and drama. Its language has clear elaborated context that support the story explicitly (Kenereg, 1966) and also tells us how people are interesting each other within the novel through the portrayed characters, so the story can be easily understood. This context is important to determine the politeness strategies used in the novel.

The phenomenon of politeness strategies can be encountered in any context of conversation. Novel as the subject of this research serves conversations in which the politeness strategies occur. And John Grisham's novel, particularly *The Client* is the interesting subject to be analyzed.

The Client becomes one main selection within literary Guild and Doubleday Book Club. It also includes into Reader's Digest Condensed Book Selection. According to the publishers of those weekly magazines, Grisham employs just enough foreshadowing to keep the suspense rolling. Since the great sell of the novel was estimated, the first printing of the novel reached 950.000 printings *(http://search.barnesandnoble.com/booksearch/isbninquiry.asp?z=y&isbn=97804 40213529)*. The estimation of the publisher is obviously true. The Client eventually was sold more than 2 billion exemplars. Even, its edition position was on the top list of New York Time for about 46 weeks (Grisham, 1994). Warner Bross as a great production film in United States was so interested to the novel and therefore, the made it into film.

Beside its big achievement, *The Client* also describes some uniqueness which makes it differ from other novels. Noticed that the main key of the story is the trial to force the confession of a boy called Mark that he knows where the crops of the senator hidden by the murder. When police and some detectives investigate, they try to make some assumption made in order to encourage the speaker to confess. The assumption made as if the speaker believes that the addressee has already known it and true.

This study has relation with the research done by Mukarromah (2002). Her research describes politeness strategies used by male and female broadcasters of Andalus FM. Next thesis is conducted by Aini (2003). She researched the politeness strategies used by nurses in therapeutic communication in RSUD Pare

Kediri. And another researcher is Azza (2004) who emphasizes her study in politeness strategies used in Rahmania Arunita's "Eiffel…I'm in love". She found some strategies that are applied by portrayed characters in their dialogues. Other researcher who conducted the study of politeness strategies is Mustain (2005). His analysis described the politeness strategies used in caricatures published by Jakarta post. While, in this study, the researcher focuses on four politeness strategies used in John Grisham's novel "*The Client*".

Based on the description above, the research on "politeness strategies used in John Grisham's novel "*The Client*" is significant to be conducted.

1.2. Problem of the Study

Based on the background of the study, the problem of the study is focused on "What politeness strategies are used in John Grisham's novel "*The Client*"?

1.3. Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study is to describe the politeness strategies in the novel of John Grisham *"The Client."*

1.4. Significance of the Study

There are two kinds of significance in this study, those are theoretical and practical. Theoretically, the research is significant to provide some information about politeness strategies for those who are interested in the study of politeness strategies.

Practically, the result of the research will be beneficial for those who want to deal with understanding the novel, in the background of the story, and in analyzing the novel from other aspects.

This research is also important for those who are interested in some other subjects such as those which related to socio-culture. Since the setting is in United States, people might get some information dealing with American people's life especially the life of people in the lower class like Mark Sway and his family. We also will know on how a criminal case is being investigated and on how the country responds to such matter.

1.5. Scope and Limitation of the Study

A plot in a novel consist of the beginning, the middle, and the end. In this research, the researcher limited her study over the beginning of the novel. The reason is in this part, the background of the study of the story is described. The answer for any questions in the novel refers to the beginning of the story. In the middle of the novel to some parts of the end, the characters keep asking whetheer Mark really knows where Senator Boyette's crops hidden or not. And the answer for this question is available in the beginning of the novel.

The data chosen are in the form of utterances of the characters within the novel. The narration is taken as it is necessary to clarify the context of the utterance. This is accomplished because a unique discovery is found within the novel.

Some discourse aspects related to the concept of pliteness strategies are taken into consideration in order to help the researcher in giving a clear description of the analysis within discussion.

The discussion is emphasized on the use of politeness strategies, which is based on Brown and Levinson's theory that classifies the strategies into bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record.

1.6. Definition of the Key Terms

In order to avoid misinterpretation about the used of terms; it is important for the researcher to give the suitable meaning of the key terms. Some terms are defined as follows:

1. Politeness strategies are kinds of communication strategies that emphasizes on the polite words in action (Brown and Levinson).

2. John Grisham is an American novelist who is popular in writing the thriller novels and obtained a great achievement by his vast mega seller's novels.

3. Novel as one of literary works, is a literary text that is valued by its culture that used special language and that effects people with emotions that bring them into the imaginary world, as mentioned by Cunning (in Nafi'ah, 2003).

4. The Client is one of Grisham's novels, which tells about Mark Sway as the witness of the case.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this part, the writer presents theory that is related to the object of this study. It involves Face and Politeness in Concept, Politeness Strategies in Linguistics, Appropriateness of the Language Use, Influencing Factors in Choosing Politeness Strategies, John Grisham's novel *The Client*, and Its Previous Studies.

2.1. Face and Politeness in Concept

As a social person, human being always needs to have a communication with others. It is impossible for them to get a comfortable life without communicating and cooperating with others. Every people need to communicate with others in order to cooperate and get along with them. And to interrelate and to communicate with others, human beings use language as a means of communication.

Sapir as quoted by Alwasilah (1985: 94) states that human beings do not live in the objective world of social activity as ordinary understood, but are very much at the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society.

Virtually, verbal communication or language is used by human being as a medium to exchange a few words with others. They apply it to keep a good relationship with their friends, families, and the society around them. The

existence of human beings can not be separated from the society. It means that they are not able to live alone. In this case, the interrelationship is needed.

Although human beings admit that language can be used to do any communication functions, they agree to take a general assumption that the function of language is to communicate information (Wahab, 1998: 128-129). In the other hand, Lyon (in Brown and Yule, 1983) states that communication is primarily matter of speaker's seeking either to inform a hearer of something or to enjoy in some action upon him. But, language is not simply as a medium of informational transformation. More, it has a great role in establishing and maintaining the relationship to the other people. People have to see to whom we are speaking, because it may be some expressions are considered rude. Chaika (1982: 2) says:

> Human beings use language to reveal or conceal our personal identity, our character, and our background, often wholly unconscious that we are doing so. Almost all of our contact with family and friends, much of our contact with the strangers, involves speaking. And much of that speaking is strongly governed by rules, rules that dictate not only we should say, but also how we say.

We need to identify the social values of a society in order to speak politely. Making decisions about what is not regarded as polite in any community will involves assessing social relationship along the dimensions of social distance or solidarity, and relative power or status. Being polite may also involve the dimension of formality. In a formal situation the appropriate way of talking to your brother, for example, depend on your roles in the context. It is okay for you to call your brother "Tom" at home but not in formal situation, such as in a law

court whenever he is acting as the judge. However you may not say and call him "Tom" because it is considered as rude and disrespectful.

The different address forms can be produced by different degrees of status or intimacy the connotations of address forms such as Title (T), First Name (FN), Last Name (LN), Nick Name (NN), Title and Last name (TLN) or some combinations of them and so on are all different. Each has different stylistic implications and the rules for their usage, as well as the frequency of their usage are quite complex. Names used as terms of address can be personal names, family names or combination of both. Names are used to address people as individuals, because whenever someone calls with the names it can be assumed that he is known to the addressee. Poynton as edited by Patz (1992: 57) states that the choice of name forms in address may not only reflect an already existing relationship, however, but may also indicate the desire of the speaker to create such a personal relationship, or even to act as if such relationship, with all its attendant rights and obligations, already existed.

According to Chaika (1996: 34), nevertheless, since the politeness indicates formality, therefore the social distance, their reaction was perhaps to be expected. One's family interprets intimacy as a sign of affection and belonging. He (1982: 37) also mentions that where language can be used to say anything, style is confined to massages about social status, moods, and desired degree of intimacy between speakers.

Politeness is a word which requires people to face problematical operation in using any language. It is difficult to learn because it involves understanding all

the implied aspect of language. Not just the language itself but also the social and cultural values of the community where the language grows, because language cannot be separated with the community who use it.

Moreover, using language must be appropriate with the social context of the speaker. The important characteristic of the social context is the context of the person spoken to. And it also involves particular the role relationships and relative status of the participants in a discourse. The speech between strangers or individuals of unequal rank (due to status in an organization, age, social class, education, or some other factors), for example, is likely to be less relaxed and more formal than that between colleagues. Moreover the speech will reconcile whenever it happens between individuals with the same or alike level.

In daily conversation, people can identify the real condition where the interaction between alike or different level of social stratification happens. Knowing realizing the social distance better can help people create the interaction goes well. When we are with a group of friends, for instance, we can say to them, "*Go get me that plate!*", or "*Shut-up!*" However, when we are surrounded by a group of adults at a formal function, in which our parents are attending, we must say, "*Could you please pass me that plate, if you don't mind?*" and "*I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, but I am not able to hear the speaker in the front of the room.*" In different social situations, we are obligated to adjust our use of words to fit the occasion. It would seem socially unacceptable if the phrases above were reversed.

The good example of address usage is Javanese language. The Javanese speaker should choose an appropriate level for different situation and the status of addressee. Holmes (1992: 303) suggests that the higher the addressee's status, the more complex the level of Javanese selected. As well as choosing between low style (*Ngoko* or 1), middle style (*Krama Madya* or 2) and high style (*Krama Inggil* or 3), Javanese speakers also add another dimension of politeness to high and low style by using high of low honorifics. Moreover, he suggests that social status, social distance or solidarity and the degree of normality of the interaction are relevant dimensions in all societies in determining ways of speaking politely.

Wardhaugh (1986: 251) stated that many languages have many distinction corresponding to the *to –vous* (T/V) distinction in French, where grammatically there is a 'singular you' *tu* (T) and a 'plural you' *vous* (V) but usage requires that you use vous with individuals on certain occasions. The T form is sometimes described as the 'familiar' form and the V form as the 'polite' one. Other languages with a similar T/V distinction are Latin (*tv/vos*), Russian (*ty/vy*), Italian (*tu/lei*), German (*du/sie*), Swedish (*du/ni*) and Greek (*esi/esis*).

The study of politeness strategy is basically the study of knowing the way the people use the language while they are having interaction or communication. It preaches how to use the language and conduct the conversation run well and go smoothly.

Corresponding with politeness, some languages have been seen to build the very complex system of politeness. Javanese, one of the principle languages of Indonesia, is a language in which, as Geertz (in Wardhaugh, 1986: 267) says that

it is nearly impossible to say anything without indicating the social relationship between the speaker and the hearer in terms of status and familiarity. Before one Javanese speaks to another, he or she must choose the appropriate speech style (or styleme, in Geertz's terminology). They are high, middle, and low style.

Being linguistically polite involves speaking to people appropriately with their relationship. Politeness is closely related to the social construction and social relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Therefore, making decision of what is and is not considered polite in any communities, involves assessing social relationship along the dimension of social distance or solidarity, and relative power or status (Hymes, 1992: 297).

Smooth communication is also realized through the speaker's choice of expressions to confirm to the expected and prescribed norms of speech appropriate to the contextual situation in individual speech communities. Leech (in Subiyanto, 2001: 01) then defines politeness as a form of behavior which is aimed at the establishment, and maintenance of comity, i.e. the ability of participant in a socio-communicative interaction to engage in the interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony.

