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ABSTRACT


Politeness, in both verbal and non-verbal communication, has been a major aspect in people’s life. Politeness plays an important role in keeping a conversation run well and go smoothly. However, English second language speakers still find difficulties in speaking English properly and politely.

This research aims to answer two research questions. The research questions were formulated as follows: 1) which types of politeness strategies are used by the characters in The Great Debaters movie? And 2) what factors affect the characters’ politeness in speaking?

The writer conducted a pragmatic study to answer the two research questions. Data used in this research were collected from 166 pages of The Great Debaters movie transcription.

The research results showed that the characters in The Great Debaters movie applied the types of politeness strategies, namely off-record, bald-on-record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. Moreover, the characters also revealed the factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking, namely language style, register and domain, and slang and solidarity. However, the characters did not show language and gender factor in their conversation since they were mostly engaged in the same topic, namely a debate competition.

Keywords: politeness strategies, character, The Great Debaters

Kesantunan, baik dalam berkomunikasi secara lisan dan tidak lisan, telah menjadi aspek utama dalam kehidupan sehari-hari. Kesantunan memiliki peran yang penting guna menjaga komunikasi agar bejalan baik dan lancar. Namun, para pembicara Bahasa Inggris masih menemukan kesulitan dalam berbicara Bahasa Inggris secara benar dan sopan.

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menjawab dua rumusan masalah. Pertanyaan penelitian diformulasikan sebagai berikut: 1) tipe strategi kesantunan manakah yang digunakan oleh para karakter di film The Great Debaters? dan 2) faktor apakah yang mempengaruhi kesantunan para karakter dalam berbicara?

Penulis melaksanakan penelitian pragmatik untuk menjawab dua rumusan masalah. Data yang digunakan dalam penelitian diperoleh dari transkrip film The Great Debaters yang berjumlah 166 lembar.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa para karakter dalam film The Great Debaters menerapkan tipe strategi kesantunan, yaitu off-record, bald-on-record, positive politeness, dan negative politeness. Peneliti juga menemukan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kesantunan para karakter dalam berbicara, yaitu language style, register and domain, dan slang and solidarity. Namun, para karakter tidak menunjukkan faktor language and gender dalam percakapan karena para karakter kerap terlibat dalam topik yang sama, yaitu kompetisi debat.

Kata kunci: politeness strategies, character, The Great Debaters
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the introduction of this study. It consists of the research background, the research problems, the problem limitation, the research objectives, the research benefits, and the definition of terms. Each section is presented as follows.

A. Research Background

In daily conversations, language reflects the context in which it is used. Moreover, people will adapt their talk to suit the audience. People use language differently in formal and casual expressions. People in their relation to others need to preserve these kinds of expressions for themselves and people they interact with polite utterances. In social interaction, to be polite is very important in keeping the smoothness of the interaction. People need to see to whom they are speaking because some expressions may be considered rude. It is needed to identify the social values of a society in order to speak politely. The study of politeness strategy is basically the study of knowing the way people use a language while they are having interaction or communication. It gives the information on how to use a language and conduct smooth and flowing conversations. Being linguistically polite involves speaking to people appropriately in the light of their relationship to others. Inappropriate linguistic
choices may be considered rude. As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 60), politeness is defined as the strategies to save the hearers’ face employed by the speakers to achieve a variety of goals, such as promoting or maintaining harmonious relationship. According to Yule (1996, p. 60), face is the public self-image of a person. It refers to the emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects the others to recognize. People need to consider their speaking politeness to avoid making others feel uncomfortable.

People who study other languages need to understand about other cultures because culture and language are inseparable. Every country has its own culture that need to be understood and learnt further in order to avoid misunderstanding when people talk to others from different culture, for example, the cultural differences in responding to compliments. When a native speaker gives a compliment and says, “You are a kind person”, Indonesians will likely show their denial and answer “No, I do not think so.” It happens because merely accepting a compliment will be considered as arrogance. As a polite person, the speaker should be able to use the appropriate politeness strategies in his or her society by understanding the hearer’s culture. On the other hand, English language learners, particularly English Language Education Study Program learners as teacher candidates, need to be able to not only speak English fluently but also apply appropriate politeness strategies in the target language.

The writer focuses on a movie entitled *The Great Debaters*, an American movie which is based on a true story. It tells about the efforts of an underdog debate team from Wiley College whose members are “black” people that want to
place their team on equal footing with “whites”. The writer chooses *The Great Debaters* movie because it serves a great deal of politeness phenomena among the characters in which writer seeks to analyze. *The Great Debaters* movie is an excellent source since it has various utterances which can be the main source and object to be analyzed. The writer focuses on the characters’ utterances in the forms of social behavior involving language. The writer is impressed by various cultures in the world, in particular Indonesia and English culture in speaking politely. By considering the phenomena, the writer analyzes the politeness strategies used by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie since it is interesting to reveal the different ways among the characters interaction by means of communication, especially in the use of politeness strategies and the factors affecting speaking politeness.

As communication plays an important role in keeping the smoothness of an interaction, there is a need to raise second language (L2) learners’ consciousness in characteristically distinct features of two languages. One of the examples is the use of politeness strategies. Indonesian and English society may learn the concept of politeness from each other that is referred to as mutual respect. For example, Indonesian society can learn from English society about how one’s attitude in keeping the eye contact, proper body language or sincere smile when speaking to others.

The writer analyzes politeness strategies applied by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie because a movie can be a good medium to study other languages even cultures. Through a movie, people can know about the habits or
the cultures of the places and the people where the movie took place. Moreover, a
movie can be a good medium to study sociolinguistics, especially politeness
because language cannot be separated from society. Based on the explanation, the
writer found out that politeness strategies and factors affecting someone’s
politeness in speaking are very important and interesting to be explored.
Therefore, the writer decided to analyze the politeness strategies and factors
affecting someone in speaking politely in the movie entitled *The Great Debaters.*

Within this movie, the writer found politeness strategies by Brown and
Levinson (1987). The following example may be useful to clarify the background
of the research:

Mr. Tolson : Oh.. radio broadcast?
Miss Booke : Yes.
Mr. Tolson : Any other sources?
Miss Booke : *Well.. I…*

The politeness strategy of the conversation above is off-record politeness.
The speaker does not purposefully finish her utterance. The sentence is
incomplete. The conversation leaves the implication of “hanging in the air.” The
sentence typed in bold “Well.. I…” showed that Miss Booke did not finish her
utterance. Mr. Tolson asked Miss Booke whether she had other sources or not, but
she answered the question incompletely. According to the context, Miss Booke
did not know the right answer, so the conversation left hanging in the air. She was
confused.

That is why the writer conducts this research, so people who read this
research will have deeper information about politeness strategies. For the benefit
of this research, it can help English language learners especially the English
Department students who study sociolinguistics and pragmatics. This research tries to help them to get further understanding in the study of politeness strategy and factors that affecting it. Applying the concept of politeness, this research can be beneficial to English language learners’ ability to speak politely and appropriately in different social context.

B. Research Problems

The study aims to analyze types of politeness strategies used by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie and factors affecting the characters’ politeness. Based on the research background of the study, two research problems are formulated as follows.

1. Which types of politeness strategies are used by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie?

2. What factors affect the characters’ politeness in speaking?

C. Problems Limitation

The scope of the study is to analyze the use of politeness by *The Great Debaters* movie’s characters. The characters are Mr. Tolson, Henry Lowe, Mr. Farmer, James Farmer Junior, Samantha Booke, and Burgees. The writer focuses on six characters because these characters appear more frequently than the other characters do, which means they play an important role in the movie. The data will be analyzed based on the theories of Brown and Levinson (1987) and Spolsky
D. Research Objectives

The study is conducted in order to find out:

1. the types of politeness strategies used by the characters in The Great Debaters movie.
2. the factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking in The Great Debaters movie.

E. Research Benefits

The writer believes that the study will be beneficial for the following parties.

1. English Teachers

The study will help teachers be more aware of the way they speak to others, especially when they teach in the classroom. They will be more prudent in selecting their words. In addition, this study will encourage teachers in assessing their students’ proficiency in the sociolinguistic aspect notably politeness.

2. English Language Education Study Programs Learners

The study will give some benefits to English language learners who study sociolinguistics and pragmatics. First, English language learners will understand the definition of politeness strategies and the factors that affect someone’s
politeness in speaking as those are elaborated in this study. Second, this study will help English language education learners apply their English proficiency appropriately in their teaching and learning practice. As a result, English language education learners will be able to speak English politely.

3. Readers

The study will provide useful information related to politeness for its readers. Hopefully, it will enrich their knowledge and understanding of politeness. Readers will also understand the meaning of politeness itself, the politeness strategies, and the factors affecting politeness in speaking. Therefore, the readers are able to apply politeness behavior in speaking with others.

4. Future Researchers

The writer expects the study to be a good reference for future researchers in conducting research on pragmatics under the same topic. The study will also give valuable information related to speaking politeness.

F. Definition of Terms

In order to give a better understanding, the writer presents the definition of terms. The terms used in this study are defined as follows.

1. Politeness

According to Holmes (1995, p. 4), politeness is defined as an expression of concern for the feelings of others. In this thesis, the term *politeness* is used to mean a way of acting or behaving that respects the feeling of other people. Brown and Levinson (1987) categorize politeness into four types of politeness strategies,
namely bald-on-record, off-record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. The characters’ utterances in the movie are the main concern of this study.

2. **Character**

A character is described by Abrams (1999, p. 32) as the persons represented in a dramatic or narrative work, who are interpreted by the reader as being endowed with particular moral, intellectual, and emotional qualities by inferences from what the persons say. The term *character* in this thesis refers to a person who describes his or her own behavior’s qualities and motivations.

2. **The Great Debaters movie**

In this thesis, *The Great Debaters* movie is used as the data source. *The Great Debaters* movie is a 2007 American drama movie which is based on a true story about the Wiley College debate team. *The Great Debaters* movie tells about the effort of an underdog debate team from Wiley College whose members are “black” people that want to place their team on equal footing with “whites”. The movie starts with Melvin B. Tolson, a professor at Wiley College Texas who inspired his students to form the school’s first debate team. He trains them with the goal that they will compete with white debate teams across the country to prove that they are just as good, maybe even better. However, on their way to get it, they face some problems until finally the team of four competes against the leading team in the country, Harvard University, and successfully wins the contest.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The writer provides two sections in this chapter. The first section is the theoretical description, which includes the discussion of pragmatics, speech acts, sociolinguistics, and politeness theory. The second section is the theoretical framework, which is used to synthesize all the theories elaborated in the theoretical description in order to correlate the theories to the study.

A. Theoretical Description

The writer presents four parts, namely pragmatics, speech acts, sociolinguistics, and politeness theory. Pragmatics is necessarily discussed as it is closely related to meaning in the contexts and the study. It deals with utterances of The Great Debaters movie’s characters. Pragmatics consists of speech acts, which focuses on language as a tool of communication. Sociolinguistics is discussed in order to make a definite understanding of the topic discussed. Politeness theory, furthermore, is used as the basic theory of the study.

1. The Study of Language Usage

The study of language usage or pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that studies communication. It is the study of how people interact when using language. It explains language use in a context including the effect on an utterance and the goal that the speaker intends to reach through expression. In Crystal’s
words (1985, p. 240), pragmatics is defined as the study of language from the users’ points of view, especially of the choices they make in using language in social interaction and the effect of their use of language has no other participants in the act of communication.

According to Crystal’s (1985) definition, to achieve a successful communication between individuals, there should be a repertoire from a certain code to be selected first, a respect to social rules that constrain the way ones speak, and a choice that has consequences on the hearer. So, there are some factors that one should know to achieve successful communication. As stated by Blum-Kulka (1997, p. 38), language is the chief means by which people communicate, yet simply knowing the words and grammar of a language does not ensure successful communication.

Pragmatics is concerned more with the meanings that words convey or the speaker’s intention in producing certain utterances. Pragmatics focuses on the study of the speaker’s meaning, not in the grammatical or the phonetic form of utterances. It is in line with Leech (1992) that pragmatics is the study of how language is used to communicate. It concerns by how people use language within context and why they use language in particular ways. These definitions focus on how speakers use language for communication to convey meanings in particular context. It is in line with Mackinlay and Genesereth (1985) that define language as a set of conventions that a speaker and a hearer have for constructing and interpreting the messages. By delivering messages through a language, both speakers and hearers must be familiar with the context of situations. As a result,
the speakers are able to express meaningful utterances. Meanwhile, for the hearers, they are able to understand the speakers’ utterances well.

2. **Speech Acts**

A speech act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. Nhan (2012, p. 93) elaborates speech acts by stating “People, when trying to express themselves, they do not only produce utterance containing grammatical structures and words, but also perform actions via those utterances such as inviting, leaving-taking, and accusing.” The theory of speech acts starts with the assumption that the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologizing, thanking, congratulating, etc. A speech act might contain just one word, as in “Hi!” to perform a greeting, or in a sentences, as in “Hi, Eric. How are things going?” To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses a regret. As speech acts include real-life interaction, it requires not only knowledge of the language but also the appropriate use of that language within a given culture.