According to Grundy (2000: 145-146), politeness phenomena also extend the notion of indexical, because every utterance is uniquely designed for its audience. Seen as the exercise of language choice to create a context intended to match the addressee's notion of how he or she should be addressed, politeness phenomena is a paradigm example of pragmatic usage. Among the aspects of context that particularly determinate the language choice in the domain of

politeness are the power distance relationship of the interactants and the extent to which a speaker imposes on or requires something of their addressee. In being polite, a speaker is attempting to create an implicated context (the speaker stands in relation X to the addressee in respect of act Y) that matches the one assumed by the addressee. Politeness phenomena are one manifestation of the wider concept of etiquette, or appropriate behavior.

Besides, linguistic politeness relates with the honorifics. Someone will use an honorific style of whenever he wants to speak with others. In the case of languages, such as Javanese language, linguistic politeness is mostly demanded to show a relationship of the different speech community into three groups of speakers defined by him in the following terms: (1). the non-*prijaji*, urbanized some what educated persons, (2). the peasants and uneducated towns people, and (3). *Prijaji*, elsewhere defined by him as "the white collar elite" of Javanese society. According to Geertz, each of these three groups has its disposal a different set of possibilities as to the use of the vocabularies of respect. Uhlenbeck (1978: 302) says that these possibilities are described in terms of language levels which roughly correspond to the familiar Javanese terms *ngoko*, *krama* and *madya*.

In case of communication, however, everyone wants to be understood and not to be disturbed by others; moreover, he or she does not want to loose his face while communicating. Loosing face means the notions of being embarrassed, humiliated, or disappointed. That is why face is something that is emotionally invested, maintained, enhanced, and constantly attended in an interaction.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearers' "face." Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that "self-esteem" in public or in private situations. Usually you try to avoid embarrassing the other person, or making them feel uncomfortable. Face Threatening Acts (FTA's) are acts that break on the hearers' need to maintain his/herself admiration, and be respected. Politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with these FTA's.

Furthermore, Goffman (in Renkema, 1993: 13), the social psychologist who introduced the concept of "face", defines that face is the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken. On the other word, face is the image that a person project in his social contact with others. Furthermore, every participant in the social process has the need to be appreciated and the need to be free and not interfered by others. He calls the need to be appreciated as positive face and the need not to be disturbed as negative face

Moreover, Brown and Levinson as quoted by Goody state that face is the public self-image that every members wants to claim for himself (Goody, 1996: 66).

One access to the study of face and politeness phenomena can definitely be built around the examination that language users often depart from the conditions of most advantageous information exchange because, not to do so, would amount to a loss of face of speaker or hearer. Such as (dad to son) *are you using the car tonight?* Counts as face regarding strategy, among other reasons,

because it leaves room for the interlocutor to reject by saying *sorry, it is already taken* (rather than the more face threatening *you may not use it*). In that common sense, the speaker and the hearer's faces are being intended to.

Whenever people do the interaction with others, they have a special intention to the existence of the conversation and its condition. Whatever they said should be appreciated and not to be bothered by others, it means that they do not want to loose their face. As Brown and Levinson (in Goody, 1996: 66) states that our notion of face is derived from that Goffman and from the English folk term, which ties up face concept of being embarrassed or dishonored, or loosing face. Thus, face is something that emotionally invested, that can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended in interaction. In general, people cooperate (and presuppose each other's cooperation) in maintaining face in interaction, such cooperation is based on the mutual weakness of face.

Generally, every participant of the interaction will try to maintain each other's face, because everyone's face depends on every one else being maintained. Instead, the aspect of face can be told as basic requirements, which every participant knows the desires of every other member's interest to partially satisfy. In Goffman's opinion, every participant in the social process has the need to be appreciated by others and the need to be free and not interfered with. He calls the need to be appreciated as positive face and the need not to be disturbed as negative face (Renkema, 1993: 13).

Face can be divided into two components. Brown and Levinson (in Goody, 1996: 67) say that one could subsequently distinguish between two types

of face requirements; positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to the desire to be appreciated as a social person. Negative face refers to the desire to see one's action unimpeded by others.

Negative is familiar as the formal politeness. But positive face and its derivatives forms positive politeness are less obvious. The reduction of a person's public self-image or personality to a want that one's wants be desirable to at least some others can be justified in this way. The most noticeable and important aspect of a person's personality in interaction is what the personality requires and needs of other interactants that include the desire to be understood, like or admired. The next steps to represent this desire as the want to have one's goal thought of as desirable not just by anyone, but by some particular others especially relevant to the particular goals. Consider an example, the gardener who spends much of the time and effort to expend on his or her roses is proud of his or her roses, and he or she likes others to admire them and say '*what a lovely roses', how do you do it?*.

Corresponding to those previous two face types, language communities develop strategies to attend to positive and negative face wants. The strategies are referred to as positive and negative politeness strategies. With particular reference to negative face wants, Brown and Levinson had developed the concept of face threatening acts to refer to verbal acts which intrinsically threaten face and may therefore require redressive action.

2.2. Appropriateness on the Language Use

Whenever human being exists, there is a language. Human being and language can not be separated. It grows because of human, while human develops with language. Meanwhile, languages firmly integrated into human's activities.

Otto Jesperson wrote in the introduction to his *Philosophy of Grammar* (in Renkema, 1993: 8):

> The essence of language is human activity – activity on the part of one individual to make him understood by another and activity on the part of the other to understand what was in the mind of the first.

It means that language exists in order to be an instrument of interaction between human being, in order that they can communicate and develop them selves.

Moreover, language, action, and knowledge are inseparable. As J.L Austin discusses in his 1955 lectures at Harvard University, utterances are actions (Austin, 1962 in Stubbs, 1983: 1). Some actions can only be performed through language (for example, apologizing), whilst others can be performed either verbally or non-verbally (for example, threatening). In addition, as soon as we start to study how language is used in social interaction, it becomes clear that communication will not take place without sharing knowledge and assumptions between speakers and hearers.

Language and situation are also inseparable. Of course, it has no deterministic relationship except in highly ritualized situation. It involves given social situation, such as Stubbs' example 'a small village shop', (Stubbs, 1983: 1) says that it is possible to predict a great deal about the content, function, and style of language used there.

It is obvious enough in a common sense way, of course, that much of language are not to be taken literary. Language is used to perform action, and those different social situations produce different language.

Furthermore, language that is used in such situation is primarily 'message oriented'. It is important that the recipient gets the informative detail correction. For example, if a policeman gives direction to a traveler, a doctor tells a nurse how to administer medicine to a patient, a householder puts in an insurance claim, a shop assistant explains the relative merits of two types of knitting wool, or a scientist describes an experiment, in each case the speaker should make clear what he/she says. It will be unfortunate or disastrous consequences if the message is not understood by the recipient (Brown and Yule, 1983: 2).

As Goody (1996: 60) says that we believe the pattern of 'message construction' or 'ways of putting things' or simply language usage, are part of the very stuff thing that social relationship are made of (or, as some would prefer, crucial parts of the expressions of social relationships). Discovering the principles of language usage may be largely coincident with discovering the principle out of which social relationship, in their interaction aspect are constructed. Language may be used to perform many communicative functions, and people nonetheless make the general assumption that the most important function is the communication of information. Lycons (as stated in Brown and Yule, 1983: 2) observes that the notion of communication is readily used 'of feelings, moods and attitudes', but he suggests that he will be primarily interested in 'the intentional transmission of factual, or prepositional information'. Similarly, Bennet (in

Brown and Yule, 1983: 2) remarks that it seems likely that the communication is primarily a matter of speaker are seeking either to inform the hearer of something or to enjoying in some action upon him.

In addition, while the use of language is for the transmission of factual or proportional information, it has been concerned that the use of language is to establish and maintain social relationships. The language has also been frequently commented-on particularly the conventional use of language to open talk exchanges and to close sociologists and sociolinguists. Even, conversational analysts have been particularly concerned with the use of language to negotiate role-relationships, peer solidarity, the exchange of turns in a conversation, the saving of face of both speaker and hearer (ef. Labov, 1972a; Brown and Levinson, 1978; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Lakoff, 1973 in Brown and Yule, 1983: 3). It is clearly stated that the use of language in everyday life is characterized by interpersonal. For example (in Brown and Yule, 1983: 3):

> When two strangers are standing shivering at a bus-stop in an icy wind and one turns to the other and says 'My goodness, it is cold', it is difficult to suppose that the primary intention of the speaker is to convey information. It seems much more reasonable to suggest that the speaker is indicating readiness to be friendly and to talk. Indeed, a great deal of ordinary everyday conversation appears to consist of one individual commenting on something which is present to both him and his listener.

Meanwhile, casual conversation generally contains phrases and echoes of phrases, which appear as contribution of a conversation, not in instance of information giving.

In addition, speakers establish the choice of language use not only from the different sexes, but it also depends on the function of the utterances, for

example to keep the distance between the speaker and the hearer or to build a relationship more likeable and enjoyable (*International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 58: 35, in Ohoiwutun, 1997: 90).

2.3. Politeness Strategies in Linguistics

Politeness strategy is one of communication strategy that emphasizes on the polite words and actions. This research, however, will focus on politeness which is recommended by Brown and Levinson.

According to Brown and Levinson, politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer's face (Goody, 1996). Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining the 'self-esteem' in public or in private situation. Goffman in Renkema (1993) introduces the concept of face as an image which is projected by a person in his social contacts with others. Face has the meaning as in the saying to loose fact. In Goffman's opinion, every participant in the social process has the need to be appreciated by others and the need to be free and not to be disturbed. He calls the need to be appreciated as a 'positive face' and the need to be free or not to be disturbed is called as 'negative face'.

Positive face represents the want of every participant of conversation that his/her wants be desirable to at least some others. Meanwhile, the negative face represents the want of every participant of conversation that his/her actions are not disturbed by others (Goody, 1996). Further, Goffman classifies the face work that is aimed positive face is called 'solidarity politeness' and face work that deals with negative face is known as 'negative politeness'.

Politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with the FTA's. We understand the notion of 'face' previously from the dramaturgical theories of Erving Goffman that individuals as social actors perform (present a public self) on the stage of everyday life. They use linguistic, behavioral, and gesture displays to present a positive self-image (face) to the social world (Morand, 2003). They also try to create impressions in others and to appear as smooth and as competent as they can in their performances. Meanwhile, face is the positive social value of each person in public arena, and it is the very reflection of self worth which upon these presentational aspects hangs individuals' self-esteem, self-identity, and their credibility as a member of the social group.

In contrast, politeness supports the people to keep other's face in interaction. Because all of people have face and also 'face wants', that they have desire and expectation, thus others who surround them in interaction will help them to verify and maintain their public fascination. If another person does not cooperate with them, they would be embarrassed and humiliated or 'losing face'.

Therefore, politeness strategies are developed for the main purposes of dealing with the FTA's in order to save the hearer's face and usually it is used to avoid embarrassing the other or making them feel uncomfortable. And FTA's are the acts that break the hearer's need to maintain his or her self esteem and to be respected.