Moreover, almost any speech act is the performance of several acts at once. According to Searle (1987, p. 54), speech acts consist of three different aspects of the speaker’s intention, namely an act of saying something, an act of doing something, and an act of affecting someone. In general, speech acts are acts
of communication. Speech act theory was initiated by Austin (1962) and developed by Searle (1969). He distinguished the importance of performing an action through an utterance into three terms, namely locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. The writer elaborates the theories from Searle (1979) related to locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts and gives explanations on the use of these theories.

a) Locutionary Act

Locutionary act is saying something (the locution) with a certain meaning in traditional sense (Searle, 1979). This might not constitute a speech act. Searle (1979) states that this act contains the way people produce an utterance and mean what they say literally. The utterance, “the weather is too cold” could be perceived as its literal meaning that the weather or the temperature is really cold.

b) Illocutionary Act

Illocutionary act is a performance of an act in saying (Searle, 1979). The true “speech acts” are informing, ordering, warning, and undertaking. An illocutionary act has the potential to damage the hearer’s positive face. The example of illocutionary act is insulting a hearer or expressing disapproval of something, or the hearer’s negative face; or the illocutionary act may potentially damage the speaker’s own positive face or negative face. According to Searle (1979), there are five basic of primitive illocutionary acts. Each point will be presented as follows.
i) Directives

Searle (1979) states that directives represent a world-to-words fit, means the speaker is attempting to bring the world in line with words. A directive counts as an attempt to get the hearer to perform some future action. Requesting, ordering, and questioning are the examples of directives. Directives focus on the speaker’s behavior. “I order you to leave the room” is the example of ordering.

ii) Assertives

Searle (1979) mentions that assertives focus on conveying information about some state of affairs of the world from one agent, the speaker, to another, the hearer. It represents an attempt to deliver an actual state of affairs, to commit the speaker to something being the case. The examples of assertives are asserting, concluding, informing, predicting, and reporting. “The cat is on the mat” is the example of informing.

iii) Commissives

Commissives are the attempt to commit the speaker to a future course of action (Searle, 1979). Warning, promising, threatening, and guaranteeing are kinds of commissives. “I promise to be at home before nine o’clock” and “I swear to bring it back” are the examples of promising.

iv) Declaratives

Searle (1979) states that declaratives are speech acts, where the speaker brings about some states of affairs by the mere performance of the speech act. It is an act that brings into existence to which it refers. The acts include blessing,
firing, or bidding. “I hereby pronounce you man and wife” is an example of blessing.

v) Expressives

Expressives are speech acts, the purpose of which is to express the speaker’s attitude about some states of affairs (Searle, 1979). This act expresses the psychological state of the speaker explicitly. It reveals the speaker’s feeling of certain situations. It includes acts of congratulating, thanking, apologizing, and welcoming. “I am sorry for breaking your glasses” is an example of apologizing.

c) Perlocutionary Acts

Searle (1979) states that speech acts have an effect on the feelings, thoughts or actions of either the speaker or the listener. In other words, they seek to change their minds. If one is warned against a particular course of action, she may not heed the warning. Perlocutionary acts are external to the performance. e.g., inspiring, persuading, deterring. “Come in. Give it a try” is the example of the way the speaker persuades the hearer by using language to utter something.

3. The Study of Language and Society

The study of the relationship between language and society is called sociolinguistics. Spolsky (1998) defines sociolinguistics as the field that studies the relation between language and society, between the uses of language and the social structures in which the users of the language live. Sociolinguistics can help people understand why they speak differently in various social contexts and help to uncover the social relationships in a community. For example, people probably
would not speak the same to their boss at work as they would do to their friends, or speak to strangers as they would do to their family.

A speaker of a language should pay attention to the sociolinguistic aspects in a conversation. Each language is used within different contexts, by different people and for different reasons. In learning a language, it is important to consider those factors to communicate effectively with others, which are probably the ultimate goal.

4. Politeness Theories

To begin with, the writer needs to elaborate the term “polite” in a detail, as it is the focus of this study. Being polite is not a matter of saying “please” and “thank you” (Holmes, 1995, p. 296). A polite person makes others feel comfortable. Being linguistically polite involves speaking to people appropriately in the light of their relationship to others. Lakoff (1975) interprets politeness as those forms of behavior which have been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction. Meanwhile, Brown and Levinson (1987) define politeness as rational behavior aiming at the strategic softening of face threatening acts. Take the word *can* and *could* as the example of politeness.

a) *Can* you take my bags up?
b) *Could* you take my bags up?

Example (a) is considered less polite than example (b). The word “can” is polite but less concessive, while the word “could” shows that the speaker is asking for help politely. Those examples lead to the concepts of “face” as a basis for politeness theory. According to Goffman (1967), face is the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken
during a particular context. Face, in a sense, is one’s situated identity but it is not a specific identity (e.g., sophisticated). Meanwhile, Brown and Levinson (1987) define face as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. Furthermore, they classify face into two. Those are positive face, or the desire of connection with others, and negative face, or the desire for autonomy. Face, simply put, is someone’s self-image that needs to be recognized by others.

a) Positive Face

Positive face is the need of every member to be accepted, even liked to by at least some others. Brown and Levinson (1987) define positive face as the individual’s desire to be appreciated and approved in social interaction. This involves such areas as avoiding imposing on others, wanting to complete actions without interference from others, expressing deference to others and expecting respect from others. It simply means that someone wants to be approved by their community through their own image.

b) Negative Face

Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 62) state that the will of every member to be independent and unimpeded by others is known as negative face. In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 129) mention that negative face is the desire for freedom of action and imposition. The word “negative” here does not mean something “bad”. This involves such areas as wanting others to like the same things as one’s like, agreeing with others, expressing solidarity and equality with others.
5. Face Threatening Acts

The nature of interaction that speakers often find themselves producing utterances that threaten one or both types of face or is called Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). A Face Threatening Act is a threat to a person’s face. Face Threatening Acts, according to Brown and Levinson (1987) are acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the intended hearer and/or of the speaker. It is in line with Yule (1996, p. 61) that FTAs are acts which threatens the positive or negative face of the hearer. The speaker, in some ways, threatens the self-image of the hearer. The acts are usually done verbally. For example, if someone asks to borrow money, he is potentially imposing on the person’s and so threatening his negative face. Conversely, if someone’s apologize to other, he will be threatening his positive face since he is acknowledging having imposed on the person and asking for acceptance of this.

6. Politeness Strategies

Since some acts are threatening to face and require softening, language users try to develop politeness strategies to reduce face loss. Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 92) categorize politeness into four (4) politeness strategies; Off-Record, Bald On-Record, Positive, and Negative Politeness. The elaboration for each strategy is described as follows.

a) Off-Record

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), off-record or indirect strategy is done to let speakers figure out the unclear communicative intention. It indicates if the speakers want to avoid their responsibility of doing face threatening acts,
they can employ the strategy and let the hearers interpret the intended message. Off-record simply means the statement when one’s saying is not directly addressed to the other or ‘hints’. “Uh, I forgot my pen”, means that the speaker wants the intended hearer to lend a pen. The meaning of the statement is not directly stated by the speaker and therefore the addressee needs to interpret the meaning.

1) Strategy 1: Give hints

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), giving hint is when speaker says something that is not explicitly relevant to the topic. The speaker invites the hearer to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance. “It is cold in here,” is the example of this strategy. The speaker said to the hearer that it was cold in that place. She or he gave a hint which asked the hearer to shut the window.

2) Strategy 2: Give association clues

A speaker gives a related kind of implication triggered by relevance violations that is provided by mentioning something associated with the act required of a hearer, either by precedent in the speaker-hearer’s experience or by mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience. “My house isn’t very far away... There’s the path that leads to my house,” is the example of this strategy (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The speaker gives a clue to the hearer to come visit him or her.
3) Strategy 3: Presuppose

By implicating something, a speaker forces a hearer to search for the relevance of the presupposed prior event (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example is “I washed the motorcycle again today.”

4) Strategy 4: Understate

A speaker understates what he or she actually wants to say. In the case of criticism, the speaker avoids the lower points of scale, and in the case of compliment or admission, the speaker avoids the upper points (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Example:

A: “What do you think of Anna?”
B: “Nothing’s wrong with her.”

The speaker asked what the hearer thought about Anna. In response to the question, the hearer answered that nothing was wrong with Anna. In fact, the hearer understated what actually she or he wanted to say. The hearer actually thought that Anna was very good. It implied that the speaker avoided the upper points.

5) Strategy 5: Overstate

A speaker exaggerates or chooses a point on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example is “You never do your assignments.”

6) Strategy 6: Use tautologies

By uttering a tautology, a speaker encourages hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example is “Boys will be boys.”
7)  **Strategy 7: Use contradictions**

By stating two things that contradict each other, a speaker makes it appear that he or she cannot be telling the truth (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example is “Well, John is here and he isn’t here.”

8)  **Strategy 8: Be ironic**

A speaker can indirectly convey his or her intended meaning by saying the opposite of what he or she means if there are clues that his or her intended meaning is being conveyed indirectly. The example is “Dan is a real genius.” (After Dan has just done five stupid things in a row).

9)  **Strategy 9: Use metaphors**

A speaker uses metaphor and makes a hearer interprets his or her intended meaning by him or herself (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example is “My job is a jail.” When someone says that, he or she is using metaphors by mentioning jail to represent his or her job. Jail may represent the unpleasantness.

10)  **Strategy 10: Use rhetorical questions**

A speaker asks a question with no intention of obtaining an answer. The question leaves their answer hanging in the air and implicated. It may be used to do the FTAs. The example is “Did someone leave the light on?” (Of course the speaker knows that someone left the light on).

11)  **Strategy 11: Be ambiguous**

A speaker makes purposeful ambiguity which may be achieved through metaphor and lets a hearer guess what she or he means (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example is “John’s a pretty sharp cookie.”
12) **Strategy 12: Be vague**

A speaker may go off record with an FTA by being vague about who the object of the FTA is, or what the offence is. The example is “I’m going down the road for a bit.” (to the local pub).

13) **Strategy 13: Over-generalize**

A speaker utters a rule instantiation which may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Then, a hearer has the choice of deciding whether the general rule applies to him or her. The example is “If that door is shut completely, it sticks.”

14) **Strategy 14: Displace hearer**

A speaker may go off record as to whom target for his FTA is (Brown & Levinson, 1987). He may pretend to address the FTA to someone whom it would not threaten, and hope that the real target will see that the FTA is aimed at him. Example: A secretary in an office asks another – but with negative politeness – to pass the stapler, in circumstances where the professor is much nearer to the stapler than the other secretary. His face is not threatened and he can choose to do it himself as a bonus “free gift.”

15) **Strategy 15: Be incomplete, use ellipsis**

A speaker does not purposefully finish his or her utterance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It can leave the implication of “hanging in the air” just like rhetorical questions. The example is “Oh sir, a headache...” It was used by a niece to ask the father’s younger brother for an aspirin. This gave him the option of telling her to go and lie down instead of dispensing a precious pill.
b) Bald-on-Record

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that bald-on-record is used in different situations since speakers can have different motives in doing the face threatening acts. This strategy is ranked as the most direct strategy. It refers to the expression of an act in the most direct way. It requires no effort from the speakers to reduce the impact of the FTAs. Bald-on-record is likely to shock people to be addressed, embarrass them, or make them feel a bit uncomfortable. “Come in” or “Do sit down” are the examples of bald on-record. Moreover, the speaker can ask the hearer to do something, for example, “Pass me the ketchup!”. The strategy can shock the hearer, therefore this type of strategy is commonly found in people who know each other very well and are very comfortable in their environment, such as close friends and family members.

1) Strategy 1: Great Urgency or Desperation

This strategy is used when a speaker is needed of attention very soon, especially before anything else because of its importance. In cases of great urgency or desperation, a compensation would actually decrease the communicated urgency. For example:

(a) “Help!”
(b) “Watch out!”

The non-urgent substitution for the example (a) is ‘Please help me, if you would be so kind”. The word “help!” with an exclamation point shows that there is no other choice in that situation. The speaker needed a help from the hearer. In (b), the speaker used the expression to warn the hearer of a danger or an accident that seemed likely to happen.
2) Strategy 2: Speaking as if great efficiency is necessary in attention-getters

This strategy is used when a speaker speaks as if maximum efficiency were very important; he or she provides metaphorical urgency for emphasis. For example:

(a) Look, the point is this . . .
(b) Listen, I’ve got an idea.

The speaker in (a) and (b) used them in order to get the attention from the hearer. In (a), the word “look” is a verb used by the speaker to direct the hearer’s eyes in order to see. In (b), the word “listen” is a verb used to get the hearer’s attention.

3) Strategy 3: Task-oriented or Paradigmatic Form of Instruction

This strategy is used to give a task to a hearer in order to get the desire results. Face redness may be felt to irrelevant when the focus interaction is task-oriented (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example of this strategy is “Give me the nails”. The speaker gave the hearer a task to give the nails to him or her.

4) Strategy 4: Sympathetic Advice or Warning

Brown and Levinson (1987) states that in doing FTA, a speaker conveys that he or she does care about a hearer, so that no pressure is required. Sympathetic advice or warning may be bald on record. For examples:

(a) Careful! He is a dangerous man.
(b) Your slip is showing!

In (a), the speaker warned the hearer to be careful because the man was dangerous. Here, the word “careful” was used to give an attention to what the hearer was doing so that he did not get harmed by the dangerous man. In (b), the speaker gave sympathetic expression that the hearer’s slip was showing.
5) Strategy 5: Granting Permission for Something

This strategy is used when a speaker gives or allows a hearer to do something. The example of granting for something is “Okay, you may go.” It indicates that the speaker allowed the hearer to move to another place.

6) Strategy 6: Invitations

This strategy is used when a speaker requested a hearer to do something. “Come in” or “Enter” are the examples of this strategy. These imply that the speaker asked the hearer to move towards the speaker in a room or a building.

7) Strategy 7: Welcoming

Welcoming (or post-greeting) is used when a speaker insists that a hearer may impose on his or her negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 99).