Because speakers use different strategies to avoid or to minimize threats to face, in the following sub topic, the writer explains some politeness strategies based on Brown and Levinson's description of theory that sum up human

"politeness" behavior. Brown and Levinson (1978: 65) present four strategies to face "threatening face" (FTA's = Face Threatening Acts); Bald on Record, Negative Politeness, Positive Politeness, and Off-Record-indirect strategy, that are schematized as follow:

2.3.1. Bald On-Record Strategy

Bald on-Record strategy provides no effort by the speakers to minimize the impact of the FTA's. The speakers usually shock the hearers, embarrass them, or make them fell a bit uncomfortable. The prime reason for bald-on record is whenever S wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy H's face. However, this type of strategy is commonly found with people who know each other very well, and very comfortable in their environment such as close and family.

This strategy as speaking in conformity with Grice's maxims (Grice 1975). These maxims are an intuited characterization of conversational principles that world constitute guidelines for achieving maximally efficiency of communication. These maxims are:

a. Maxim of quality. It means speak the truth informatively and be sincere

b. Maxim of quantity. It means speak informatively

c. Maxim of relevance. It means speak relevant

d. Maxim of manner. It means avoid ambiguity

In Goody (1996), Brown and Levinson have categorized bald on-record into two classes, they are:

a. Cases of non minimization of the face threat

The condition in which maximum efficiency is very important, and both S and H mutually know this, no face redress is needed. For example:

"*Help!*" (Emergency condition)

"*Give me just more week!*" (To pay rent)

The condition in which S provide metaphorical urgency for emphasis. It explains why orders and entreaties which have inverted assumptions about the relative status of S and H, both seem to occur in many languages with the same superficial syntax, namely imperative. For example:

"Send me a post card"

"*Don't forget us!*"

The situation in which S speaks as if imploring H to care for S, thereby, stressing his high valuation of H's friendship. There is a task-oriented interaction in which face redresses may be felt to be relevant, as in:

"*Lend me a hand here!*"

The situation in which S's want to satisfy H's face is small, because S is powerful and not fear retaliation or non-cooperation from H, or s wants to be rude, or does not about maintaining face, usually in teasing and joking. For example:

"*Cry, get angry*" (teasing).

The condition in which S conveys that he cares about H. it can happen in sympathetic or warning. For example:

"Careful! He is a dangerous man"

The situation in which S grants permission for something that H has

requested. For example: "*Yes, you may go*!"

b. Cases of FTA-oriented usage

In this circumstance, it is polite for S to reduce H's anxieties by

preemptively inviting H to impinge on S's preserve that includes:

Welcoming, in this situation S insists that H may transgress. For example:

"Come in, don't hesitate, I'm not busy". In this case, S will not say "come in" to

person who are clearly more important than he and are clearly in a hurry. This

invitation belongs to bald on-record because there is no other face want is

affected, the lighter the invitation, the more polite it is.

Greeting and farewell, in this condition S insists that H may transgress on his

positive face by talking his leave. For example: *I am staying, you go"*

Offers, in this situation S insists that H may impose on S's negative face. For

example: "*Don't bother, I'll clean it up / leave it to me*"

2.3.2. Positive Politeness

Brown and Levinson in Green (1994: 2) states that the positive politeness

is approached-based, try to show that S wants what H's wants (shares H's positive

face wants) i.e. that they are "the same" in some ways, or that S like H in order to

have H's positive face. Positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee's

positive face, his perennial desire that his wants (or the action / acquisitions /

values resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable (Brown and Levinson in Goody, 1996: 106).

Moreover, Holmes suggests that positive politeness emphasizes shared attitudes and values. For instance, when the boss asks to his employee, who is subordinate people, to use first name (FN) to him, this is a positive politeness, expressing solidarity and minimizing status difference. Beside that, the positive politeness is a face saving acts which is concerned with the person's positive face which tends to show the solidarity, emphasize that both speakers and hearer want the same thing, and they have a common goal (Yule, 1996: 62). However, positive politeness is face work that is aimed at positive face.

There are some strategies according to Brown and Levinson (Goody, 1996: 108-134) that may be conveyed by the speaker in their conversation in order to have positive politeness.

a. Claim common ground

The first type of positive politeness strategies involves S 'claiming ground' with H, by indicating that S and H both belong to some set of persons who share specific wants, including goals and values. There are three ways of making this claim, they are:

1. S may convey that some wants (goals, or desired objects) of H`s is admirable or interesting to S too. The positive-politeness strategies of this method are:

a. Notice, attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods). Generally, this output suggests that S should take notice of aspects of H`s condition.

For example, "*Goodness, you cut your hair! ...... By the way, I come to borrow some flour*", and "*You must be hungry, it's a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch? *".

b. **Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)**. This is often done with exaggerated intonation or stress. For example, "*What a fantastic garden you have!*", and "*How absolutely marvelous/ extraordinary/ incredible.*"

c. **Intensify interest to H**. Another way for S to communicate to H that he shares some of his wants is to intensify the interest of his own (S`s) contributions to the conversation, by making a good story. However, the use of directly quoted speech rather than indirect reported speech is another feature of this strategy, as is the use of tag questions or expressions that draw H as a participant into the conversation, such as "*You know, isn't it ?*", and "*See what I mean?*".

2. **S may stress common membership in a group or category**. This emphasizes that both S and H belong to some set of persons who share some wants. The positive-politeness strategy of this method is the use in-group identity markers. However, the strategies included in this method are: in-group usages of address forms, of language or dialect of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis. The address forms used to convey such in-group membership include generic names and terms of address, such as honey, dear, brother, sister, sweetheart, etc. Furthermore, the use in-group language or dialect includes the phenomenon of code-switching which

involves any switch from one language or dialect to another in
communities.

3. S can claim common perspective with H without necessarily referring to in-group membership. The positive-politeness strategies of this method are:

a. Seek agreement

Agreement can be stressed by repeating part or all of what the preceding speaker has said in a conversation.

A: You know what is your girl friend's name?

B: Diana, Lady Diana.

A: <u>Lady Diana</u>, do you truly love her?

B: Yes of course, I do so much.

C: Ok, <u>you do so much</u>.

b. Avoid disagreement

The strategies to avoid disagreement are:

1. *Token agreement*, it means that the desire to agree or appear to agree with H leads also to mechanism for pretending to agree. For instance, the speaker responds to a preceding utterance with "*Yes, but…..*" rather than with "*No*" to appear the agreement or to hide the disagreement. The agreement yields examples like the following (where B is a response to A, in each case):

   A: That's where you live, Florida?

B: That's where I was born

A: Can you hear me?

B: Barely

A: So it this permanent?

B: Yeah, it is 'permanent'-permanent until I get married again

2. *White Lies*, it is the positive politeness strategy used by the speaker to avoid   disagreement, where S, when confronted with the necessity to state an opinion, wants to lie rather than damage H's positive face. For example: "*Yes I do like your new hat!*"

c. Presuppose/ raise/ assert common ground

It can be done by *gossip* or *small talk*. The value of S`s spending time and effort on being with H, as a mark friendship or interest in him. S can thereby stress his general interest in H, and indicate that he has not come to see H simply to do the FTA, even though his intention to do it may be made obvious by his having brought a gift. Or may be S gives raise to the strategy of redressing an FTA by talking a while about unrelated topics. Another strategy is personal-center switch: S to H. this is when S speaks as if H were S or H's knowledge were equal to S knowledge. However, sometimes the speaker uses tag questioning his conversation by falling intonation, "*I had a really hard time learning to drive, didn't I?*"

d. Joke

Joke is a basic positive-politeness technique used to minimize the FTA. For example: "*Ok if I tackle those cookies now?*" and "*How about lending me this old heap of junk?*" (H's new Cadillac)

b. Convey that S and H are cooperators

This is the second major class of positive-politeness strategies derived from the want to convey that the speaker and the addressee are cooperatively involved in the relevant activity, and they achieve goals in domain.

The strategies that may be derived from this major class of positive-politeness are:

Assert or presuppose S knowledge of and concern from H's wants.

One way of indicating that S and H are cooperators is to assert or imply knowledge of H's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants with them. For instance, "*Look, I know you want the car back by 5.00, so should (n't) go to the town now?*

Offer and promise

Offer and promise can indicate that S and H are cooperators. However, S may choose to stress his cooperation with H by claiming that whatever H wants, S wants for him and will help him to obtain. For example, "*Do you need some helps?*"

Be optimistic

Optimistic expressions of FTAs are one out come of this strategy (and constitute perhaps the most dramatic difference between positive politeness and negative politeness ways of doing FTA). For example:

        a) *I borrow a cup of a flour*

        b) *You'll lend me your lawnmower for the weekend, I hope.*

        c) *Look, I'm sure you won't mind if I borrow your typewriter*

Include both S and H in the activity

In order to stress the cooperativeness between S and H, an inclusive "we" form can be used. For instance:

    S: Let's have a cookie, then.

    H: Let's get on with dinner, eh?

    S: Let's stop for a bite. (S wants a bite, so he says "*Let's stop*")

    S: Give us a break

Give (or ask for) reasons

Another way of indicating that S and H are cooperators is by including H in the activity, for S to give reasons as to why he wants. For example, "*Why don't we go to mall?*", "*Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend?*" Why don't I help you with the suitcase?*"

Assume or assert reciprocity

The cooperativeness between S and H can be stressed by giving reciprocal rights or obligations obtaining between S and H. For example, "*I'll do X for you, do Y for me*".

Giving gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation).

This type involves S's decision to redress H's face directly by fulfilling some of H's wants in indicating that S wants H's want for H. it is stressed by using gift-giving to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation). For example; "*I know that you love West life so much, may be this poster will make you happy*".

2.3.3. Negative Politeness

Another kind of politeness is negative politeness. It is derived from negative face. Negative politeness strategy (formal politeness/respect politeness) has the main focus on assuming that you may be imposing and intruding on H's space. In other words, speaker attempts to minimize the imposition on H or acknowledge H's negative face. This strategy assumes that there might be some social distance or awkwardness between speaker and hearer and it is likely to be used whenever a speaker wants to put a social brake on his interaction (Brown and Levinson, 1987). It is also impersonal and it can include expressions that refer to neither the speaker nor the hearer. Its language emphasizes the speaker's and the hearer's independence. For instance, "*There is going to be a party, if you can make it. It will be fun*", and not "*Come on, let's go to the party. We'll have fun*" (Yule, 1996).

Negative politeness is also known as respect politeness where every participant in the social process has the need not to be disturbed and to be free. In Holmes` opinion (1992:297), negative politeness pays people respect and avoids

intruding on them. However, Brown and Levinson (Goody, 1996:134) said that negative politeness is redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face; his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded.

According to Brown and Levinson (Goody, 1996: 137) there are some strategies that may be included in negative-politeness, they are:

1. Be direct

In the formal situation, sometimes the directness is needed to minimize the imposition by saying the point and avoiding the further imposition of prolixity and ambiguity as mentioned by Lakoff (in Goody, 1996). Fortunately, this strategy is rarely used in negative politeness because it is more relevant to be used in bold on-record strategy. For example, "*Help me to pick up these boxes!*"

2. Don't assume about H's wants

This type tries to avoid assuming that anything in FTA is desired or believed by H. it is stressed by hedging such assumptions in the form of word and phrase that modify the degree of predicate membership. For example, "*A swing is sort of a toy*", or "*You are quite right*".