8) Strategy 8: Greetings and Farewells

This strategy is used when a speaker welcomes a hearer to show his or her friendliness or politeness. Meanwhile, the farewell strategy is used when the speaker says goodbye or takes his or her leaves to the hearer. The examples of this strategy are “come”, “go”, or “sit down”.

c) Positive Politeness

Positive politeness confirms that the relationship of both speakers and hearers are friendly and expressing group reciprocity to minimize the distance among them. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that this strategy attempts to attend the hearers’ interests, needs, wants, and goods. Positive politeness addresses the positive face wants of the interactants or desire of connection. In Brown and Levinson’s view, positive politeness is assumed to be less polite than...
negative politeness. The important function of positive politeness is to share some degrees of familiarity with the hearer. It can be considered as the code or language of intimacy. This can be accomplished in various ways, for example, the use of joking and familiar terms of address. “Honey”, “luv”, and “sister” are the examples of the use familiar terms of address used in group identity makers.

1) Strategy 1: Notice, attend to a hearer (her or his interests, wants, needs, goods)

The strategy suggests that a speaker should take notice of aspects of a hearer’s condition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It can be anything which looks as though the hearer would want the speaker to notice and approve it. “You must be hungry; it’s a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch?” is the example of this strategy. The example showed that the speaker paid attention to the hearer’s need. The speaker assumed that the hearer had to be hungry because it was a long time since breakfast. As the action of attending the hearer’s need, she or he offered to have some lunch.

Another example is a runny nose. If one’s ignoring it then it categorizes as negative politeness, but if one will notice and attend to this state of affair by presenting the runny nose with a tissue then it shows positive politeness.

2) Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer)

This strategy is often done with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodic, as well as intensifying modifiers. The example is “What a fantastic garden you have!” The example shows that the speaker exaggerated his
or her compliment about the hearer’s garden. The word “fantastic” implies that the hearer has an extremely good garden.

3) Strategy 3: Intensify interest to a hearer; making good story, draw the hearer as a participant into the conversation.

Another way for a speaker to communicate to a hearer that he or she shares his or her wants is to intensify the interest of the speaker’s own contributions to the conversation by ‘making good story’. The example of this strategy is “I come down to the stairs, and what do you think I see?–a huge mess all over the place, the phone’s off the hook and clothes are scattered all over…” (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

4) Strategy 4: (Use in-group identity markers); address form, in-group language or dialect, jargon or slang, contraction and ellipsis.

This strategy is done by using innumerable address forms to indicate that a speaker and a hearer belong to some set of persons who share specific wants. The example is “Come here, guys.”

The example above shows that the speaker used in-group identity markers by saying “guys” intended to the hearers. The word “guys” was used to address a group of people of either sex. The address form was used to convey such in-group membership including generic names and terms of address.

5) Strategy 5: Seek agreement; repetition – agreement may also be stressed by repeating part or all of what the preceding speaker has said.

Another way to save positive face of a hearer is to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with him or her. Seeking agreement may be stressed by raising
‘safe topic’ and repeating what the preceding speaker has said in a conversation. Below is the example of this strategy:

A: “John went to London this weekend!”
B: “To London!”

From the example above, we could see the speaker (A) said to the hearer (B) that John went to London this weekend. In response to the speaker, the hearer repeated what the preceding speaker has said before by saying “To London!”.

6) Strategy 6: (Avoid disagreement); token agreement, pseudo-agreement, white lies, hedging opinions.

The desire to agree or appear to agree with a hearer leads to mechanism for pretending to agree (Brown & Levinson, 1987). By using this strategy, the speaker may go in twisting their utterances to agree or to hide disagreement. The example is below.

A: “That’s where you live, Binna?”
B: “That’s where I was born.”

The speaker asked for information to the hearer whether she lived in that place or not. In response to the speaker, the hearer answered by avoiding disagreement. She did not say that the speaker’s question was incorrect.

7) Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert common ground; gossip, small talk, point-of-view operations, presupposition manipulations.

This strategy is widely used by a speaker as a way to indicate that the speaker knows the hearer’s wants, tastes, and habits. The example is (place switch) – the use of proximal rather than distal demonstratives: “This is a man I could trust” (proximal) versus “That is a man I could trust” (distal demonstratives).
8) **Strategy 8: Joke**

Jokes are based on mutual shared background knowledge and values that they redefine the size of FTA. The example is “OK, if I tackle those cookies now?”

9) **Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose speaker’s knowledge of and concern for hearer’s wants.**

This strategy is done by asserting knowledge of the hearer’s wants and willingness to fit one’s own wants with them. “I know you love roses but the florist didn’t have any more, so I brought you geraniums instead,” is the example of this strategy.

10) **Strategy 10: Offer, Promise**

This strategy is done to give the potential threat of some FTAs. A speaker may claim that he or she will help obtain whatever a hearer wants. The example is “I will drop by sometime next week.” The speaker promised to the hearer that she or he would drop by next week.

11) **Strategy 11: Be optimistic**

This strategy assumes a hearer will cooperate with a speaker because it will be in their mutual shared interest. For example, someone said, “You’ll lend me your bike, right?” to somebody before using his or her bike. The speaker was optimistic that the hearer would lend her or him a bike.
12) Strategy 12: Include both a speaker and a hearer in the activity

This strategy is done by using an inclusive ‘we’ form, when a speaker really means ‘you’ or ‘me’. The example is “We will shut the door, ma’am. The wind’s coming in.”

13) Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons

Another aspect of including a hearer in the activity is demanding reasons ‘why not’ and assuming that the hearer has no good reason why he or she cannot help. The example is “Why not lend me your cottage for a week?” The word “why” was used to ask for a reason. The speaker asked for the hearer’s reason not to lend him or her a cottage for a period of seven days.

14) Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

The strategy is done by giving evidence of reciprocal rights or obligations obtained between a speaker and a hearer. A reciprocity is behavior in which two people give each other help and advantages. The example is “I’ll lend you dictionary if you lend me your book.” In the example, the speaker said that she or he would lend the hearer a dictionary if the hearer lend the speaker a book.

15) Strategy 15: Give gifts to a hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

To satisfy a hearer’s positive face, a speaker may do this classic strategy. That is to give a gift not only tangible gifts but also human-relation wants such as the wants to be liked, to be admired. “You’re such a very kind-hearted boy. Would you help me to move this table?” is the example of this strategy.
In the example above, the speaker gave a gift to the hearer by complimenting the hearer before asking for help. She or he said that the hearer was such a very kind-hearted boy. The word “kind-hearted” is an adjective which is intended for a person who likes and always wants to help other people.

d) Negative Politeness

On the other hand, Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 131) define negative politeness as “the heart of respect behavior” and it is “more specific and focused.” The function of this strategy is to minimize imposition on the hearers. It aims at the realization of solidarity. Therefore, it automatically assumes that there might be some social distances or awkwardness in the situation. Using hedges or questions is one of the examples of negative politeness strategy. “I just want to ask you if I could use your pen?” is the example of minimizing imposition.

1) Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

This strategy is conducted by using phrases and sentences that have contextually unambiguous meanings that are different from the literal meaning (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The example is “Can you pass the salt?” The example happened when the speaker was cooking and needed a help from somebody to pass the salt.

Conventional indirect forms can be performed by questioning or asserting the felicity conditions underlying the act. Thus, to request another to shut a door, one can say “will you shut the door?”, “can you shut the door?”, “are you able to shut the door?”, “did you shut the door?”, “I want you to shut the door,” and so on.
2) Strategy 2: Do not assume a hearer is able or willing to comply to any acts imposed on him.

A hedge makes the membership of a noun phrase in a set that it is partial, or true only in certain respects and more complete than might be expected (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Hedge may be functioned to soften command and turn it into a polite suggestion. The example is “I wonder whether I could just sort of ask you a little question.”

3) Strategy 3: Be pessimistic about ability or willingness of a hearer to comply to any acts imposed on him.

This strategy gives a threat to a hearer’s negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of a speaker’s speech act obtain. The example is “I’ve come (if I may) to see you for what might be a night.”

4) Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition

One way of defusing the FTA is to indicate that the intrinsic seriousness of the imposition is not great, though it is. For example if a speaker wants to ask a hearer to have a talk together, he or she may say “Could I talk to you for just a minute?”

5) Strategy 5: Give deference.

A speaker raises and satisfies a hearer’s want to be treated as superior. Moreover, it indirectly gives respect to the hearer. There are two sides of deference realization: one in which a speaker humbles and abases himself and another when the speaker raises a hearer (pays him positive face or satisfies the
hearer’s want to be treated as superior). The example is “Mr President, if I thought you were trying to protect someone, I would have walked out.”

6) Strategy 6: Apologize; admit the impingement, indicate reluctance, give overwhelming reasons, beg forgiveness.

By apologizing for doing an FTA, a speaker can indicate his or her reluctance to impinge on a hearer’s negative face. The example is “I’m sorry to bother you...” The speaker asked forgiveness to the hearer at the beginning of his or her utterances. It implied that the speaker wanted to respect the hearer. Furthermore, it was also to prevent a conflict after the speaker’s statement that might be regarded as offensive words to the hearer.

7) Strategy 7: Impersonalize a speaker and a hearer; per-formatives, impersonal verbs, address terms as ‘you’ avoidance.

Another way of indicating that a speaker does not want to impinge on a hearer is to phrase the FTA as if the agents were other than the speaker or not the speaker alone at least, and the hearer were other than the hearer or only inclusive of the hearer. The example is “It looks (to me) like...”

8) Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule

One way of dissociating a speaker and a hearer from particular imposition in the FTA is to state the FTA as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation. The example is “Passenger will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train.”
9) Strategy 9: Nominalize to distance the actor and add formality

The more nouns are used in an expression, the more removed an actor from doing or being something and the less dangerous an FTA seems to be. “An urgent request is made for your cooperation” is better than “We urgently request your cooperation.” That is one of the examples of this strategy.

10) Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebted a hearer.

This strategy is done by claiming a speaker’s indebtedness to a hearer or by disclaiming any indebtedness of the hearer, so that the speaker can give an FTA. “I’ve come if I may too difficult to speak to you,” is the example of this strategy. The example implied the speaker asked the hearer a favor. He or she would do a kind of action for the hearer. In that case, the speaker had to come if he or she might too difficult to speak to the hearer.

7. Factors Affecting the Characters’ Politeness

Spolsky (1998) identifies four factors which affect people’s politeness. There are language styles, registers and domains, slang and solidarity, and language and gender. Those four factors determine the use of language concerning politeness between speakers and hearers. The explanation for each factor is described as follows.

a) Language Styles

A speaker is usually aware of the hearer. People can choose to speak formally or informally according to the person they are addressing. According to Spolsky (1998), people can consciously choose how they try to use language by applying formal or informal expressions to people that they address. Further, he
states that when one speaks formally, he is engaged in a favored and educated norms of their society because he is able to use his language well. Thus, Spolsky (1998) also states the importance of language style is to represent the speaker’s sense of identity.

b) Registers and Domains

Spolsky (1998) emphasizes that people with particular occupation may create terms for new concepts. People who work at mining environment will be different from people who work at geology in terms of language. Each group can develop terms which may not be familiar for people who do not keep up with the other environment. Thus, a register is a variety of language involving roles and statuses, which is used in certain situations. Social situation is also a key to determine politeness in speaking. Spolsky (1998) states that there is a typical domain which defines the way people speak in terms of social situation. Further, he states that domains are named usually for a place or an activity in it. Two common domains are home and work.

c) Slang and Solidarity

Spolsky (1998) mentions that slang is used as special kinds of intimate or in-group speech. Slang has social functions as a sign of identity membership and solidarity among people who use it. Spolsky (1998), further, explains that solidarity has a major impact on language. People tend to show group solidarity to others by applying the same language use, such as accent or word choice.

The importance of language in establishing social identity is also shown in the case of slang. Slang is a kind of jargon marked by its rejection of formal rules
and its marked use to claim solidarity. Slang regularly transgresses other social norms, making free use of taboo expressions. The use words like ‘fuck’ and ‘shit’ in public media has become a sign of revolt, depending on one’s point of view.

d) Language and Gender

Spolsky (1998) states that both men and women share differences in vocabulary. As for children, they tend to pick women’s and men’s talk as social stereotypes. They assume women’s talk has something to do with home and domestic activities, whereas men’s talk is associated with the outside world and economic activities.

B. Review of Related Studies

This section is to review other related studies previously done on the same topic. In doing this research, the writer needs to seek for references, especially from related studies. Many researchers conducted a research on politeness analysis. There are two studies that will be reviewed by the writer.

The first study is conducted by Putri (2003), which aims to analyze the type of politeness strategy used in Oprah Winfrey’s talk show and to analyze the factor that might influence the choice of strategies in Oprah Winfrey’s talk show. In analyzing the data, the writer used Brown and Levinson’s theory (1987) to answer the two research problems. The study used two factors proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) namely intrinsic payoffs and sociological variables. The study found the four politeness strategies revealed by Oprah Winfrey and Ricky Martin. Further, the two factors influencing the choice of politeness strategies...
occurred in their conversation. However, the writer did not provide the theory used in the study. It can be concluded that the study lacks related theories used in analyzing the data.

The second study is conducted by Hameed (2010), which aims to investigate the role of gender in determining politeness strategy, with regard to negative and positive strategies. The study also used the four politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). However, Hameed (2010) only focused on the negative and positive strategies intended to perform. The result showed that men are more able to perceive polite requests as compared to women. Thus, gender plays a considerable role in the recognition of polite requests.

Similarly, the writer conducted a pragmatic study which focused on types of politeness strategies but she expanded the analysis by using the characters’ utterances as the data source. Further, the writer also combined the factors affect the characters’ politeness in speaking based on Spolsky’s (1998) theory. The writer decided to employ the factors affecting the characters politeness in speaking proposed by Spolsky (1998) since those factors are more specific.

C. Theoretical Framework

This researcher analyzes the use of politeness strategies by the characters of *The Great Debaters* movie. The writer summarizes and synthesizes all the theories used in the analysis of the research to solve the research problems. Based on the theoretical description, the writer employs some theories from some linguists. The first theory is pragmatics proposed by Crystal (1985), Blum-Kulka
Pragmatics is necessary because it deals with the relation between language and context. It deals with the utterances of *The Great Debaters* movie’s characters. The second theory is speech acts proposed by Nhan (2012) and Searle (1987). Speech act theory as a part of pragmatics focuses on language as a tool for communication. Furthermore, Searle’s theory (1979) on the importance of performing an action through an utterance will also be presented to give a clearer explanation of the theory.

The third theory is sociolinguistics proposed by Spolsky (1998). Sociolinguistics is presented to make a clear understanding of the topic discussed about the relationship between language and society. The fourth theory is politeness proposed by Lakoff (1975), Brown and Levinson (1987), and Goffman (1967). Politeness theory is important since it is the main topic of this research. The fifth theories are positive and negative face proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The concepts of “face” is necessary to be included since it is the basis of politeness theory. The sixth theory is Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Yule (1996). It is related to positive and negative face. The seventh theory is politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The last theory is factors affecting someone in speaking proposed by Spolsky (1998). Politeness strategy and factors affecting someone in speaking theories will be used as the basic theories of the research.

The first research problem “Which types of politeness strategies are used by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie?” deals with politeness strategies, in which Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory is applied to analyze the data.
There are four politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), namely off-record (indirect), bald on-record, positive politeness, and negative politeness.

The second research problem “What factors affect the characters’ politeness in speaking?” deals with factors in speaking politely, in which the theory of Spolsky (1988) is used for analyzing the data. There are four factors affecting someone in speaking politely, namely language styles, registers and domains, slang and solidarity, and language and gender.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the analysis of the methodology used to obtain the data of the findings. There are six sections in this chapter, namely the research method, the research setting, the research subject, the research instruments and data gathering technique, the data analysis technique, and the research procedure.

A. Research Method

The writer focused on the utterances of the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie related to speaking politeness. The methodology was used to find out the answers to the research problems: (1) Which types of politeness strategies are used by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie? (2) What factors affect the characters’ politeness in speaking?

The writer conducted this research which was categorized as qualitative research. Frankel and Wallen (2006) state that qualitative research is a study which investigates the quality of relationship, activities, situations, and materials. Besides, the data collected are in the forms of descriptive rather than numerical or statistical data. Therefore, this study do not deal with any numerical data. It refers to Sutopo’s theory that in qualitative research, the data collected are usually in the forms of words, sentences or pictures in which the meaning is more significant than number (2002, p. 35).
In conducting qualitative research, there are several methods that can be applied. Some of them are content analysis, case study, and discourse analysis. The writer used discourse analysis as the method in accomplishing this research. Taylor (2001) loosely defines discourse analysis as “the close study of language in use”. Primarily, Potter, and Wetherell (2001) state discourse analysis espouse the principle that people construct versions of their social world through the instrumentality and functionality of language. Discourse analysis provides a different way of theorizing language. Potter (2003) states discourse is situated sequentially, it can be in the sense of primary context within which social interaction occurrence comes first and largely shapes account and construction of participants involved in discourse. It depends on the variability of language use in different cultures and contexts.

Discourse analysis is more concerned with the analysis of texts and/or utterances within specific socio-cultural context and indicates a method of data analysis that can tell researchers about the discursive construction of a phenomenon (Willig, 2008). Specifically, this method focuses on a power, domination and construction, and reproduction of power in texts and conversations, language in social contexts, and interactions (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). The use of discourse analysis for this research was due to the focus of this study which was analyzing the types of politeness strategies and the factors affecting someone in speaking politeness. Since this study dealt with language use in social interactions, discourse analysis was considered as the most appropriate method for this study.
B. Research Setting

The analysis of The Great Debaters movie started in December 2015. Firstly, the writer looked for the movie script on www.subscene.com. Secondly, the writer compared the movie and the script to ensure the accuracy of the movie script. The technical processes of data tabulation were analyzing the script, categorizing the characters’ utterances, identifying the characters’ factors of politeness, and writing up the report on the study. Since the study does not deal with a field study or human interaction, the research setting was varied, such as home, library, café, and anywhere as long as an internet connection was available.

C. Data Source

The writer chose The Great Debaters movie as the data source in this study since the movie had good ratings and reviews. The movie also told about life of a lecturer and students which worked together as a debate team. Brown and Levinson (1987) examine that high and low status of someone will determine the way they interact with others. It is related with politeness which was the focus of this study, then, it was a great data source.

The Great Debaters movie was the data source in this study, in which the characters’ utterances were used as the data. There were six characters from the movie that were taken as the data source because the characters appeared the most in the movie. The first character was Mr. Tolson, who acted as a debate coach for Wiley College debate team. The second character was Mr. Farmer, who was
James’ father and Mr. Tolson’s friend. The other characters were James Farmer Junior, Henry Lowe, Samantha Booke, and Burgees, who acted as the members of Wiley College debate team.

D. Research Instruments and Data Gathering Technique

There is an instrument used in the study. It was The Great Debaters movie’s transcription as the document. A document is an artefact which has as its central feature an inscribed text (Scott, 1990). Simply put, a document is a written text. The writer employed the movie transcription to collect the data of the characters’ utterances. The transcription consisted of 166 pages which was taken from www.subscene.com. The utterances were used to analyze the first research problem: (1) Which types of politeness strategies are used by the characters in The Great Debaters movie? The second research problem: (2) What factors affect the characters’ politeness in speaking? was analyzed based on the politeness strategies used by the main characters in speaking. The writer selected certain utterances dealing with politeness strategies by the four characters in the movie. The activity was done more than one time in order to understand and prevent misinterpreting the context and the content of the situation in the movie.

E. Data Analysis Technique

The writer gathered the characters’ conversations in the movie based on the transcription and observed how they try to deliver their messages to others and
also how they respond to the conversations. Furthermore, the writer classified certain utterances into four politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson (1987). After being classified, the utterances were analyzed to find out the factors that influence the main characters’ politeness in speaking according to Spolsky (1998).

The writer focused on politeness strategies and factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking. The data were discussed based on the theories provided. Those utterances were classified into two sections: types of politeness strategies used by the *The Great Debaters* movie’s characters and the factors that affect the characters’ politeness in speaking.

In gathering and analyzing the data, the writer used two tables to categorize the data and to make the data clearer and easier to read. Table 1.0 presented the examples of the data analysis of the types of politeness strategies used by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie.

**Table 3.1. The Example List of Politeness Strategies Used by the Characters of The Great Debaters Movie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>T/PP 00:08:57,817</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>Why'd you come back?</em> Henry: <em>School's the only place you can read all day. Except prison.</em></td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Henry the reason why he would come back to school after he was disappear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>S/OR 00:12:56,755</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>Most of the New Deal goes to children, anyway, and to the handicapped, and to old people--</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Is that fact, or conjecture?</em></td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Samantha’s utterance was incomplete. It made the utterance hanging in the air.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legends:

- **OR**: Off-Record
- **BOR**: Bald On-Record
- **PP**: Positive Politeness
- **NP**: Negative Politeness

Table 2.0. below gave the list of the factors influencing the characters’ politeness in speaking in *The Great Debaters* movie.

**Table 3.2. The Example List of Factors Influencing the Characters’ Politeness in Speaking in *The Great Debaters* Movie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burgees</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson, thank you for a wonderful dinner.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Burgees spoke formally to his lecturer. He is engaged in a favored and educated norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Yes, sir.</td>
<td>Register</td>
<td>Since Mr. Tolson was a professor in Willey College, the students called him “sir” or “Mr. Tolson”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Research Procedure**

The procedures taken in this study were:

1. **Analyzing the Transcription**

The writer analyzed *The Great Debaters* movie transcription to collect the data related to the characters’ utterances. To ensure the authenticity and accuracy of the transcription, the writer compared the transcription with the movie. The writer analyzed the conversation of the characters to find out the answers of the research problems.
2. Categorizing the Characters’ Utterances

Having analyzed the script, the writer categorized the characters’ utterances into four potential types of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). There are off-record, bald-on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. Each utterance in the movie’s script was put into each category to help the writer in analyzing the data.

3. Identifying the Characters’ Factors Affecting Characters in Speaking Politeness

After categorizing the characters’ utterances, the writer identified each utterance to find the factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking. The writer employed the theory proposed by Spolsky (1998) related to politeness factors in speaking. There were language styles, registers and domains, slang and solidarity, and language and gender.

4. Drawing the Conclusion

The writer provided explanations on each character’s utterances presented as the examples and associated the findings. The data were discussed based on the theories provided. The writer focused on types of politeness strategies and factors affecting the characters in speaking politeness. Those data were classified into two sections: the types of politeness strategies and the factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking. Since the research was qualitative research, the writer presented the results in a narrative form.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter consists of two parts, namely the discussion of politeness strategies found in *The Great Debaters* movie based on Brown and Levinson (1987) and the discussion of factors in speaking politeness by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie based on Spolsky (1998).

A. Politeness Strategies Used in *The Great Debaters* Movie

Since some acts are threatening to face and require softening, language users try to develop politeness strategies to reduce face loss. Brown and Levinson (1987) categorize politeness into four types that sum up human politeness behavior: off-record, bald-on-record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. In the discussion below, the writer found that the six characters of *The Great Debaters* movie revealed the four types of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The following analyses of the four types of politeness strategies were arranged based on the frequency of occurrence.

1. Positive Politeness

The positive politeness strategy was the most dominant strategy found in the movie. The characters in *The Great Debaters* movie revealed the subtypes of positive politeness strategy, i.e. including both a speaker and a hearer in the activity, being optimistic, noticing hearer’s needs and wants, seeking agreement,
using in-group identity markers, promising, asking for reasons, presupposing speaker’s knowledge, exaggerating, and drawing hearer as the participant into the conversation. The results and discussion of each subtype of positive politeness strategy were as follows.

Dialogue 1

**Setting** : Henry’s house  
**Situation** : James is asking Henry to go with him to get Mr. Tolson and Samantha.  
**Participants** : James and Henry

Henry : What's going on?  
James : *We're gonna go get Mr. Tolson and Samantha, head back to the campus, and have a pep rally.*  

(J/ PP/01:05:23,499)

Samantha decided to sleep in Henry’s house. In the next morning, James and the school band came to Henry’s house. Suddenly, James knocked the door. He asked Henry to get ready and go with him. Henry and Samantha were very shocked.

The conversation above showed that James revealed positive politeness strategy, i.e. including both a speaker and a hearer in the activity (see Appendix A, p. 98, item 108). In this case, James used the word *we* which meant he included Henry, the hearer, as a participant in his utterance. Brown and Levinson (1987) assert a speaker is done this strategy by using *we* form when he or she really means *you* or *me* to address a hearer. This subtype of positive politeness strategy had the higher frequency than the others subtypes.
Dialogue 2

Setting : Mr. Tolson’s house
Situation : Mr. Farmer is asking to Mr. Tolson about James.
Participants : Mr. Farmer and Mr. Tolson

Mr. Farmer : Is he involved in this?
Mr. Tolson : Of course not, James.

(T/PP/01:00:14,624)

Mr. Farmer and his wife were attending Mr. Tolson’s party. Mr. Farmer remembered that he had to ask to Mr. Tolson about James. He was curious about the day when James came home late. Mr. Farmer wanted to know the truth from Mr. Tolson. Mr. Farmer and Mr. Tolson were arguing about James. However, Mr. Farmer did not believe what Mr. Tolson explained.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Tolson depicted positive politeness strategy, i.e. being optimistic (see Appendix A, p. 96, item 100). Mr. Tolson was very optimistic that he was not with James at that night. The word of course showed sincerity hedge. He was not with James.

Dialogue 3

Setting : Mr. Tolson’s house
Situation : Debate Team Tryout
Participants : Mr. Tolson and James Farmer

Mr. Tolson : You smell very good, Mr. Farmer.
James : Thank you, sir.
Mr. Tolson : You're very welcome.

(T/PP/00:10:35,781)

Mr. Tolson held debate team tryout in his house, corner of June and Campus, at 7.30. He wanted to choose the best members for the debate team. The debate tryout already started at 7.30 but James Farmer had not showed yet.
James finally came to the house and walked in to find a seat. Mr. Tolson who stood in front of the room smelt something good. He noticed that it was James’ smell. He gave a compliment to James. He said that he smelt very good and smiled. James thanked him.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Tolson revealed positive politeness strategy, i.e. giving compliment (see Appendix A, p. 81, item 12). In this case, Mr. Tolson gave a compliment to James because he smelt very good by saying “You smell very good, Mr. Farmer.” Brown and Levinson (1987) clarify such a compliment as a sign of showing attention to the hearer’s needs and wants.

In other words, the compliment supported what James wanted to hear. It is in line with Wardaugh (2006, p. 277) that positive politeness leads to achieve solidarity through offers of friendship or the use of compliments. This strategy is commonly used by people who have already known each other fairly well like members of the same group or community.