3. Don't coerce H

3.1. By avoiding coercing H's response means that S gives H the option not to do a certain act. It covers three strategies, such as:

a. Be conventionally indirect

Indirect means not saying what really mean to soften the utterance. Indirect speech acts can be included in this strategy. The use of indirect

request is the example of this strategy. "*I don't suppose I could possibly ask you for a cup of sugar, could I?*"

b. Question, hedge

In the literature, a 'hedge' is a particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set. For instance, "*John is true friend*", "*I wonder if you could help me out!*"

c. Be pessimistic

This strategy gives redress to H`s negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of S speech act obtain, such as, "*Could you do X?*", "*could you jump over that five-foot fence?*".

3.2. By avoiding coercion of H means that S minimizes the threat by clarifying S view of the P, D and R values. It covers two strategies, such as:

a. Minimize the imposition (Rx)

The strategy is used to minimize one's own action or goods to the addressee. For example, "*Could I borrow your pen just for a minute?*"

b. Give deference

There are two sides to the coin in the realization of deference which has double side nature; the first is the raising of the other, and the second is lowering of one self as clearly shown in honorific systems. By honorific, we can understand direct grammatical encoding of social status between participants or between participants and person or thing

referred to in the communication event. For example, "*Excuse me, Sir, could you show me the way to the bank?*" or "*Excuse me, can you show me the way to the bank?*"

4. Communicate S want not to impinge on H

Indicate that S is aware and he takes account in his decision to communicate the FTA is one of the ways to satisfy H's negative face. There are two basic ways to communicate the FTA, namely:

4.1. Apologize

By apologizing for doing an FTA, the speaker can indicate his reluctance to impinge on H's negative face and thereby/there fore redress that impingement partially. It is one way to partially satisfy H's negative face demand by indicating that S is aware of them and taking them into account in his decision to communicate the FTA. There are, at least, four ways to communicate regret or reluctant to do the FTA:

a. Admit the impingement

S can simply admit that he is impinging on H's face, with expression like "*I hope this isn't going to bother you too much*" or "*I'm sure you must be very busy, both…..*", or "*I know this is a bore, but please listen to it once more*".

b. Indicate reluctance

S can attempt to show that he is reluctant to impinge on H with the use of hedges or by the expression such as, "*I don't want to bother you, but please tell her to call me tonight*".

c. Give overwhelming reasons

S can claim that he has compelling reasons for doing the FTA, thereby it implies that normally he would not dream of impinging H's negative face, such as, "*Can you possibly help me with this, because I simply can't manage it*".

d. Beg forgiveness

S may beg it is forgiveness by saying, for example, "*Excuse me, but…*" or "*I'm sorry to bother you…*".

4.2. Disassociate S and H from the particular imposition

This type provides S implicitly conveys that he is reluctant to impinge H. it can be achieved by some strategies bellow:

a. Impersonalize S and H

It is one of negative-politeness strategies that avoid the use of the "I" and "you" pronouns. This strategy aims at making generalization of S and H. it is stressed by the use of performative verb, imperative, impersonal verb, passive voice, etc. For example, "*OK class, pay attention to this picture*".

b. State the FTA as a general rule

This strategy shows that S is forced by some circumstances in stating FTA based on social rule, regulation, or obligation. For instance, "*I'm sorry, but late comers can't be seated till the next interval*".

c. Nominalize

The important thing in nominalizing the subject of the utterance is to make the utterance more formal. For example, "*I'm surprised that you failed to replay*".

5. Redress others' wants of H

This is the higher strategy of negative politeness that consists of offering partial compensation for the face threat in FTA. It shows that negative politeness attends to other wants can be derived (H's desire for territorial integrity and self determination). It covers two strategies, namely:

5.1. Give deference to H

It indicates that H is respected and esteemed and felt to be superior. For example, "*Excuse me, Sir, could you show me the way to the bank?*"

5.2. Go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting H

S can redress the FTA by explicitly claiming his indebtedness to H, by means of expression such as the following, for request, "*I'll never be able to repay you if you...* ", and "*It wouldn't be any trouble; I have to go there right now anyway*".

Those are two kinds of politeness and the strategies that are included on positive politeness and negative politeness. However the use of negative politeness will employ speech politer than positive politeness, because as it is based on the scheme of possible strategies for doing FTA. However, the scheme is numbered based on the degree of politeness.

Leech as quoted by Ohoiwutun (1997: 93) classified the politeness principal into two categories, absolute and relative politeness. Absolute politeness refers to general norms that are conducted similarity by every language and relative politeness refers to the special norms conducted by certain speech community because it follows the dimension and standard of those communities, therefore relative politeness is very varied.

There are several rules in order to conduct politeness to run the speech or conversation well. Leech quoted by Hamas (2002: 26) stated that linguistic politeness includes several rules as follow: Firstly, rule of attention that minimizes the limit and maximizes the profit of others. Secondly, rule of kindness that minimizes the profit of own and maximizes the profit of others. Thirdly, rule of respectfulness that minimizes the impoliteness of others and maximizes the respect of others. The forth is rule of simplicity that minimizes the praise of own and maximizes the praise of others.

2.3.4. Off Record Strategy

Off record strategy has the main purpose of taking some pressures off of the hearer. In this case, the speaker performs an act in a vague manner that could be interpreted by the hearer as some other acts. Such an off record utterance usually uses indirect language that constructs more general utterance or actually different from what one mean. Therefore, the interpretation of the utterance greatly depends on the existence of contexts that frames up the utterance.

Brown and Levinson (1987) have also explained some classes that lie on off record strategy they are as follows:

1. Invite Conversational Implicatures

If speaker does the FTA indirectly, he must give H some hopes that H picks up and interprets what S really means to say. In conversational implicature, context is mostly needed to interpret the real meaning of off record utterances. This class covers some strategies, such as:

1.1 Violate relevance maxim (breaking the maxim of relevance/be relevant), it is stressed by some strategies below:

 a. **Give hints**

  If S says something that is not explicitly relevant, so he invites H to search for interpretation of the possible relevance, this considers as a violation of relevance maxim. Giving a hint means raising the issue of act A by stating reason for doing act A. For instance, *"This soup is a bit bland"* (means to pass the salt)

 b. **Give association clues**

  This strategy is provided by mentioning something associated with the act required of H, precedent in S-H's experience and mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience. Euphemism for taboo topic is also derived from this kind of implicature. For example, *" Are you going to market tomorrow? There is a market tomorrow, I suppose"* (means to give him a ride to the market).

c. **Presuppose**

This strategy provides that the utterance might be almost relevant in context. For instance, *"I washed the car again today",* in this matter S presuppose that he has done it before, so he implicates a criticism by using *again* to make it relevant with the prior event.

1.2 Violate quantity maxim (breaking the maxim of quantity/be informative), it is stressed by some strategies below:

a. **Understate**

Understatement is a way of generating implicature by saying not informatively. Usually it uses predicate that describes the lower actual state of affair.

For instance, "It's not half bad" (means that S thinks it's surprisingly good)

b. **Overstate**

Overstatement is the opposite of understatement. It usually uses predicate that describes the higher actual state of affair. In this case, the implicature often lies far beyond what is said. For instance, *I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer"* (means apology for not getting in touch).

c. **Use tautologies**

By using tautology (patent and necessary truth), S encourages H to look for an informative interpretation of non-informative utterance. For example, *"If I won't give it, I won't"* (means I mean it).

1.3. Violate quality maxim (breaking the maxim of quality/be sincere), it is

stressed by some strategies below:

    a. **Use contradiction**

        By stating two things that contradict each other, S makes it appear that

        he can not be telling the truth, so he encourages H to look for an

        interpretation that reconciles the two contradictories. For instance,

        when drunken person says on the phone, *"Well, Jim is here and he is*

        not here"

    b. **Be ironic**

        Irony is usually marked by particle that conveys S true feelings

        indicate the contrary to the fact. For instance, *"He's a real genius"*

        (after he has done ten stupid things)

    c. **Use metaphors**

        Usually metaphor is on record, but there is possibility that the

        connotation of the metaphor is off record. For example," John is a real

        fish" (He drinks/swims/etc like a fish)

    d. **Use rhetorical question**

        By using rhetorical question, S wants to provide him with the indicated

        information in purpose of leaving the answer hanging in the air. For

        instance, *"How many times do I have to tell you"* (means many times).

2. be vague or ambiguous

        S may be going off record by being vague that make his communication

ill-defined. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson have described the off record

usages of such violation of manner maxim violation in off record strategy, such as:

2.1. Be ambiguous

Ambiguity includes the literal meaning of the utterance and its possible implicature. A purposeful ambiguity can be achieved by using metaphor since it does not have exactly clear connotation. For example, "*Jean is a hot cheek*"

2.2. Be vague

S may go off record by being vague about the object of the FTA. For instance, "*Perhaps someone did something naughty*"

2.2. Over generalize

When S makes generalization of what is said has the choice of deciding whether the general rule is fit or not to him. For instance, "*Mature people sometimes help do the dishes*"

2.4. Displace H

S may pretend to address the FTA to someone would not threaten and hope the real target will realize it. For example, "*Oh God, I forget that I have run out of cash*"

2.5. Be incomplete, use ellipsis

Elliptical utterance is legitimated by various conversational contexts that use a half undone FTA. So S can leave the implicature hanging in the air. For example, "*Oh mom, a headache...*" (It means asking for aspirin)

Beside the strategies of above, Brown and Levinson also provide their theory with a framework for determining gradation of politeness (Renkema, 1993). Furthermore, Levinson describes it in an underlying structure consisting of four position, they are:

(1) pre-sequences

(2) go ahead reaction

(3) action/ request

(4) consent

For example:

A: *Are you doing special tonight?* (1)

B: *No, not really .Why?* (2)

A: *Well, I wanted to ask if you would like to go out the cinema with me* (3)

B: *I'd like to* (4)

Pre-sequence is used to find out whether the speaker will get a positive response from the hearer or not. By using pre-sequence, it is possible for the speaker to minimize the threat to word his hearer in order to achieve his final goal.

2.4. Factors Influencing the Choice of Politeness Strategies

Every person will have any special intention in doing anything whenever it will give him some advantages. However in doing the FTAs, there are some factors that can affect him to use the strategies that have been mentioned before.

According to Brown and Levinson (Goody, 1996: 76), there are tree factors that can influence the choice of strategies. First, the intrinsic payoffs and

then the relevant circumstances and then relate the two. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson describe and explain the factors as follows:

a. The Intrinsic Payoffs: a priori consideration

Brown and Levinson give the complete list of payoffs for each of the strategies, they are as follow:

1. **By doing on record**, a speaker can potentially get any of the following advantages: he can enlist public pressure against the addressee or in support himself, he can get credit from honesty for indicating that he trusts the addressee; he can get credit for outspokenness, avoiding the danger of being seen to be a manipulator, he can avoid the danger of being misunderstood; and he can have the opportunity to pay back in face whatever he potentially takes away by the FTA.

2. **By doing off record**, on the other hand, a speaker can profit in the following ways: he can get credit for being tactful, non-coercive, and he can avoid responsibility for the potentially face-damaging interpretation. Furthermore, he can give (no-overtly) the addressee an opportunity to be seen to care for S (and thus he can test H`s feelings toward him).

3. **By doing positive politeness**, a speaker can minimize the face threatening aspects of an act by assuring the addressee that S considers himself to be 'of the same kind', that he likes him and wants his wants.

4. **By doing negative politeness**, a speaker can benefit in the following ways: he can pay respect and deference to the addressee in return for

the FTA, and can thereby avoid incurring a future debt; he can maintain social distance, and avoid the threat (or the potential face loss) of advancing familiarity towards the addressee, etc.