Dialogue 4

Setting : In front of Mr. Tolson’s house
Situation : James is approaching Samantha
Participants : James and Samantha

James   : Tolson’s tough, isn't he?
Samantha : He sure is.

(J/PP/00:15:43,822)

Having done the debate team tryout, James ran to Samantha. He wanted to speak with her. It was the first time for them to know each other. James started their conversation by stating his opinion about Mr. Tolson. James stated that Mr. Tolson was tough. Samantha agreed with him. She said so after Mr. Tolson asked
her to speak in the hot spot. Mr. Tolson and Samantha went through a hard debate. It was the first time she met Mr. Tolson and talked to him.

The conversation above showed that James depicted positive politeness, i.e. seeking for an agreement (see Appendix A, p. 85, item 33). James thought Mr. Tolson was a tough man. He used the question tag “is’nt he” with the question mark (?). He wanted Samantha to agree with him. The answer was either yes or no. In this case, Samantha agreed with him by answering “He sure is”. As stated in Chapter II, Brown and Levinson (1987) state that another way to save positive face of a hearer is to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with him or her.

**Dialogue 5**

**Setting** : Mr. Farmer’s house  
**Situation** : Mr. Farmer is asking to James.  
**Participants** : Mr. Farmer and James

Mr. Farmer : Because you're 14 years old, Junior. You've got plenty of time for girls later.  
James : I wasn't with Samantha.  

(F/PP/00:39:14,398)

Mr. Farmer was waiting for James. The clock already showed at 2 a.m. James went home late because he followed Mr. Tolson to the secret meeting. However, he already promised him that he would not tell anybody about that. James knew that his father would get angry at him. Mr. Farmer kept asking James the reason why he went home so late. Mr. Farmer thought that James was with Samantha.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Farmer revealed positive politeness strategy, i.e. using in-group identity markers (see Appendix A, p. 91,
item 70). Mr. Farmer used a familiar address to call his son. He called James as
junior. This strategy commonly uses with some words, address form, or language
that marks a certain identity or membership (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Dialogue 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>James followed Mr. Tolson to the secret meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson and James</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

James: I promise on a stack of Bibles-- Jesus.... I won't tell anybody.

Mr. Tolson: Come on.

(J/PP/00:36:53,958)

Knowing Mr. Tolson headed somewhere, James kept following him. He
wanted to know what he was doing in the middle of the night. He followed Mr.
Tolson until he realized that he was in the forest. Mr. Tolson kept walking. He
called Mr. Tolson but he did not hear.

Mr. Tolson entered the place in the middle of the forest. He was in the
secret meeting. There, he gathered with people and discussed about something
secretly. Suddenly, there were some white guys came into the room and made
some mess. All of the people were busily trying to get away. When seeing James
in the middle of the chaos, Mr. Tolson was shocked and getting angry at James
consequently. However, James promised to him that he would never tell anybody.

The dialogue above showed James revealed positive politeness strategy,
i.e. promising (see Appendix A, p. 90, item 64). Knowing the fact about Mr.
Tolson, James promised him that he would not tell anybody about what he saw
that night. He strongly promised to him in the name of Bible. Brown and
Levinson (1987) state that promises are the natural outcome of choosing this strategy even if they are false, they demonstrate speaker's good intentions in satisfying hearer’s positive face wants.

Dialogue 7

**Setting** : Willey College  
**Situation** : Henry is approaching Mr. Tolson in front of the college building.  
**Participants** : Mr. Tolson and Henry

Mr. Tolson : I want you to come by my house tonight, 7:30. Corner of June and Campus.  
Henry : Why would I do that?  
(H/ PP/00:09:06,225)

Mr. Tolson noticed Henry’s ability since he always answered his questions in the class. Mr. Tolson could tell that Henry was different from the other students. He was so brave. He could do anything he wanted to. After teaching, he asked Henry to meet him after class. Henry approached Mr. Tolson in front of the college building. He asked Henry some questions.

Seeing Henry at the night before, Mr. Tolson wondered why he came back to school after his disappearance a couple years ago. However, Mr. Tolson believed that he had something special. He asked Henry to come by his house at 7.30 for the debate team tryout. Henry asked the reason why he should come and why he chose him. Instead of answering the question, Mr. Tolson just said that he was not sure either and that was the reason why he wanted him to go to his house for a tryout. Without any complaining, Henry just stood as Mr. Tolson passing by.

The dialogue above showed that Henry revealed positive politeness strategy, i.e. giving (ask for) a reason (see Appendix A, p. 80, item 7). He actually wanted to argue with Mr. Tolson. He wanted to know why Mr. Tolson chose him
as the candidate of the debate team. The function of asking for a reason was to find out whether or not the speaker would get positive respond from the hearer. Besides, the speaker tried to minimize the threat from the hearer in order to achieve his goal. This subtype was the most dominant strategy used by the characters in the movie.

Dialogue 8

**Setting** : Classroom
**Situation** : Mr. Tolson is talking to Henry, James, and Samantha.
**Participants** : Mr. Tolson and Henry

Mr. Tolson : **Anyone know who Antaeus was?**
Henry : Sure. He was a gigantic wrestler in Greek mythology.

(T/PP/01:13:02,758)

Mr. Tolson was talking to the debate team, Henry, James, and Samantha. He said that some institutions cancelled their invitations for Willey College debate team because Mr. Tolson had been blacklisted. He felt sorry about that. He thought that their debate team had nowhere to go.

Mr. Tolson gave reinforcement to his students by asking the question about Antaeus. Henry knew who Antaeus was and told the team about it. Henry said that Antaeus was unbeatable because anytime someone threw him down to the Earth, it would make him stronger. That was exactly what Mr. Tolson wanted to say; defeat would make them stronger. He did not want to quit just because the Dean said so. His message to them was to never quit. The debate team promised that they would debate Harvard.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Tolson revealed positive
politeness strategy, i.e. using of in-group code (see Appendix A, p. 99, item 116).

Mr. Tolson presupposed hearers’ knowledge by asking about Antaeus. He assumed that the hearers understood and shared the association of that code.

Dialogue 9

Setting : Mr. Tolson’s house
Situation : Mr. Tolson and his students are eating together.
Participants : Mr. Tolson and Samantha

Samantha : This is a great opportunity.
Mr. Tolson : Thank you very much.

(S/PP/00:50:18,095)

Mr. Tolson and the debate team were eating together. After finishing the meal, Mr. Tolson had an announcement to make. He said that recently he had sent some letters to some major universities. He told them all about what Willey College debate team had been doing. Luckily, he got a response said that they would be the one of the first Negro colleges in America to ever debate a white college, Oklahoma City University. The team was very excited. They would never think about it before. Mr. Tolson asked them to promise that they had to practice a lot for that.

The conversation above showed that Samantha depicted positive politeness strategy, i.e. exaggerating (see Appendix A, p. 94, item 84). Samantha was really exaggerated with the news. She used the word great to show her enthusiasm. It is in line with Brown and Levinson (1987) that assert a speaker likely to show his greater interest to hearer with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodics.
Dialogue 10

Setting: Mr. Tolson’s house
Situation: Debate Team Tryout
Participants: Mr. Tolson and Samantha

Mr. Tolson: You know, there's never been a female on the debating team, ever.
Samantha: Yes, sir. I know that.

Samantha was the only girl in the debate team tryout. Mr. Tolson thought that she hid for a long time because he never met her before. In fact, she was a transferred student who came to the college to participate in his team. Mr. Tolson asked Samantha whether or not she knew the fact that there had never been a female on the debating team. Samantha answered that she already knew that.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Tolson depicted positive politeness strategies, i.e. drawing hearer as a participant into the conversation (see Appendix A, p. 82, item 16). Knowing that Samantha was the only girl in his team, Mr. Tolson tried to attract her attention by saying “you know”. It indicated that he wanted Samantha to agree with his statement about female in the debate team. Hence, he did it to make her accepted what he said. Brown and Levinson (1987) assert that this subtype uses to show that a speaker includes a hearer into the middle of the events being discussed by using tag questions or expressions include hearer as a participant in the conversation, such as “Isn’t it?” or “you know?”.

2. Bald-on Record

The characters in The Great Debaters movie revealed bald-on record politeness strategy. The subtypes of bald-on record politeness strategies used by
the characters were task-oriented, great urgency, attention-getters, and greetings. The results and discussion of each subtype of bald-on-record politeness strategy were below as follows.

Dialogue 11

Setting: Willey College
Situation: Henry is approaching Mr. Tolson in front of the college building
Participants: Mr. Tolson and Henry

Mr. Tolson: I want you to come by my house tonight, 7:30. Corner of June and Campus.
Henry: Why would I do that? (T/BOR 00:09:06,225)

Henry’s ability in answering tough questions made Mr. Tolson noticed his potential to be a good debater. Henry was a person whom Mr. Tolson met in the pub. Mr. Tolson had some questions for him at that night but then Henry disappeared. Meeting Henry in the classroom, Mr. Tolson was shocked to find him as one of his students. Henry was a smart student in the class. He was so brave in expressing his idea. He could answer Mr. Tolson’s question rightly. Seeing Henry’s potential, Mr. Tolson wanted him to join the debate team. However, he still asked Henry to do the debate tryout. Mr. Tolson was directly asked Henry to come by his house.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Tolson revealed bald-on-record politeness strategy, i.e. the use of task-oriented utterance (see Appendix A, p. 80, item 7). In this case, Mr. Tolson directly asked Henry to come by his house at 7:30. He gave Henry a task to fulfil. It is in line with Brown and Levinson (1987) that this strategy is used to give a task to a hearer in order to get the desire results.
This subtype was the most dominant subtype revealed by the characters in the movie.

Dialogue 12

Setting : Henry’s house
Situation : Samantha was sleeping in Henry’s house when the school’s band came
Participants : Henry and Samantha
Henry : It's the school band, and they're outside.
Samantha : What? Jesus!

(S/BOR/01:05:11,053)

After attending a party, Henry asked Samantha to follow him. He took Samantha to a lake near his house. There were only them. Henry was attracted to Samantha, and so was she to him. When Henry told his life story, Samantha felt empathy with him.

After having a long talk, Samantha and Henry went to Henry’s house. Samantha decided to sleep there. In the next morning, the school band came to Henry’s house. James and the school band asked Henry to dress up and go with them. They planned to go to Samantha’s and Mr. Tolson’s house. Henry and Samantha got shocked. Samantha did not even know that the school band was already outside. Samantha got shocked because Henry said that there was nobody ever came to his house.

The conversation above showed that Samantha applied bald-on-record politeness strategy, i.e. maximizing efficiency in an urgent situation (see Appendix A, p. 97, item 106). Bald-on record politeness strategy is applied because Samantha was shocked seeing what happened at that time. She used the words “what” and “Jesus” with raising intonation. It showed that she was in an
urgent situation.

Dialogue 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>: Mr. Tolson’s house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>: James came late to the debate tryout. Mr. Tolson asked him to hurry up because the whole participants were waiting for him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>: Mr. Tolson and James</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Tolson : *Excuse me. We're waiting for you, Mr. Farmer.*
James : I'm going, sir.
Mr. Tolson : Thank you, Mr. Farmer.

(T/BOR/00:10:30,710)

James came late to the debate tryout. Mr. Tolson asked James to move quickly because the whole class were waiting for him in formal expression by saying “excuse me” and “Mr. Farmer”.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Tolson revealed bald-on record politeness strategy, i.e. attention getters (see Appendix A, p. 81, item 11). Mr. Tolson asked James to move quickly directly. However, the sentence “excuse me” was used to soften the request. Brown and Levinson (1987) assert that bald-on record strategy is employed as an attempt to minimize the efficiency of speaking. This subtype is trying to preserve face (instead of threatening it) which shows solidarity and respect to their communicative partners.

Dialogue 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>: Mr. Tolson’s house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>: James came late to the debate team tryout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>: Mr. Tolson and James</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

James : *Good evening, Mr. Tolson.*
Mr. Tolson : Evening.

(J/BOR/00:10:28,574)
Having prepared for the debate team tryout enthusiastically, James came late to Mr. Tolson’s house. He ran to Mr. Tolson’s house but he still came late. Knowing that he was in trouble, James greeted Mr. Tolson first before he got permission to sit. James greeted Mr. Tolson to show respect and ask for an apology. Mr. Tolson answered the greeting and asked him to sit down.

The dialogue above showed James applied bald-on record politeness strategy, i.e. greeting (see Appendix A, p. 81, item 10). In this case, James greeted Mr. Tolson to show his respect and to apologize for coming late. The word *good evening* is used to greet someone in the evening. It is in line with Brown and Levinson (1987) that this strategy is used when a speaker welcomes a hearer to show his or her friendliness or politeness.

3. Off Record

The characters of *The Great Debaters* movie revealed the subtype of off record politeness strategy, i.e. being incomplete, using metaphors, and using rhetorical questions. The results and discussion of each subtype of off record politeness strategy were as follows.

Dialogue 15

**Setting**: Mr. Tolson’s house  
**Situation**: Samantha is in the hotspot doing the debate team tryout  
**Participants**: Mr. Tolson and Samantha

Samantha : *Most of the New Deal goes to children, anyway, and to the handicapped, and to old people--*
Mr. Tolson : Is that fact, or conjecture?

(S/OR/00:12:56,755)
Samantha was a new student. She went to Willey College to join the debate team. Mr. Tolson thought that she already hid for a long time. He did not know that Samantha was transferred from another college. Mr. Tolson asked Samantha to stand in the hot spot. Mr. Tolson asked for her opinion about the topic given. She rebutted about welfare. However, when Samantha was giving her opinion, Mr. Tolson interrupted her.

The dialogue above showed that Samantha depicted off-record politeness strategy, i.e. being incomplete (see Appendix A, p. 82, item 20). Samantha’s utterance was incomplete. It left the implication of hanging in the air. She could not finish her utterance because Mr. Tolson interrupted her so she seemed confused about it. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that a speaker does not purposefully finish his or her utterance.

Dialogue 16

Setting : Mr. Farmer’s room
Situation : James is telling his father that he is one of the debate team members.
Participants : Mr. Farmer and James

James : I don't know. I never really noticed.
Mr. Farmer : Because extracurricular activities like the debate team are fine, but you must not take your eye off the ball, son.

(F/OR/00:19:37,322)

James was one of Willey College debate team members. He was chosen to be the debate team member after doing debate team tryout. He was so enthusiastic to tell the news to his father, Dr. Farmer. He met his father and told the news. His father was happy to hear the news. James also told his father about Samantha, the
only girl in the debate team. Mr. Farmer was wondering why on earth his son told him about the girl. He thought his son had a feeling for the girl. Thus, he asked his son about the girl and advised him to focus on something which was his priority.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Farmer applied off-record politeness strategy, i.e. using metaphor (see Appendix A, p. 87, item 48). In this case, Mr. Farmer gave advice to his son, James, by using metaphor. He made *you must not take your eyes off the ball.* He used the metaphor which had the same meaning as focus on something. He made James interpret the meaning by himself. It is in line with Brown and Levinson (1987) that assert a speaker uses metaphor and makes a hearer interprets his or her intended meaning by him or herself.

Dialogue 17

**Setting** : Hotel room  
**Situation** : James and Henry are arguing about debate material.  
**Participants** : James and Henry

James : *Do you hear yourself? You sound like a kid!*  
Henry : Well, you are a kid!  

(J/OR/01:38:45,799)

After discussing about the material for the debate competition, Henry had a different thought with James. Henry did not agree with James’ idea. James wanted to use Gandi’s concept of Satyagraha to begin a debate. However, Henry wanted to use other quote. Henry said that he was in charge with the team.

The conversation above showed that James used positive politeness strategy, i.e. using rhetorical questions (see Appendix A, p. 103, item 141). James, Samantha, and Henry fought about Gandhi for debate competition. James was
angry. He said *do you hear yourself? You sound like a kid!*. He asked using rhetorical question with no intention of obtaining an answer. Based on Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 211), off-record or indirect strategy is done to let speakers figure out the unclear communication intention. Hence, the speakers could employ the strategy and let the hearers interpret the intention of the message to avoid the responsibility of doing FTAs.

4. **Negative Politeness**

The negative politeness strategy was the less dominant strategy applied by the characters in *The Great Debaters* movie. The characters revealed subtypes of negative politeness strategy, i.e. being pessimistic, being conventionally indirect, addressing terms as ‘you’ avoidance, and apologizing. The results and discussion of each subtype of negative politeness strategy were as follows.

**Dialogue 18**

**Setting**: In the party

**Situation**: Henry came when James is dancing with Samantha

**Participants**: Henry and James

James: *Mm-hmm. I guess I better go get me some punch.*

Henry: *Here, you can have mine if you want.*

Samantha invited James to dance with her. James was so enthusiastic. He was so nervous but still Samantha gave a compliment to him. Henry was jealous. James noticed it and he decided to get some punch. Henry asked Samantha to go with him. At first, Samantha refused him but after negotiating, she went with Henry and left James in the party.
The dialogue above showed that James revealed off-record politeness strategy, i.e. being pessimistic (see Appendix A, p. 89, item 58). He made to express his doubt in making decision. He seemed confuse in making the reason. James made the utterance with low intonation. He directly expressed his pessimism to continue his activity before leaving her along with Henry. It is in line with Brown and Levinson (1987) that state this subtypes will give a compensation to a hearer’s negative face by explicitly expressing doubt about the conditions of the appropriateness of a speaker’s speech act obtain.

**Dialogue 19**

**Setting**: Hotel room  
**Situation**: Henry wakes Samantha and Henry up because he wants to tell something  
**Participants**: Henry and James

James : Can everybody shut up and go to bed?  
Henry : James, come on, wake up.

(J/NP/01:41:43,944)

James, Henry, and Samantha went to Harvard University for joining a debate competition held by Harvard University. They already knew that Harvard debate team was the best team so far. They really had to prepare everything in detail. It made the team worried. They prepared the arguments perfectly. However, there was a problem within the team. Each of them had their own idea. They argued with each other because they thought that their own ideas were the best. James wanted to begin the debate with Gandhi but Henry insisted to begin with another figure. They fought each other stating their own ideas were the best. James believed that they would be the winner if they began the debate with
Gandhi. However, Henry was the captain of the debate team. He thought that he had the right to make the decision. The team was disappointed with his statement.

After leaving the hotel, Henry started to think. He finally realized that he made a mistake. He remembered Mr. Tolson’s advice for the team. Henry came back to the hotel and told Samantha and James about his decision. He woke Samantha and James up to tell them something. He thought James was ready to join the debate competition.

The dialogue above showed that James applied negative politeness strategy, i.e. being conventionally indirect (see Appendix A, p. 104, item 144). This strategy is conducted by using phrases and sentences that have contextually unambiguous meanings that are different from the literal meaning (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Here, James asked Henry to shut up and go to bed for instance.

To request Henry to shut up and go to bed, James used the words “can you shut up and go to bed?”.

Dialogue 20

**Setting**: Henry’s house

**Situation**: Mr. Tolson is talking to Henry because he has something to ask

**Participants**: Mr. Tolson and Henry

---

Henry  : Mr. Tolson, it was a rough night.

Mr. Tolson : **Yes, it was, Mr. Lowe, for all of us.**

(T/NP/01:28:34,355)

---

Mr. Tolson came to Henry’s house. He wanted to ask about Samantha. Mr. Tolson believed that it happened between Henry and Samantha. He thought Henry was the only reason that made Samantha walked out from the team.
Henry admitted that. Henry said that he was drunk at that time. He did not realize that he called another girl and went out with her. He felt sorry about that. He knew that Samantha walked out on him. He asked Mr. Tolson to keep Samantha on the team.

The conversation above showed that Mr. Tolson revealed negative politeness strategy, i.e. the use of indirect address terms as ‘you’ avoidance (see Appendix A, p. 101, item 129). Mr. Tolson softened his utterance by using “you” avoidance. He mentioned Mr. Lowe rather than you. It supports Brown and Levinson’s (1987) statement that say another way of indicating that a speaker does not want to impinge on a hearer is to phrase the FTA as if the agents were other than the speaker or not the speaker alone at least and the hearer were other than the hearer or only inclusive of the hearer.

Dialogue 21

**Setting**: James’ house
**Situation**: Mr. Farmer was waiting for James because he came home late
**Participants**: Mr. Farmer and James

James: *Sorry I'm late.*
Mr. Farmer: *You’re sorry?*  

(J/NP/00:37:57,488)  

James followed Mr. Tolson to the secret meeting. He did not realize that it already late at night. Realizing that his son had not gone home yet, Mr. Farmer was still waiting for James. Late at night, James came home and said sorry to his father. He felt guilty because he made his father wait for him. He made his father worried. Mr. Farmer got angry at him. He asked the reason why he came home late but James did not want to tell the truth because he had already promised Mr.
Tolson that he would not tell anybody about what happened that night. It made Mr. Farmer angry at him.

The conversation above showed that James applied off-record politeness strategy, i.e. apologizing (see Appendix A, p. 91, item 66). He tried to beg forgiveness from his father for making his father worried that he came home late. He actually did not know his father was waiting for him. He apologized to his father in normal intonation. He wanted to respect him because he was his father. It was also to prevent conflict with his father after doing a mistake. It is in line with Brown and Levinson (1987) that a speaker can indicate his or her reluctance to impinge on a hearer’s negative face by apologizing for doing an FTA.

From the analysis of politeness strategies’ utterances, the writer found the types of politeness strategies revealed by the characters in The Great Debaters movie were off record politeness strategy, bald-on record politeness strategy, positive politeness strategy, and negative politeness strategy.

B. Factors Affecting The Characters’ Politeness in Speaking

Language styles, registers and domains, slang and solidarity, and language and gender are factors that affect people in speaking politeness (Spolsky, 1998). In this research, the writer found the factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking in The Great Debaters movie (see Appendix B) were language and styles, registers and domains, and slang and solidarity. The followings are the discussion of each factor.
1. **Language and Styles**

The movie contained some formal and informal expressions in the characters’ utterances. Spolsky (1998) states that people can consciously choose how they try to use language by applying formal or informal expressions to people that they address. Further, Spolsky (1988) states that one’s is likely to conform to the favored and educated norms of the society if the situation is more formal and he or she is giving more attention to the language. Simply put, language style refers to different degree of formality.

The characters’ utterances in the movie contained formal and informal expressions. Mr. Tolson used formal expressions when he called his students in the class by saying “Now that Mr. Farmer has joined us, we can begin. Sit down, Mr. Farmer.” It showed how Mr. Tolson assimilated the context of the situation. He fully realized what he had to do in a situation in which he needed to engage a formal expression (see Appendix B, p. 105, item 1). He addressed his student by using “Mr.” or “Mrs.” indicating that he was being formal and polite. It also showed that he wanted to treat his students as a professional debater by creating a formal situation in the class. Another examples is in a scene when Mr. Tolson asked James to move quickly because he came late by saying, “Excuse me. We're waiting for you, Mr. Farmer” (see Appendix B, p. 105, item 2). James understood that Mr. Tolson wanted to make a formal situation in the class. He asked him to do the task politely. He answered Mr. Tolson by saying, “I’m going, Sir”. Both of them used formal expression since Mr. Tolson engaged in the situation where the
hearer would answer him in formal expression. The use of the word “excuse me” expresses formality.

In a scene when James requested Henry to shut up, he said, “Can everybody shut up and go to bed?” (see Appendix B, p. 108, item 29). The word “can” here represents formality instead of saying, “Shut up and go to bed”. The six characters in the movie employed formal language style in speaking. The formal language style is considered as negative politeness strategy based on the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987).

2. Registers and Domains

A register is a variety of language most likely to be used in a specific situation and with particular roles and statuses involved (Spolsky, 1998). A register is marked by choices of vocabulary and of other aspects of styles. Besides, domain is named usually for a place or an activity. Spolsky (1998) states that register and domain belong to social situations which are also a key to determine politeness in speaking.

The conversations or the activities of the characters in the movie mostly took place in the campus. The topic of the conversation was mostly related to debate competition. Most of the time, the conversations took place in the classroom when Mr. Tolson was lecturing, explaining about debate. Mr. Tolson, James, Henry, Samantha, and Burgees talked about debate or debate competition. Their conversations would run such as “You know, there's never been a female on the debating team, ever” (see Appendix B, p. 106, item 10) and “Tell me the irony in the name Bethlehem Steel Corporation” (see Appendix B, p. 106, item 9) or
“Harvard ain't going to debate us, not little old Wiley College in Marshall, Texas” (see Appendix B, p. 108, item 28).

As a debate team, even outside of the campus, Mr. Tolson, James, Henry, Samantha, and Burgees, would engage in the conversations with the same topic, i.e. debate. The domain in the *The Great Debaters* movie was mostly college. Classroom, then, was the place. The role-relationship included a lecturer and students. Debate was the common topic of the conversation.

3. **Slang and Solidarity**

Slang is important in establishing a social identity. Spolsky (1998) states that slang is used as special kinds of intimate or in-group speech. Solidarity was represented by Samantha when she gave James a compliment about his presence in the debate team. She gave a compliment by saying, “You're our best researcher, James. We could not do this without you.” (see Appendix B, p. 108, item 26). It showed that she fully realized that James was giving a huge impact on their debate team even though he was only the researcher of the team. Another example of showing solidarity was when Mr. Tolson gave a compliment to his students. He said to James, “You smell very good, Mr. Farmer” (see Appendix B, p. 105, item 5) and James answered by saying “thank you” to Mr. Farmer.

By choosing the form of language associated with a specific group, the characters were making a claim to be counted as a member of the same group. The characters in *The Great Debaters* movie engaged in the same topic which was related to debate competition. Their conversations were mostly related to debate competition. Although Mr. Tolson was a professor and a coach, there was no
power connection in their relationship. They were still engaged in the same topic and situation. The tendency to use positive politeness strategies, emphasizing closeness between speaker and hearer, can be seen as slang and solidarity.

From the discussion above, the writer thought that research question (1) and research question (2) had been answered. The writer found that the types of politeness strategies used by the characters in The Great Debaters movie were off-record politeness strategy, bald-on record politeness strategy, positive politeness strategy, and negative politeness strategy (see Appendix A). Furthermore, the factors affect the characters' politeness in speaking were language and styles, registers and domains, and slang and solidarity (see Appendix B).

To sum up, it could be noticed that the types of politeness strategies and the factors affecting the characters' politeness were related. The characters of The Great Debaters movie were affected by three factors when they revealed the four types of politeness strategies.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of three sections, namely conclusions, implications, and recommendations. The first section summarizes the research findings, the second section presents the involvement of the study in education, and the third offers the recommendations for the English learners, English teachers, and future researchers.

A. Conclusions

There were two research problems which need to be answered in this research as formulated in Chapter I. The first research problem was aimed to find out the types of politeness strategies used by the characters in The Great Debaters movie. The second research problem was aimed to find out the factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking.