5. By not doing the FTA, the pay off for fifth strategic choice, is simply that S avoids offending H at all with this particular FTA, of course S also fails to achieve his desired communication.

b. The circumstances: sociological variables

According to Brown and Levinson (Goody, 1996: 79) there are three factors that can influence the choice of strategies. They are:

1. **The "social distance" (D) of S and H (a symmetric relation)**. D is a symmetric social dimension of similarity / difference within which S and H stand for the purposes of this act. In many cases (but not all), it is based on an assessment of the frequency of interaction and the kinds of material on non-material goods (including face) exchanged between S and H or parties representing S or H, or for whom S and H are representative.

2. **The "relative power" (P) of S and H (an asymmetric relation)**. P is an asymmetric social dimension of relative power. That is, P (H, S) is the degree to which H can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (face) as the expense of S plans and self-evaluation.

3. **The "absolute ranking" (R) of impositions in the particular culture**. R is culturally and conditionally defined ranking of imposition by the degree to which they are considered to interfere with an agent's wants of self-determination or of approval; (his negative-and positive-face wants).

Moreover, Brown and Levinson (1996) developed a theory on the relationship between the intensity of threat to face and linguistically realized politeness. The intensity of threat to face is expressed by a weight (W) that is linked to the FTA (Rankema, 1993: 14). They also give formula for the weightiness of FTA. Intensity of threat to face:

$$W (FTA) = R + D + P$$

Which R is as rate of imposition, D is as distance and P is as power. Take a look on these examples:

a. *Excuse me sir, would it be all right if I smoke?*

b. *Mind if I smoke?*

The utterance (a) is usually said by an employee to his boss, while in the same situation, the utterance (b) is might be said by the boss to the employee. Both utterances show the intensity of the threat to face based on the social circumstances.

The comprehensive explanation is given by Brown and Levinson (Goody, 1996: 82).

c. The integration of assessment of payoffs and weighting of risk in choice of strategies.

Indeed, there are very general social motivations for using various technique of positive and negative politeness, they operate, respectively, as a kind of social accelerator and social brake for decreasing or increasing social distance in relationship, regardless of FTA (Brown and Levinson in Goody, 1996: 98).

2.5. The Client by John Grisham

The story begins in Memphis, Tennessee, with eleven-year old Mark Sway and his younger brother Ricky sneaking out into the woods to smoke a cigarette. As they smoke, they stumble upon Jerome Clifford. He is obviously drunk, and proceeds to stick a hose from the tailpipe of his car into the back window to allow exhaust into the cab. Mark recognizes this as a suicide attempt. He crawls out, three times to remove the hose, making Jerome angrier every time he finds it unplugged. On the third and final effort by Mark, Jerome catches him and throws him into the car as well.

Jerome reveals that he is a lawyer for Barry "The Blade" Muldanno, a mafia hit man. Barry is currently a suspect in the of Senator Boyd Boyette. However, the FBI, without a body, cannot conclusively prove that Muldanno is the doer, or that there was at all. Clifford eventually reveals the location of the body, under his boat, in the concrete of his own garage, before losing consciousness.

Mark bolts from the car and finds a terrified Ricky, and they watch in horror as Jerome emerges from the car, screams in rage, and puts a gun in his mouth and pulls the trigger. They both run back to the house, where Mark places an anonymous 911 call, telling where the body is. Ricky, meanwhile, has withdrawn into the fatal position and will not respond to Mark in any way. Mark decides to return to the scene and watch, where the police catch him hiding in the bushes. Officer Hardy takes him back home, where Mark's mother, Dianne Sway, has just

returned from work. Officer Hardy recognizes that Ricky has gone into shock and calls an ambulance, at which time the entire family is taken to the hospital. Reverend Roy Foltrigg, the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Louisiana at New Orleans, has personally taken the case of Senator Boyd Boyette for the publicity. He listens to the story of Mark Sway, and how he seems to know something. Foltrigg meets with Special Agents Trumann and McThume, and decides that they need to know everything that Mark knows. Meanwhile, Mark decides that he needs a lawyer. He chooses Ms. Reggie Love, who will do his case probono.

Mark tells his whole story to Reggie, and she tells Mark that she will deal with the FBI for him, and that he doesn't have to say anything. She decides that he should not tell anyone where the body is buried, because Muldanno has mafia ties, and no one can prove that Mark knows at all.

The FBI wants to meet with Mark, so Reggie straps a tape recorder onto him and sends him in to talk to McThume and Trumann. They tell him that he does not need a lawyer, or his parents, present. The two agents know that they are violating the law, but they believe that they can get away with it. That is, until Reggie comes in fifteen minutes after Mark has gone to "go to the bathroom". She uses the tape as blackmail, to ensure that McThume and Trumann tell her everything she needs to know about Foltrigg and the investigation.

Just afterwards, Slick Moeller, a reporter for the Memphis Press, publishes a front-page story about Jerome Clifford's suicide. Moeller has an extensive list of informants, from the police to hoodlums, and has never revealed a source. Once

he gets a tip that Mark knows a bit about Clifford's, he decides to track him down and ask him. Slick gets information about Mark's little brother, Ricky, and how he is in shock. He questions Mark briefly, and then leaves. The story on Mark runs front page the next day.

A burly man with mafia ties, by the name of Paul Gronke, hires Jack Nance to do some routine surveillance on Mark Sway. Nance agrees to do it, seeing as he does not care about the job as long as he gets his hundred dollars an hour. Meanwhile, Muldanno sends two hit men, Bono and Pirini, down to Memphis to keep an eye on Mark and kill him if the need arises.

Reggie takes Mark home to eat with her mother. All of Reggie's clients had eaten with Momma Love, and Mark was no exception. At the same night, Bono and Pirini burn the Sway's trailer down as a warning. Bobby Ord (One of Foltrigg's assistants), Fink, K.O. Lewis, and McThume talk to the Juvenile Court Judge, Harry Roosevelt. Roosevelt is reluctant to put Mark on trial, because the FBI has no concrete evidence against him, but the threats against Mark by the mafia are too much for Harry to bear, so he orders Mark to be detained, for his own safety. Two policemen seize Mark near Ricky's room, and he is taken to the Juvenile Detention Center, where he awaits trial. Reggie tells him he would continue to be detained if he did not talk, and then they go to trial. When Mark is called to testify, he refuses to answer any questions, and is taken back to the Detention Center.

Foltrigg issues grand jury subpoenas for Mark, Dianne, and Reggie, and orders them all to appear in court. Slick Moeller, who just ran a story revealing

confidential information in the Sway case, is issued a subpoena and taken to trial. He is ordered to reveal the identity of his informant, and when he fails to do so is put in jail.

Mark, after running around his cell for thirty minutes, shock. He is extremely hot and sweaty, his heartbeat is very high, and by sucking on his thumb like Ricky did, he is able to fool the doctors. They take him to the hospital where, in the confusion, he is able to escape. He calls Reggie and has her pick him up, and they make their way to New Orleans, where the body of Senator Boyd Boyette is buried.

Once they get there, they discover that the mafia is trying to rescue the body as well. Three hit men are busy digging up the bottom of the garage, trying to get the body out before daybreak. Mark throws a rock through the plate glass window next door, setting off the alarm and causing a few police to rush to the scene. The hit men flee, and Mark and Reggie confirm that the body is still there.

Reggie cuts a deal with the FBI, telling them that Mark will only reveal the location of the body once he, and his family, are well under the protection of the Witness Protection Program. K.O. Lewis agrees. Mark and his family are flown, with new identities, to a private airport, where Ricky can get better care. Reggie and Mark, however, can never see each other again.

2.6. Previous Studies

Before the writer continues this study, she has collected some data and much information which related to the discussion. There were some analyses discussing the politeness strategies previously. First, the analysis of politeness strategies written by Noriko Kitamura (2000) from the school of European, Asian, and Middle Eastern Languages and studies, University of Sidney by title "*Adapting Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness to the Analysis of Casual Conversation*". He analyzed a small segment of casual conversation in Japanese to show how Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness can be adapted and applied in non-goal oriented interaction. This adaptation of their theory to a different type of the interaction has revealed some types of politeness phenomena not described by Brown and Levinson. Then, he conclude that politeness phenomena can be identified utilizing Brown and Levinson's theory not only in goal-oriented interaction, but also in non-goal oriented interaction.

Second research is conducted by Kenji Kitao (1988) which is entitled "*Politeness Strategies Used in Requests – A cybernetic Model –*". In this research, Kenji Kitao discusses a cybernetic model of politeness strategies in the process of making a request rather an explanatory descriptive. He reviews politeness strategies, systems and cybernetic models and explains how they work together in the cybernetic model, which he presents.

The third previous research was conducted by Diana Yuliana R.G. (2003) from student of State Islamic University of Malang. This research is under the title

"Politeness Strategies of Madurese and Javanese in Cross-Cultural Interaction in Probolinggo". She analyzed the politeness strategies that appeared in Probolinggo community; especially she focused on the Javanese and Madurese community. Then, she analyzed which of the politeness of Javanese and Madurese that mostly used by them. She also described how well their culture influences the use of politeness strategies.

Next, Nayyarotin Mukarromah (2002), a student of State Islamic University of Malang. Her study focuses on politeness used by male and female broadcasters of Andika Lugas Swara (Andalus) FM Malang. In her study, she found that there are certain words which are commonly used by male and female broadcasters of Andalus FM Malang. She finally concludes that both the male and female broadcasters use positive and negative politeness, which consist of repetition, included both S and H in the activity, offers and promise, exaggeration and intensify interest to H. while negative politeness strategies used are apologize and passive forms. Next thesis is conducted by Aini (2003), she made research about the politeness strategies used by nurses in therapeutic communication in RSUD Pare Kediri.And another researcher is Azza (2004) who emphasizes her study in politeness strategies used in Rahmania Arunita's "Eiffel…I'm in love". She found some strategies that are applied by portrayed characters in their dialogues. And the next investigator is Mustain (2005) his analysis described the politeness strategies used in caricatures published by Jakarta post. There are some studies that may have similar discussion with the previous research although it is not the same at all. However, the study about the politeness strategies which is

focused on the John Grisham novel "*The Client*" is absolutely investigated by the

researcher in purpose to give additional contribution to the field of the study

especially in Discourse Analysis. Therefore, this study will lead the next study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the research method used. It includes research design, research subject, data sources, research instrument, data collection, data analysis, and triangulation.

3.1. Research Design

This research uses a qualitative research because of some factors. Firstly, the data gained are the utterances of the characters within the novel that take the form of words and sentences rather than numbers. Secondly, the hypothesis is not formulated in the beginning of the research since the research merely describes the politeness used in *The Client.*

Since the research is qualitative, the process of the research is circular, having completed the next stage, it could come back to the first stage to change some aspects or make some remedy.

3.2. Research Data

The data of this research are the utterances of all characters within *The Client* in the beginning of the story. This is accomplished because there is a unique discovery concerning politeness strategies in the character's utterances.

The data are chosen based on how its significance in influencing the story. Therefore, other data that do not give the direct contribution to the story are reduced.

3.3. Data Sources

The data source of this research is the beginning of the novel *The Client.* This includes chapter 1 to chapter 6. this chapter serves the main idea of the novel and describe the complexity of the politeness theory.