The first research result showed that the types of politeness strategies used by the characters in The Great Debaters movie were off-record (indirect), bald-on-record (direct), positive politeness, and negative politeness (see Appendix A). The second research result showed that the factors affecting the characters’ politeness in speaking were language and styles, registers and domains, and slang and solidarity (see Appendix B). However, the characters did not show language
and gender factor in their conversation because they were mostly engaged in the same topic which was about debate competition.

B. Implications

As a teacher, it is important to teach students not only the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) but also the ethical values of those skills. Teaching and learning English, especially in speaking skill, should be done not only in the cognitive skills but also in the affective skills. Teachers can help their students to apply politeness through language in daily English conversation. The proper use of English should be applied in teaching and learning activities. Politeness can be one of the strategies to build a decent relationship between teachers and students.

The four politeness strategies can be applied in teaching and learning activities in the class. Teachers can give an example to students, for example when they ask students to do something. Instead of saying “close the door!” the teacher can use negative politeness strategies by saying, “could you close the door, please?” Furthermore, the teacher can teach how to respond after receiving a help. Students can say “thank you”. Teachers can give a compliment to students who are able to answer a question by applying positive politeness strategy such as “Brilliant!”.

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearers’ “face”. Brown and Levinson (1987) define face as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. Speakers try to
avoid making hearers feel uncomfortable. There are four types of politeness strategies, namely off-record, bald on-record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. Therefore, those four types of politeness strategies can be applied and implemented during speaking activities in front of the class. As English teachers, they can use some teaching strategies which can get students to be more active in speaking class. Before starting the class, the teachers can set a rule for today’s class. The teachers can ask the students to speak in English and use polite expressions during teaching and learning process. Thus, teachers will make certain rule that students speak English politely by setting the rule.

Implementing politeness in the process of teaching English speaking skills is important. Teachers can use some general topics which are dealing with politeness expressions. The teaching materials can be:

1. Asking, giving, and refusing opinion
2. Asking, giving, and denying information
3. Asking, granting, and denying permission
4. Asking, offering, and responding to advice and suggestion
5. Expressing and responding to gratitude

The example of the teaching materials is “expressing and responding to gratitude”, which has some expressions learned by students, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressing Gratitude</th>
<th>Responding to Gratitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you very much</td>
<td>You’re welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to say thank you to …</td>
<td>No problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t mention it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, applying off-record, bald-on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness strategy during the teaching and learning process in the classroom can positively be a good example for students. Teachers can say
indirectly and use “could” or “please” when asking for help, such as “could you please clean the whiteboard?” which refers to a negative politeness or giving a compliment which belongs to a positive politeness strategy, to show appreciation by stating, “your presentation is very interesting.”

The appropriate politeness strategy will create a good habit if it is applied in daily conversations. In short, teachers and students should apply the appropriate politeness strategies by considering the context of the situation. As a teacher, giving the various models of politeness expressions in daily conversations of teaching and learning process will help students in building a good manner by applying the appropriate expressions. Moreover, they will feel more comfortable in interacting with their teachers and other students since they are able to engage in a polite way of speaking.

C. Recommendations

The following recommendations are for English teachers, English learners, readers, and future researchers. First, for the English teachers, the writer hopes that the study will help teachers be more aware of the way they speak to others, especially when they teach in the classroom. They will be more prudent in selecting their words. Teacher can use positive politeness strategy such as “can you clean the whiteboard, please?” In addition, this study will encourage teachers to assess their students’ proficiency in the sociolinguistic aspect, notably politeness.
Second, the writer hopes that the study will give some benefits to English language learners who study sociolinguistics and pragmatics. English language learners will understand the definition of politeness strategies and the factors affecting someone’s politeness in speaking as those are elaborated in this study. Writer also hopes this study will help English language education learners apply their English proficiency appropriately in their teaching and learning practice. As a result, English language education learners will be able to speak English politely.

Third, the writer hopes the study will provide useful information related to politeness for its readers. Hopefully, it will enrich their knowledge and understanding of politeness. Readers will also understand the meaning of politeness itself, the politeness strategies, and the factors affecting people in speaking politely. Therefore, readers are able to apply politeness behavior in speaking with others.

Fourth, for future researchers, the writer expects the study will be a good reference for future researchers in conducting a research on pragmatics under the same topic. The study will also give valuable information related to speaking politeness.
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APPENDIX A