The Client told about a boy called Mark who knows where the senator crops is hidden. In other chapters, this key is not completely described. But, in the beginning of the novel, any information about whether Mark knows where the crops is hidden or not is described.

To know about what politeness strategies are used in the novel means knowing any concept of politeness theory that applied within the novel. Chapter 1 to chapter 6 involve the complexity of politeness theory in four strategies.

3.4. Research Instrument

Research instrument is important to obtain the data of this study for it is a set of method which is used to collect the data. The researcher is the main instrument, because it is impossible to interview and investigate the data (novel) directly without any interpretation from the researcher herself.

3.5. Data Collection

In data collection, the researcher initially devided the novel into its plots. They are the beginning, the middle, and the end. Next, the researcher identifies which part of the novel that represents the idea of the whole novel. This is done by detecting the main idea of the novel and finding which part of the novel that represents it.

The next step accomplished is by recording the conversation on notes including the description of the setting taken from narration in the novel.

3.6. Data Analysis

In data analysis, the conversation is fragmented in accordance to its topic. This is done in order to make the data more effectively and systematically analyzed. Next, the researcher identifies the politeness strategies used in the utterance of the characters based on the theory of politeness strategies. Finally, the politeness strategies found is categorized into the types of politeness strategies based on the characteristics indicated.

3.7. Triangulation

Triangulation is a method of confirming the finding to obtain better picture of reality, enrich theoretical concept, and verify many of the study's elements. Denzin (in Stainback, 1988: 71) has identified several types of triangulation. First is triangulation of data sources which involves, when appropriate, the

convergence of multiple data sources. The second, methodological triangulation, which involves the convergence of data from multiple data collection procedures. And the last is investigator triangulation; here, generally multiple researchers are involved in an investigation.

In this study, investigator triangulation is used because in confirming the finding of the study, the researcher uses the informants to recheck the result of the study in the purpose of achieving the accuracy of her finding. Furthermore, it will reduce the potential bias that may result from a single investigator working alone.

In this case, the researcher takes Burhanuddin, SS. as the informant because he is English Lecturer, and he has a deeper understanding about the theory of politeness strategies and its aplication on language research.

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Findings

This chapter presents the data analysis which was discussed based on the theory of politeness. The data were taken from the beginning of the novel. From this part, the number of the data analyzed is 20 data. These data were selected as the wholeness of the conversation of which its selection was intended to gain a clear description of the conversational context. The beginning part of the novel was selected because it represents the main idea of the story in the novel.

The display of the data was done formerly by giving the description of the setting in the beginning of the conversation. Each statement uttered by one character was labeled based on the chapter and the sequence of utterance in the chapter of the novel. Therefore, the analysis of the data used label as the representative of the statement. The setting of the conversation that helps the readers to understand also became consideration of the discussion and thus it was written the brackets.

Data 1

Mark and Ricky are in the wooded trail behind their house where Mark usually spends his time to smoke and Ricky also wants to do that.

(M: Mark, R: Ricky)

M   : *"(1.1) You know the rules,"*
R   : *"(1.2) Yeah, if I tell anyone, you will beat me up."*

M   : "That's right."

The utterance (1.1) *you know the rules* is a kind of bald on record strategy. This utterance is uttered when Mark as a speaker gives warning to the hearer (Ricky), if the hearer tries to avoid the rules that they have made, the hearer will get punishment from speaker. It means, the speaker cares about the hearer. By using utterance (1.1) speaker tries to impose the hearer negative face.

And the next is the utterance (1.2) *Yeah, if I tell anyone, you will beat me up* is a kind of bald on record strategy also by using seek agreement. This strategy states to raise safe topics to satisfy hearer's desire to be right. In this case, Ricky as a speaker tries to minimize the distance between them as a family by stating *Yeah, if I tell anyone, you will beat me up.* It is done to make them more comfortable by stating that utterance.

Data 2

Mark and Ricky are still in the wooded trail until someone comes and tries to kill himself.

(M: Mark, R: Ricky)

R   : "Why does he want to kill himself?"
M   : *"(2.1) How am I supposed to know? But we gotta do something"*
R   : "Yeah, let us get the hell outta here."
M   : "No. Just be still a minute."

The utterance (2.1) *how am I supposed to know? But we gotta do something* uses off record strategy by using understatement utterance. The

utterance is intended to give information implicitly but informatively. It means that the speaker gives information incomplete but has been understood by the hearer. The speaker is not necessary to give information in more detail because the speaker considers that the hearer understands what he means.

In this case, Mark as a speaker uses off record strategy to answer Ricky's question. Mark considers that except him and Ricky who have been together before they meet him (Jerome) in the yard behind their house. It means that they have known each other before they meet him.

Data 3

After that time Mark tried to help that man but, the man was caught him and he want that Mark pick up the gun and shoot him.

(M: Mark, JC: Jerome Clifford)

C	: *"(3.1) Would you like to pick up the gun and shoot me with it?"*
M	: *"(3.2) No sir."*
C	: "I'm not afraid of dying, kid, you understand?"
M	: "Yes sir, but I don't want to die; I take care of my mother and my little brother."
C	: "Aw, ain't that sweet. A real man of the house."

And the utterance (3.1) *would you like to pick up the gun and shoot me with it?* Is a kind of indirect order that shows Jerome does not coerce Mark, Jerome gives the order in the purpose of asking Mark to do what he wants, by avoiding coercion on Mark, and Jerome minimizes the threat by clarifying his view of values not to directly expect Mark. It is marked by the minimization S's

imposition to H's negative face. It belongs to negative politeness strategy since it might be imposing on H's space.

The utterance (3.2) *No sir* is an expression that indicates the granting permission for something that has been requested. In this case, Mark is not responding Jerome's permission to shoot him with the gun. This kind of utterance can be categorized into bald on record strategy in granting Jerome's permission.

Data 4

Mark was in the car with Clifford. He was caught by Clifford because he tried to fail Clifford suicide.

(M: Mark, JC: Jerome Clifford)

M : *"(4.1) Why are you doing this?"*
C : *"(4.2) Because I want to die,"*
M : "Why?"

When Clifford tried to kill himself, Mark knows it. Therefore, the information that Clifford tried to kill himself becomes part of the conversational background between Mark and Clifford (4.1) *why are you doing this* is a kind of positive politeness by giving or asking a reason. Here, the function of giving or asking a reason is to find out whether the speaker will get the positive response or not from the hearer. Beside that, the speaker tries to minimize threat H in order to achieve his final goal.

And the next utterance (4.2) *because I want to die* is kind of off record strategies by using going a head reaction. It means that there is a possibility that

hearer will answer the speaker's question, so it becomes a signal to continue proposing the reason.

Here, Jerome tries to answer Mark question, he has definite to maintain the case. He scared about his problem and cannot finish his problem, and than he tries to end his problem by killing him self, he want to do that because he felt that is the best solution for his problem.

Data 5

Mark is still in the car with Jerome. He was trapped and could no escape from Jerome.

(M: Mark, JC: Jerome Clifford)

C	: *"(5.1) I gotta tell you, kid; it's nice having you here. No one wants to die alone. What's your name?"*
M	: "Mark"
C	: "Mark who?"
M	: *"(5.2) Mark sway. What is your name?"*
C	: "Jerome, but you can call me Romey. That what my friends call me, and since you and I are pretty tight now you can call me Romey. No more question, okay, kid?"

At the time of conversation, Mark is in the car with Clifford. This context (5.1) *I gotta tell you, kid; it's nice having you here. No one wants to die alone. What's your name?* is a kind of positive politeness by using seeks agreement. In this condition in which S tries to minimize the distance between expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected in case of getting closer to H. in this case, Jerome tries to minimize the distance between him and Mark, and Jerome tries to ask agreement from Mark that he want to die

with him, and for making sure his agreement Jerome tries to move their talking by

using utterance *What's your name?*.

The next utterance (5.2) *Mark sway. What is your name?* Is a kind of

positive politeness also. Here, S using avoiding disagreement. Here S tries to

minimize the loosing face from the hearer, by uttered *what is your name?* Here S

also wants to know who the hearers name is after the hearer ask speaker's name.

Data 6

Mark is still in the car with Jerome, then Jerome ask to Mark some

question about how old is he.

(M: Mark, JC: Jerome Clifford)

C   : *"(6.1) How old are you, mark?"*
M   : "Eleven."
C   : *"(6.2) You told me that. And I'm forty four. We are both too young to die, are not we mark?"*
M   : "Yes sir."

The utterance (6.1) *How old are you, mark?* Is a kind of positive

politeness. Here, speaker provides effort to minimize the distance between the

speaker and the hearer by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's

need to be respected. In this utterance speaker also call the hearer with his nick

name, "Mark". It means that there is no distance between them or difference

social level. So, the hearer feels comfortable with the condition.

The next utterance (6.2) *you told me that. And I'm forty four. We are both*

too young to die, are not we mark? Is a kind of bald on record strategy by using

granting permission that hearer has requested. In this utterance, speaker claims the

hearer case of non minimization of the face threat by indicating that speaker and hearer belongs to person who share specific wants, goals, and values. In this case, Jerome granting permission for something to Mark that he want to die with him.

Data 7

Jerome told Mark about what happened to him. In fact he was a lawyer and had a client who killed someone. Mark kept asking clifford and both name in the car.

(M: Mark, JC: Jerome Clifford)

M   : *"(7.1) Who did your client kill?"*
C   : *"(7.2) A United States Senator. I'm telling. I'm spilling my guts. Do you read newspapers?"*
M   : "No."
C   : *"(7.3) I'm not surprised. Senator Boyette from New Orleans. That's where I'm from"*

Clifford had already told Mark that he is a lawyer and had a client who did a murder. This utterance (7.1) *who did your client kill?* Can be categorized into negative politeness strategy. It can be classified into direct utterance. In this case, speaker may be imposing and intruding on hearer's space. Speaker attempts to minimize the imposition on hearer or acknowledge hearer's negative face. Negative politeness strategy is also called as respect politeness. In this case Mark uses negative politeness to answer Jerome question to him. By using negative politeness strategy, Mark wants to respect Jerome as hearer and also because of Jerome age.

The next utterance (7.2) *A United States Senator. I'm telling. I'm spilling my guts. Do you read newspapers?* Is a kind of positive politeness strategy. It is classified into exaggerate utterance. Speaker feels sympathy to hearer's condition by using repetition utterance. In this situation, speaker claims the hearer in the common ground by indicating that speaker and hearer belongs to persons who share specific wants, goals, and values. In this case, Jerome feels sympathy with Mark's condition that he does not know the news that A United States Senator was killed by his client.

And the utterance (7.3) *I'm not surprised. Senator Boyette from New Orleans. That's where I'm from* is a kind of positive politeness strategy by using exaggerate utterance. The exaggeration used, shows that there is an emotional expression of the speaker as he feels what the hearer feels. In other word, the guest wants to come closer to hearer in the purpose of minimizing the distance between them by claiming hearer in the common ground that indicating them belong to the same values using exaggeration of approval. In this case, Jerome as a speaker feels what the hearer (Mark) feels. There for Jerome notice to Mark that Senator Boyette is come from the same country with him.

Data 8

Mark was still in the car with Jerome. Mark was eager to go out the car but was forbidden by Jerome talked about jerome client who killed the United States Senator.

(M: Mark, JC: Jerome Clifford)

M   : *"(8.1) So, where is the body?"*
C   : *"(8.2) The body of Boyd Boyette. What a question. First U.S. Senator murdered in office, did you know that? Murdered by my dear client Barry the Blade of Muldano, who shot him in the head four times, then hid the body. No body, no case. Do you understand, kid?"*
M   : *"(8.3) Not really"*

In the conversational background, Clifford told Mark that he had a client who murdered U.S. Senator and disposed his body. In (8.1) *so, where is the body?* Is a kind of direct request. In this matter, Mark tries to put pressure on Jerome to do certain action by using "So"; the utterance shows the cooperative assumption in redressing FTA that includes both S and H in the activity. This utterance belongs to positive politeness strategy since it conveys that S and H are cooperators.

The next utterance (8.2) *the body of Boyd Boyette. What a question. First U.S. Senator murdered in office, did you know that? Murdered by my dear client Barry the Blade of Muldano, who shot him in the head four times, then hid the body. No body, no case. Do you understand, kid?* Is one way on rejecting request. This utterance can be categorized as bald on record strategy by using *my dear*; the utterance shows that S may stress common membership in a group or category. This emphasizes that both Mark and Jerome belongs to some set of person who share some wants.

And the next utterance (8.3) *not really* is a kind of positive politeness by using avoiding disagreement. It means that the desire to agree or appear to agree with hearer leads also to mechanism for pretending to agree. In this case, Mark

answer the question from Jerome by using *not really* is show that Mark pretends

to agree with Jerome question. Mark better used that utterance than he says *No* to

appear his agreement or to hide his disagreement.

Data 9

Jerome held Mark to be in the car and die with him. Mark kept asking

what had done by jerome's client and the body of Senator Boyette.

(M: Mark, JC: Jerome Clifford)

C   : *"(9.1) The body's under my boat."*
M   : *"(9.2) Your boat?"*
C   : *"(9.3) Yes, my boat. He was hurry. I was out of town, so my beloved client took the body to my house and buried it in fresh concrete under my garage. It's still there, can you believe it? The FBI has dug up half of New Orleans trying to find it, but they are never thought about my house. Maybe Barry ain't stupid after all."*

In the conversational background, the existence of U.S. Senator's body

after murdered by Clifford's client is updated by the utteerance (9.1) *the body's*

under my boat is kind of positive politeness by using notice to hearer. The speaker

notice to the hearer that the body of Senator State Boyette is under his boat. In this

case, Jerome notices to Mark that the body of Senator Boyette is under his boat. It

is emphasize that both Jerome and Mark belong to the same want. Jerome notice

to Mark and Mark tries to looking for the body.

The next utterance (9.2) *your boat?* is classified into positive politeness

strategy by using seek agreement. Speaker claim common perspective with hearer

necessary referring to in-group membership. In this case, speaker stress the

utterance (9.2) by repeating part or all of what the preceding speaker has said in a

conversation. Here, Mark stress the utterance *your boat* by repeating part or all of what the preceding speaker has before in their conversation.

And the next utterance (9.3) *Yes, my boat. He was hurry. I was out of town, so my beloved client took the body to my house and buried it in fresh concrete under my garage. It's still there, can you believe it? The FBI has dug up half of New Orleans trying to find it, but they are never thought about my house. Maybe Barry ain't stupid after all* is a kind of positive politeness by using exaggerating utterance. In this case, speaker uses exaggerate utterance to make sure his utterance, because speakers want the hearer to believe with his utterance that the body is under his boat. In this case, Jerome exaggerates the utterance to make Mark believe with him if the body of Boyd Boyette is under his boat and his client that who kill him put the body there.

Data 10

Before Clifford tell to Mark where the body of Boyd Boyette he was ask to to Barry his client which was kill the U.S. Senator.

(BM: Barry Muldanno, JC: Jerome Clifford)

C : *"(10.1) So where is the body?"*
B : "You do not want to know,"
C : *"(10.2) Sure I want to know. The whole world wants to know.*
  Come on; tell me if you have got the guts."
B : "You do not want to know."
C : "Come on. Tell me."

The utterance (10.1) *so where is the body?* Is a kind of direct request. In this matter, Mark tries to put pressure on Jerome to do certain action by using

"So"; the utterance shows the cooperative assumption in redressing FTA that includes both S and H in the activity. This utterance belongs to positive politeness strategy since it conveys that S and H are cooperators.

And the next utterance (10.2) *Sure I want to know. The whole world wants to know. Come on; tell me if you have got the guts* is a kind of positive politeness by using exaggerative utterances. The speaker uses exaggerate intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodic when the speaker interested in to hearer. In this case, Jerome tries to looking for the body of Boyd Boyette that was killed by his client. He asks to his client surely, but Barry Muldanno makes him confused and he want that Jerome will ask to him until he knows the place of Boyd Boyette killed.

Data 11

After escaping from jerome, Mark and Ricky, his brother, went home. Ricky was shocked and did not talk anything. Then, Mark decidd to call 911 because he was terrified the buzzard would ripe and tear the Jerome.

(M: Mark, 911: 911 Operator)

> M : "Yeah, ther's a dead man, in the woods and well someone needs to come get him."
> 911 : *"(11.1) Who is calling please?"*
> M : *"(11.2) Uh, I really do not want to say, okay?"*
> 911 : "We need tour name, son."

There is no previous conversation that mention the existence of the woods. However, Mark assumes that this is true to the hearer and includes this

utterance (11.1) *who is calling please?* into kind of negative politeness, by using direct request. In this matter, operator's tries to put pressure on Mark to do certain action by using "please", the utterance use cooperative assumption in redressing FTA that includes both S and H in the activity.

Here, speaker tries to know who is calling in the side place, and by using "please" cooperator tries to impose the hearer's negative face. Speaker wants there is no distance between them by using that utterance.

911 operator assumes and believes that someone is calling. She also assumes that Mark knows there is someosne calling.The utterance (11.2) *Uh, I really do not want to say, okay?* is kind of negative politeness strategy. It can be classified into direct utterance. In this case, speaker may be imposing and intruding on hearer's space. Speaker attempts to minimize the imposition on hearer or acknowledge hearer's negative face. Negative politeness strategy is also called as respect politeness. In this case Mark used negative politeness strategy to answer operator's question, by using negative politeness strategy, Mark wants to respect to the women as operator and also because of operator age.

Data 12

After Mark called 911, the ambulance and the police then came to the place where Jerome was dead. While Mark tries to sneaked and saw what happened there, he was caught by a policeman, Thomas Hardy.

(M: Mark, TH: Hardy)

H   : *"(12.1)What are you doing here?"*
M   : *"(12.2) Just watching,"*

H : "let's walk over there"
M : "I need to go gome."

This utterance (12.1) *what are you doing here?* Is a kind of off record strategy by using pre-sequence. Pre-sequence is used to find out whether the speaker will get a positive response from the hearer or not. By using pre-sequence, it I possible for the speaker to minimize thread to word his hearer in order to achieve his final goal. By using the utterance (12.1) caps tries to minimize thread to Mark to achieve his final goal.

And the next (12.2) *just watching,* is one way on rejecting request. This utterance can be categorized as bald on record strategy because Mark's want to satisfy cops face is small and shows that he does not care about cops positive face in case of answering cops question.

Data 13

After they saw all the accident, Mark and Ricky went home and do not tell anyone what happened in the wooded trail.

(M: Mark, M: Mom)

M : *"(13.1) Hi, Mom"*
M : *"(13.2) Where have you been? What's wrong with Ricky?"*

The utterance (13.1) *Hi, Mom* is classified as bald on record strategy. It is uttered when speaker wants to reduce the hearer's anxieties. Speaker wants that hearer will impose the negative face. It means that hearer will act on doing what he wants freedom. In this case Mark give greeting to his Mom and his Mom will

answer his greeting. By using greeting means that speaker wants to make condition between them more warm and comfortable.

The next utterance (13.2) *where have you been? What's wrong with Ricky?* It is also classified into bald on record strategy. There is no effort from speaker to minimize the face threat. Speaker makes the hearer lose face but the hearer feels uncomfortable with this condition. It is shows that there is no distance between them. In this case, mom gives response to hearer's utterance *Hi, Mom.* By using utterance (13.2) *where have you been? What's wrong with Ricky?*, mom uss this utterance to make the situation more comfortable between them.

Data 14

Mark and Hardy are in the police office, Hardy was caught him because he think that Mark knows that accident.

(M: Mark, TH: Hardy)

H　　: *"(14.1) Are you telling the truth, son?"*
M　　: *"(14.2)Yes sir. About what?"*
H　　: "About what you saw?"
M　　: "Yes sir. You do not believe me?"
H　　: "I did not say that. It is just a little strange, that's all."

The utterance (14.1) *Are you telling the truth, son?* Is a kind of positive politeness strategy. In this case speaker stress common memberships in a group or category. This emphasizes that both speaker and hearer belong to the same set of persons who share some wants. Here, Hardy as a speaker investigates Mark as a hearer to tell the truth; by stress "my son" speaker wants that there is no distance between them, and they can speak more comfortable.

The next utterance (14.2) *Yes sir. About what?* Is a kind of positive politeness also, by using avoiding disagreement; it means that speaker desires to agree or appears to agree with hearer leads and also to mechanism for pretends to agree. In this case, Mark pretending to agree with Hardy question/statement that asks to Mark is he telling the truth on Hardy's question.

Data 15

Foltrigg and Trumann are still confuse with this case, they feel there are any doubted with Jerome suicide.

(F: Foltrigg, T: Trumann)

F   : *"(15.1) No doubt, it's suicide?"*
T   : "No doubt."
F   : *"(15.2) Where did he do it?"*
T   : "Somewhere in north Memphis. Drove into the woods in his big black Lincoln, and took care of him self."
F   : *"(15.3) I don't suppose anyone saw it?"*
T   : *"(15.4) Evidently not. A couple of kids found the body in a remote area."*

The utterance (15.1) *No doubt it's suicide?* Is a kind of positive politeness. It is classified on offering. Speaker offers something to the hearer. It means that speaker wants what hearer's wants. In this case, Foltrigg wants that no doubt in this case that Jerome is suicide. And Trumann make sure his argument. It is showed by hearers replied. It means that there is a solidarity feeling between them.

The next utterance (15.2) *where did he do it?* Is a kind of positive politeness also that is categorized into the claim common ground. Here, speaker try to know

where Jerome drove his car and hearer makes sure by showing that Jerome is going to somewhere in North Memphis.

And utterance (15.3) *I don't suppose anyone saw it?* Is a kind of positive politeness by using avoiding disagreement. Here, speaker pretends to agree to the hearer that no one saw that accident. In this case Foltrigg pretend to agree with Tumann about what he said.

And by seeking agreement speaker uttered (15.4) *evidently not. A couple of kids found the body in a remote area.* It is categorized as positive politeness speaker safe topics to satisfy hearer's desire to be right. In this case Trumann as speaker safe topics to make Foltrigg satisfy to be right and try to minimize the distance between them.

Data 16

After finding Jerome crops, the police will do an autopsy to know when Jerome was passed away.

(F: Foltrigg, T: Trumann)

F : *"(16.1) How long had he been dead?"*
T : "Not long. They will do an autopsy in a few hours, and determine the time of death."

The utterance (16.1) *how long had he been dead?* Is classified into positive politeness that is categorized into claim common ground. Here, speaker takes care to the hearer by asking the condition of the body of Jerome by uttering (16.1) to Trumann. And Trumann makes sure on his utterance by doing an autopsy to know when he (Jerome) has passed away by suicide.

Data 17

Foltrigg and Trumann still confused why Jerome kill himself and why in Memphis.

(F: Foltrigg, T: Trumann)

F   : *"(17.1) Why Memphis?"*
T   : "Not sure. If there's a reason, we do not know it yet."

The utterance (17.1) *Why Memphis? Is* a kind of positive politeness. It is classified into offering utterance. Speaker offers something to the hearer. It means that speaker wants what the hearer's wants. In this case, Foltrigg wants to make sure with Trumann utterance, but Trumann does not sure with his utterance. It is showed by hearer's utterance (*Not sure. If there's a reason, we do not know it yet.).* Here, Trumann still pretends to answer Foltrigg's question but he will look for the reason.

Data 18

Trumann ask to Foltrigg why he does not informed to him about what he have been discussed with Thomas.

(F: Foltrigg, T: Trumann)

T   : *"(18.1) Why weren't we informed?"*
F   : *"(18.2) We were about to tell you. In fact, Thomas and I discussed it this afternoon, just a short time we got the call."*

The utterance (18.1) *why weren't we informed?* Speaker uses off record strategy. It is classified into implicature utterance. Actually speaker wants to know

what they have talked about, because the hearer does not inform about that. But speaker wants to avoid doing an FTA to the hearer, so that he utters implicature utterance like (18.1) utterance. Speaker uses the utterance (18.1) means that he wants hearer to tell about what they have talked to another person..

The next utterance (18.2) *we were about to tell you. In fact, Thomas and I discussed it this afternoon, just a short time we got the call"* Is a kind of off record strategy by using understatement utterance. The utterance is intended to give information implicitly but informatively. It means that the speaker gives information incomplete but it has been understood by the hearer. The speaker does not necessary to give information more detail; because speaker considers that the hearer understands what he means. In this case, Foltrigg as a speaker uses off record strategy to answer Trumann question. Foltrigg considers to Truman that before he come he have together with Thomas. It means that they have known each other before, and by using pronoun "we" speaker expect that hearer will comfortable with the situation. The hearer will feel enjoy with the conversation.

Data 19

Foltrigg and Trumann believe that before Jerome kill himself he had do a long journey and stop it in somewhere.

(F: Foltrigg, T: Trumann)

F : *"(19.1) You guys need to track Clifford's movements from New Orleans to Memphis. Which route did he take? Are there friends a long the way? Where did he stop? Who did he see in Memphis? Surely he must've talked to someone from the time he left, New Orleans until he shot himself. Don't you think so?"*

T : *"(19.2) It's a long drive. I'm sure he had to stop along the way."*

> F : "He knew where the body is, and he obviously planned to commit suicide. There's an outside chance he told someone, don't you think?"
>
> T : "Maybe."

The utterance (19.1*) you guys need to track Clifford's movements from New Orleans to Memphis. Which route did he take? Are there friends a long the way? Where did he stop? Who did he see in Memphis? Surely he must have talked to someone from the time he left, New Orleans until he shot himself. Don't you think so?* Speaker uses positive politeness strategy. It is categorized on stress common membership in a group. Speaker uses group identity marker "guys" to call his partner. It is showed that both speaker and hearer have the same wants. In this case, Foltrigg calls Trumann "Guys". It means that there is no distance or social level between them. It is done by Foltrigg to make the situation more comfortable.

The next utterance (19.2) *It's a long drive. I'm sure he had to stop along the way* is classified into positive politeness also, by using notice to hearer. The speaker notice to the hearer that Memphis is far and need along drive to go there, and he sure that He (Jerome) had to stop along the way. It is emphasized that both Trumann and Foltrigg belong to the same want. Trumann want to make Foltrigg believe with him and Foltrigg try to believe his utterance.

Data 20

Foltrigg and Trumann still believe that if anyone had some problem he will share his secret to another person same with Jerome.

(F: Foltrigg, T: Trumann)

F   : *"(20.1) Now, would you share your little secret with anyone?"*
T   : *"(20.2) Perhaps. I don't know."*
F   : *"(20.3) There's a chance, right?"*
T   : "Slight chance"
F   : "Good"

The utterance (20.1) *now, would you share your little secret with anyone?* Is a kind of positive politeness. It is uttered because speaker and hearer cooperating each other. They have same goals, and speaker knows the hearer's wants. It is indicating that speaker and hearer is a partner. In this case, Foltrigg and Trumann is partner to finishing the case. By using utterance (20.1) means that Trumann knows what Foltrigg wants.

The next utterance (20.2) *perhaps. I don't know.* Is kind of positive politeness by using avoiding disagreement. Here, speaker pretends to agree with hearer's utterance that is uttered before. The speaker uses avoid disagreement utterance to reduce the distance and the hearer anxieties. In this case, Trumann pretend to agree with Foltrigg utterance.

And the utterance (20.3) *there's a chance, right?* Is kind of positive politeness also by using notice to hearer. The speaker sure that there is a chance to maintain this case although that is just slight chance. In this case, Foltrigg feels sure that to maintain this case still there is a chance although very little chance. It is emphasized that both Foltrigg and Trumann belong to the same want. Foltrigg wants to finish this case, and Trumann help him to finish his case.

4.2. Discussion

In the case of communication, maintaining other's face is needed in order to make the communication runs well and smoothly. One way to maintain other's face is by applying politeness. Politeness is a communication strategy that people use to maintain and develop relationships (related goal) and a technical term in language study to signify the strategies we use to achieve our goals without threatening the self-respect of others. There are four politeness strategies, namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record.

In this study, the researcher analyzes the usage of those four politeness strategies of the portrayed characters in John Grisham's novel "The Client". From the finding above, it can be formulated that most of portrayed characters in the novel use politeness strategies during their conversation in their dialogues, although not all the strategies are covered, furthermore, the description of politeness phenomena in John Grisham's novel "The Client" can be described as follows:

1. Bald on record strategy

This strategy provides no effort by the speakers to minimize the impact of the FTA's. The speaker usually shock the hearer, embarrass them, or make them feel a bit uncomfortable, in this novel; there are some strategies of bald on record such as of non-minimization FTA and cases of FTA oriented.

By granting permission it can be found in utterance (3.2), (6.2). by rejecting request (8.2), (12.2), by reduce the H anxieties (13.1), by using no effort from speaker to minimize the face threat (13.2).

2. Positive Politeness

This strategy provides effort to minimize the distance between expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected. In this occasion, it is also as a social accelerator that is used by speaker to indicate his wants to come closer to hearer. In this novel, there are some strategies of positive politeness such as claim common ground and convey that S and H are cooperators.

By using give or ask reason it can be found in utterance (4.1), seek agreement (1.2), (5.1), (9.2), (15.4), avoiding disagreement (5.2), (8.3), (14.2), (15.3), (20.2).S provides effort to minimize (6.1), exaggerate (7.2), (7.3), (9.3), (10.2), notice (9.1), (19.2), (20.3), common memberships (14.1), (19.1), offering (15.1), (17.1), claim common ground (15.2), (16.1), cooperation (20.1).

3. Negative Politeness Strategy

This strategy has the main focus on assuming that you may be imposing and intruding on H's space. In other words, speaker attempts to minimize the imposition on H or acknowledge H's negative face. In this novel, there are some strategies belong to negative politeness such as be dire4ct, don't coerce H, communicate S's want, and redress others wants of H's.

By avoiding coercion it can be found in utterance (3.1), direct utterance (7.1), (8.1), (10.1), (11.1), (11.2).

4. Off Record Strategy

This strategy has the main purpose of taking some pressure off of the hearer. In this case, the speaker performs an act in a vague manner that could be interpreted by hearer as some other acts.

By using understatement it can be found in utterance (2.1), (18.2), go head reactions (4.2), implicature utterance (18.1).

Beside the strategies above the use of pre-sequence in the purpose of softening request to find out whether S will get positive response or not. It can also minimize the threat toward H, so if he receives negative response she will reduce on opportunity to get loss face. This can be found in utterance (12.1).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

There are two things covered in this chapter, conclusion and suggestion. The conclusion will be based on the research findings above and the suggestion will leads the further research on the same field.

5.1. Conclusion

After analyzing and discussing the politeness strategies used in John Grisham's novel "*The Client*", The researcher can conclude that there are many politeness strategies applied in this novel. As mentioned above, politeness is a communication strategy that people use to maintain and develop relationships (related goal). There are four politeness strategies, namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. In this novel, those four strategies are applied by portrayed characters although not all the strategies are covered.

Based on the finding of the study, it can be concluded that:

1. **Bald on Record Strategy** is used in the situation in which S wants to achieve the maximum efficiency of this utterance in the purpose of achieving his goal without considering whether he has threatened his H or not. This strategy includes the granting permission, rejecting request, reduce the H anxieties and no effort from speaker to minimize the face threat.

2. **Positive Politeness Strategy** is used in the condition in which S tries to minimize the distance between expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected, in case of getting closer to H. this strategy includes give/ask reason, seek agreement, avoiding disagreement, S provides effort to minimize the hearer, exaggerate, notice, common memberships, offering, claim common ground, and cooperation.

3. **Negative Politeness Strategy** is used in the situation in which S has the main focus on assuming that he maybe imposing and intruding on H's space. In other words, S attempts to minimize the imposition on H or acknowledge H's negative face. This strategy includes avoiding coercion and direct utterance.

4. **Off Record Strategy** is used in the condition to take some pressure off of the hearer. In this case, S performs an act in a vague manner that could be interpreted by the hearer as some other acts. This strategy includes understatement, go a head reaction and implicature utterance.

Furthermore, the use of pre-sequence in the purpose of softening request to find out whether s will get the positive response or not. It can minimize the threat toward H. So if he receives negative response he will reduce on opportunity to get loss face.

5.2. Suggestion

Since this study focuses on the usage of politeness strategies used in John Grisham's novel "*The Client*", this study contributes on the improvement of understanding language studies especially on politeness strategies connected to literary works so it will become a direct contribution to the existing knowledge in the field of linguistic. This study can also lead the next researcher who conducts the same field of research as the reference or comparison that might be relevant to the researched subject.

To expand this area of investigation, the researcher hopes to the next researcher to conduct research on politeness strategies in the other form of literary works such as poetry and drama in the purpose of enriching the pragmatic studies. It is also hoped that the study on politeness involving language other than English, so it can be broaden the knowledge in applying linguistic aspect in various languages.

Appendix 3

<div align="center">

CURRICULUM VITAE

</div>

PERSONAL DETAILS

Name   : Yuli Fitriyana

Place/ Date of Birth   : Lamongan, 12 Juli 1983

Address   : Jl. Simpang Gajayana No: 03 Merjosari Malang

Religion   : Islam

Nationality   : Indonesian

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. S-1 Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Malang, 2007

2. MA al-Mawaddah Coper-Ponorogo, 2002

3. SMPM Karangasem Paciran-Lamongan, 1998

4. MIM Karangasem Paciran-Lamongan, 1995

THE TITLE OF RESEARCH

Politeness Strategies in John Grisham's novel *"The Client"*

Malang, March 17 2007

Yuli Fitriyana