Politeness Strategies Applied by the Characters of *The Great Debaters* Movie

Legends:
- **OR**: Off Record
- **BOR**: Bald-On Record
- **PP**: Positive Politeness
- **NP**: Negative Politeness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>T/OR&amp;PP 00:08:06,265</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>I cut my teeth as a black raccoon-</em> Henry: <em>for implements of battle.</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Meet me after class.</em></td>
<td>√ BOR PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson’s utterance was incomplete. He left the implication of “hanging in the air.” The second utterance showed that he was directly asked Henry to meet him after the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>T&amp;H/PP 00:08:31,524</td>
<td>Henry: <em>What's a professor doing in the middle of the night dressed like a cotton-chopper?</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>What is a student doing in the middle of the night throwing his life away?</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Henry and Mr. Tolson, both of them asked for reason of something happened last night when Mr. Tolson helped Henry to run away from his problem with the man in the bar. The “?” punctuation mark showed that it was a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>H/PP</td>
<td>Henry: <em>It's funny, I thought I was defending</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry was pessimistic when he said the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:08:39,332</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:08:43,803</td>
<td>T/PP 4.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson : I remember you. Couple of years ago. Then you disappeared. <strong>What happened?</strong> Henry : I come and go whenever it suits me.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Henry for an answer about a couple years ago when he met Henry. He asked Henry a reason. He asked for answer by using WH-question; “What”. The word “what” was used to ask for information about people or things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:08:53,846</td>
<td>T/PP 5.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson : Suspensions? Henry : Leaves of absence.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked for an information from Henry. He declared something which showed that he was hedging an opinion. The “?” punctuation mark showed that it was a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:08:57,817</td>
<td>T/PP 6.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson : Why'd you come back? Henry : School's the only place you can read all day. Except prison.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked the reason to Henry why he would come back to school after he was disappear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:09:06,225</td>
<td>T&amp;H/BOR&amp; PP 7.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson : I want you to come by my house tonight, 7:30. Corner of June and Campus. Henry : Why would I do that?</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson was directly asked Henry to come by his house at 7.30. Meanwhile, the second utterance showed that Henry answer Mr. Tolson’s request by asking for reason why would he do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:09:15,201</td>
<td>H/PP 8.</td>
<td>Henry : You sure you want somebody like me?</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Henry asked Mr. Tolson about his request. He wanted to make sure whether Mr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: No. That's why you're trying out. 7.30. June and Campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolson was really asked him or not. Henry used negative question which presumed “yes” as an answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T/BOR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Sit down, Mr. Farmer. Not right there. Over there.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson said to James to sit. His utterance showed task-oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J/BOR</td>
<td>James: Good evening, Mr. Tolson.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>James greeted Mr. Tolson when he came into the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T/BOR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Excuse me. We're waiting for you, Mr. Farmer.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked James to move quickly because the whole class were waiting for him. The sentence “excuse me” was used to soften the request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: You smell very good, Mr. Farmer.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson gave a complement to James because he smelt very good when he came into the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Negative means that you are what?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tolson gave a complement to Burgees because he could answer his question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: I am deeply moved. What's your name?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson was giving his sympathy to Samantha when he heard that she wanted to school in Willey College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>T/BOR 00:12:12,778</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Book? Samantha: With an &quot;e&quot;. Mr. Tolson: Arise, Miss Booke, With an &quot;e&quot;.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Samantha to come in front of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>T/PP 00:12:23,122</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: You know, there's never been a female on the debating team, ever. Samantha: Yes, sir. I know that.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson told to Samantha that there was never been a female on the debating team ever. Samantha, as the hearer was drag as a participant into the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>T&amp;S/PP&amp;OR 00:12:28,894</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: What makes you think you should be the first? Samantha: Because, sir, I am just as qualified as-- Mr. Tolson: Quit stammering, Miss Booke.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Samantha the reason that made she thought that she should be the first female debater. Meanwhile when Samantha spoke, Mr. Tolson was interrupting. It left the utterance was incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>S/OR 00:12:35,468</td>
<td>Samantha: My gender has nothing-- Mr. Tolson: &quot;Resolved: Welfare discourages hard work.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Samantha’s utterance was incomplete. It made the utterance hanging in the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>T/BOR 00:12:40,105</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: You'll argue the negative. Samantha: All right.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Samantha to argue the negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>S/OR 00:12:56,755</td>
<td>Samantha: Most of the New Deal goes to children, anyway, and to the handicapped, and to old people-- Mr. Tolson: Is that fact, or conjecture?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Samantha’s utterance was incomplete. It made the utterance hanging in the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <strong>Speak up.</strong> Samantha: It is a fact.</td>
<td>OR: √, BOR: √, PP: √, NP: √</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Samantha to speak up because Samantha was only mumbling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <strong>Of the United States?</strong> Samantha: Yes, sir.</td>
<td>OR: √, BOR: √, PP: √, NP: √</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked for an answer from Samantha about the information. The “?” punctuation mark showed that it was a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>T/NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <strong>Oh, a radio broadcast.</strong> Samantha: Yes.</td>
<td>OR: √, BOR: √, PP: √, NP: √</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson was pessimistic about his statement. He used “oh” but he was not taking full responsibility for the truth of the utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>S/OR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <strong>Any other sources?</strong> Samantha: <strong>Well—</strong></td>
<td>OR: √, BOR: √, PP: √, NP: √</td>
<td>Samantha’s utterance was incomplete. It made the utterance hanging in the air. She was not sure about her answer. She took a time to think before answering the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <strong>&quot;Syllogism&quot;?</strong> Mr. Tolson: Your logic fell apart.</td>
<td>OR: √, BOR: √, PP: √, NP: √</td>
<td>Samantha asked Mr. Tolson about the definition of syllogism because she did not know it. The “?” punctuation mark showed that it was a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>T/BOR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <strong>Tell us your name.</strong> Henry: I'm Henry Lowe. With an &quot;e&quot;</td>
<td>OR: √, BOR: √, PP: √, NP: √</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Henry to tell his name first before he started to speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>H/BOR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: You speak a few words, a pertinent quote from world literature. Henry: <em>Go ahead.</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson gave a topic for Henry. Henry replied “go ahead” to Mr. Tolson which indicated that he was ready to speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Henry: &quot;I heard the old, old men say, all that is beautiful drifts away, like the waters.&quot; Mr. Tolson: <em>Very good.</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson gave a compliment to Henry because he could answer the question well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>T/BOR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>History. And name the author this time.</em> Henry: <em>History is a nightmare, from which I am trying to awake. James Joyce.</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked Henry to answer the questions based on the clue from him. He should also mention the name of the author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>H/OR</td>
<td>Henry: <em>I love D.H. Lawrence, Have you ever read--</em> Mr. Tolson: Mr. Farmer.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Henry’s utterance was incomplete. Mr. Tolson interrupted him while he was speaking. Mr. Tolson spoke to James because he was speaking while Henry spoke in the hot spot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 31. | T/BOR | Mr. Tolson: *Tell me the irony in the name "Bethlehem Steel Corporation."
James: Bethlehem is the birthplace of Jesus, Prince of Peace and Bethlehem Steel makes weapons of war.                                      | √                     | Mr. Tolson asked James to tell to the class about poet because James spoke when Henry was speaking in front of the class. Mr. Tolson noticed and asked him to answer his question as the punishment. |
<p>| 32. | T/PP  | James: Bethlehem is the birthplace of Jesus, Prince of Peace and Bethlehem Steel makes weapons of war.                                                                                                          |                       | Mr. Tolson gave a compliment to James because he could answer well even it was a punishment but he still gave a reward for                                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>J/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>Very good. Sit down.</em></td>
<td>OR, PP</td>
<td>James.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:15:43,822</td>
<td>James: <em>Tolson's tough, isn't he?</em> Samantha: He sure is.</td>
<td></td>
<td>James sook agreement to Samantha about Mr. Tolson. He was hedging opinion from her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>I'm James.</em> Samantha: <em>Is your father Dr. James Farmer?</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Samantha was optimistic when she asked James about his father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:15:49,294</td>
<td>James: <em>Seven languages.</em> Samantha: <em>&quot;Seven languages.&quot;</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samantha repeated James’ utterance. Samantha was shocked when James said that his father could speak seven languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>He must be the smartest man in Texas.</em> James: <em>Well, that's not saying much.</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Samantha gave compliment to James’ father because he could speak seven languages. She was also optimistic when she gave the complement. She was really sure about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:16:03,776</td>
<td>James: <em>So why do you want to be on the team?</em> Samantha: <em>I think it would be good training.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>James asked for getting the answer from Samantha about the reason of being on the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:16:07,946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>J/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>Bein' a lawyer.</em> James: <em>Lawyer? That's great.</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>James gave a compliment to Samantha for her dream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:16:13,919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>J/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>Bein' a lawyer.</em> James: <em>Lawyer? That's great.</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>James gave a compliment to Samantha for her dream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:16:20,626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>You know how many Negro women practice law in this state?</em></td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>Samantha dragged James as a participant into the conversation. She wanted to give information about women who practiced law but James had already known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:16:25,664</td>
<td>James: <em>Two.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>One of them's my aunt.</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Samantha gave a complement to James because she thought it was cool having an aunt which was one of Negro lawyer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:16:29,935</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>Well, look at you, Mr. Farmer.</em></td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>H/OR</td>
<td>Henry: <em>Miss Booke with an &quot;e,&quot; she fought back…</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Henry’s utterance was incomplete. He wanted to give a complement but Samantha thought that she lost. She replied Henry’s statement before he finished his utterance. The speaker left the implication of “hanging in the air”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:16:55,194</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>And lost!</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>T/OR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>The debaters will be Mr. Hamilton Burgess from last year's team–</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Burges was so excited because he could be one of the debate team. His enthusiasm was made Mr. Tolson’s utterance incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:18:08,367</td>
<td>Burges: <em>Yea!</em></td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>Dad.</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer called his son as “junior.” It showed that Mr. Farmer used familiar address terms in group identity makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:18:41,133</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: <em>Junior.</em></td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>Not believing? Doubt?</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer said thank you to James because he could answer his question well. He gave a complement to James.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:18:48,874</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: <em>That's it. Thank you, Junior.</em></td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>F/PP 00:19:08,260</td>
<td>James: I made the debate team. Mr. Farmer: Well, congratulations.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>F/PP 00:19:27,446</td>
<td>James: She wants to be a lawyer. Mr. Farmer: A lawyer?</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>F/PP 00:19:29,748</td>
<td>James: She's very intelligent. Mr. Farmer: Is she pretty?</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>F/OR</td>
<td>F/OR 00:19:37,322</td>
<td>James: I don't know. I never really noticed. Mr. Farmer: Because extracurricular activities like the debate team are fine, but you must not take your eye off the ball, son.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>F/PP 00:19:46,265</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: Hmph. So what do we do here? James: We do what we have to do, so we can do what we want to do.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 50. | F/BOR 00:19:58,477 | Mr. Farmer: *So get to it.*  
James: *Yes, sir.* | OR: ✅ | Mr. Farmer asked James about his activity. James said that he had to do his homework. Mr. Farmer asked James to do the task. |
| 51. | J/OR 00:23:57,749 | James: *Dad--*  
Mr. Farmer: *I told you to get in the car.* | OR: ✅ | On their way to go vacation, Farmer’s car hit a pig. The whites who owned the pig was angry. They asked for money to Mr. Farmer. Mr. Farmer asked to get in the car but James run out. When James wanted to say something, his father was angry at him. |
| 52. | J/OR 00:25:48,493 | James: *He was the first Negro Ph.--*  
Mr. Tolson: *One thing we don't know about your father, Mr. Farmer.* | OR: ✅, BOR: ✅ | In the hall, Mr. Tolson asked the members of the debate team to tell about their background. It was James’ turn. He should tell about one thing that they did not know about his father. Before James finished his utterance, Mr. Tolson interrupted him because he made a fault. |
| 53. | T&H/BOR& PP 00:26:09,714 | Mr. Tolson: *Tell us about your father.*  
Henry: *Why don't you tell us something about your father?* | OR: ✅, BOR: ✅ | Mr. Tolson asked Henry to tell about his father but Henry replied him by asking a reason why he should tell something about his father. Henry also asked Mr. Tolson to tell them about his father. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>We're trying to get to know each other, Mr. Lowe.</em> Henry: I was trying to get to know you, Mr. Tolson.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson included the hearers in the activity by using the word <em>we</em>. He explained to Henry the purpose of getting such activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>H/PP</td>
<td>Henry: <em>Are we not engaged in a debate right now?</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>All right.</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Henry included the hearer in the activity by using the word <em>we</em>. He insisted Mr. Tolson to tell about his father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>Want to dance?</em> James: <em>Yes.</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Samantha offered an invitation to James. She invited James to dance with her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>You're a good dancer.</em> James: <em>Thank you. I-- I practice in my room.</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Samantha gave a compliment to James. She said that he was a good dancer even she was not really sure but she appreciated it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>J/NP</td>
<td>James: <em>Mm-hmm. I guess I better go get me some punch.</em> Henry: <em>Here, you can have mine if you want.</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>James was unconfident talking with Henry because he knew that Henry was in love with Samantha. James did not take full responsibility to the truth of the utterance. He was pessimistic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 59. | H/PP | Henry: *You know I can take you to a place that plays real music, right?* Samantha: *I'm not leaving here, Henry.* | √ | Henry was flirting to Samantha. He wanted to go to somewhere else with Samantha. The word *right* showed that he was optimistic with his utterance. He also drew Samantha as a participant in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: What are you doing out here? Huh? James: I saw you-- I was walking by your house</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>James: and I saw you dressed funny. Mr. Tolson: I'm dressed like them, son.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>J/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Not even my wife knows about this. James: I won't tell anybody, I promise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>J&amp;T/PP&amp;OR</td>
<td>James: I promise on a stack of Bibles-- Jesus... I won't tell anybody. Mr. Tolson: Come on.</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: Junior? Are you just going to stand there? James: No, sir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>J/NP</td>
<td>James: <em>Sorry I'm late.</em> Mr. Farmer: <em>You're sorry?</em></td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>James apologized to his father because he went home late. He begged forgiveness to his father in the beginning of his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>I can't tell you, sir.</em> Mr. Farmer: <em>Junior-- where were you?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer used a familiar address to call his son. He called James as <em>junior.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>I can't tell you, sir.</em> Mr. Farmer: <em>Why not?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>James still did not want to tell the truth to his father. Mr. Farmer kept asking him the reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: <em>You were with that girl.</em> James: <em>No.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer was really sure with his statement. He thought that James was going out with Samantha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: <em>Because you're 14 years old, Junior. You've got plenty of time for girls later.</em> James: <em>I wasn't with Samantha.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer used a familiar address to call his son. He called James as <em>junior.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>James: <em>What about school?</em> Mr. Farmer: <em>Don't go questioning what I just said, boy!</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer did not let James to go out from home. Though James kept talking and made his father got angry. The word <em>do not</em> with rising intonation showed urgency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: <em>And don't raise your voice!</em> James: <em>I'm not raising my voice!</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer and James kept arguing. The word <em>do not</em> with rising intonation showed urgency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 73. | 634 00:39:59,643 | **James**: Like you apologized to that pig farmer?  
**Mr. Farmer**: What did you say, boy? | √ | Mr. Farmer was angry with James’ statement. He asked James to repeat his utterance. |
| 73. | 00:42:14,478 | **James**: One week?  
**Mr. Tolson**: That's right. | √ | James repeated Mr. Tolson’s statement with raising his voice. He was a little bit shock. |
| 74. | 679 00:42:16,413 | **Samantha**: I thought Prairie View was first.  
**Mr. Tolson**: Prairie View is tough, so I thought we needed a warm-up. | √ | Mr. Tolson and the debate members were talking about the next competition. Samantha gave her opinion about it. Then, Mr. Tolson also gave his opinion but he was pessimistic with his opinion. He used the word “thought.” |
| 75. | 681 00:42:21,085 | **Burgee**: With the best Negro college in the state?  
**Mr. Tolson**: That's right, Mr. Burgess. | √ | Burgee repeated after Mr. Tolson’s. He was shocked after heard that their team would compete with the best Negro college in the state. |
| 76. | 683 00:42:25,489 | **Mr. Tolson**: Does that frighten you?  
**Burgee**: Yes, sir. | √ | Mr. Tolson noticed that Burgee was frightened with the news. He asked Burgee to make sure whether it was true or not. |
| 77. | T/BOR 00:42:28,292 | **Samantha**: One week's not enough time to write our arguments.  
**Mr. Tolson**: You do the research. I'll write the arguments. | √ | Mr. Tolson gave the task to the members of debate team to do the research for the next competition. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>T/BOR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>And you deliver them, Mr. Lowe.</em> Henry: <em>What the hell do I look like, a mailman?</em></td>
<td>OR: √ BOR:  PP: √ NP:</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson gave task to Henry to deliver the arguments in the next competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>H/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>In theory, you look like a student.</em> Henry: <em>So what you're saying is I'm not capable.</em></td>
<td>OR:  BOR: √ PP:  NP: √</td>
<td>Henry was angry with Mr. Tolson’s statement. He thought that Mr. Tolson did not believe with his ability. Henry was optimistic with his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>H/OR</td>
<td>Henry: <em>How do I know you write--</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>I write the arguments!</em></td>
<td>OR: √ BOR:  PP:  NP:</td>
<td>Henry’s utterance was incomplete. He did not purposefully finish his utterance. Mr. Tolson interrupted him when he was arguing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>J/OR</td>
<td>James: <em>Aren't they--?</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Anglo-Saxon? Yes. Yes.</em></td>
<td>OR: √ BOR:  PP:  NP:</td>
<td>James’ utterance was incomplete. He did not purposefully finish his utterance. Mr. Tolson interrupted him when he was thinking the name of the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>T/NP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>University of Oklahoma!</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Not University of Oklahoma. Oklahoma City University.</em></td>
<td>OR:  BOR:  PP: √ NP:</td>
<td>Samantha was wrong in mentioning the name of the university. Mr. Tolson was directly mention the right name of the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>H/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>The debate will take place at an off-campus site.</em> Henry: <em>Wait. An off-campus site? Why?</em></td>
<td>OR:  BOR:  PP: √ NP:</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson announced that the debate would be held at an off-campus site. Henry asked Mr. Tolson the reason of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>This is a great opportunity.</em> Mr. Tolson: Thank you very much.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Samantha really exaggerated with the news. She used the word <em>great</em> to show her enthusiasm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>H&amp;J/PP&amp;OR</td>
<td>Henry: <em>Master is going to give us a crumb off his plate, huh?</em> James: <em>What? Wha--</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Henry used the word <em>huh</em> to seek for an agreement. James was shocked with Henry’s statement, so he could not finish his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>J/NP</td>
<td>James: <em>I think Lowe here is afraid.</em> Henry: <em>What am I afraid of, James?</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>James was pessimistic in giving his opinion about Henry. He was not sure with his opinion. The word <em>think</em> showed that he did not take full responsibility for the truth of his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>J/NP</td>
<td>James: <em>I think you're afraid to debate white people.</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Anglo-Saxons.</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>James gave his opinion about Henry. He thought that Henry was afraid to debate the white people. The word <em>think</em> showed that he was not taking full responsibility for the truth of his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>T/NP</td>
<td>Burgees: <em>What's going on?</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Maybe you should ask the sheriff.</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Burgees asked Mr. Tolson about the situation. Mr. Tolson was not sure with his opinion. The word <em>maybe</em> showed that he was not taking full responsibility for the truth of his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: <em>My politics are my business.</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Burgees kept asking Mr. Tolson about the situation. Mr. Tolson was not sure with his opinion. The word <em>maybe</em> showed that he was not taking full responsibility for the truth of his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>T/OR</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: You're not--</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson wanted to explain to Burgees about the incident but he did not want to hear the explanation and keep telling what he knew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:51:32,502</td>
<td>Burgees: If my parents find--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>B/OR</td>
<td>Burgees: Mr. Tolson, please. Just tell me you're not a communist. Otherwise--</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson interrupted Burgees because he kept asking him with the questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:51:37,641</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Otherwise what?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>H/BOR</td>
<td>Henry: Meet me outside in five minutes.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Henry asked Samantha to meet him outside the house. Henry was directly asked Samantha to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:58:15,738</td>
<td>Samantha: And then what?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Dr. Farmer.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. farmer gave a compliment to Mr. Henry for his succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:58:56,813</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: Congratulations, Melvin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>F/OR</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: You've put us on the map.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer used metaphor in his utterance. You have put us on the map here meant that he could make the Willey College debate team famous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:59:01,251</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Well, your son is doing a great job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: His research is impeccable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>F/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: They'd have to catch me first.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson did not want to speak the truth. Mr. Farmer was really serious about it. He used this rather than that. He used proximal rather than distal demonstrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00:59:23,940</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: This is serious, Melvin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>F/BOR 00:59:40,023</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Jesus was a radical. Mr. Farmer: Careful.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson and Mr. Farmer were arguing about Mr. Tolson’s activity outside college. Mr. Farmer warned Mr. Tolson to be careful at his utterance. He used the word <em>careful</em> to show urgency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>F/NP 00:59:43,593</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: Mental institutions are filled with people who have confused themselves with Jesus Christ. Mr. Tolson: I’m not confused.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer used nominalize to distance the actor and added formality. He removed an actor from doing or being something. He did not mention Mr. Tolson directly but Mr. Tolson knew exactly that Mr. Farmer’s utterance was for him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>F/PP 00:59:47,997</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: You're convinced you're Jesus Christ now? Mr. Tolson: No.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer was very optimistic in asking about Mr. Tolson’s utterance. He wanted to make sure Mr. Tolson’s utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>F/PP 01:00:08,751</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: James was there that night, wasn't he? Mr. Tolson: He was not with me.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer was hedging an opinion. He was very optimistic that James was with Mr. Tolson that night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>T/PP 01:00:14,624</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: Is he involved in this? Mr. Tolson: Of course not, James.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer and Mr. Tolson were still arguing about James. Mr. Tolson was very optimistic that he was not with James at that night. The word <em>of course</em> showed sincerity hedge. He was really not with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>T/PP 01:00:24,767</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: I'm discussing it with you right now, and I don't feel like I'm getting a straight answer. Mr. Tolson: You're getting a straight answer.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer was disappointed with Mr. Tolson because the answer was not answered his question. Mr. Tolson repeated Mr. Farmer's utterance to support his answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>F/NP 01:00:29,605</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: I think that you were there with him that night. Mr. Tolson: He was not with me.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer was not really sure with his utterance. The sentence showed that he did not take full responsibility for the truth of his utterance. He thought that Mr. Tolson was going with James at that night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>F/PP 01:00:33,142</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer: He's a 14-year-old boy. Mr. Tolson: I understand that.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The sentence showed that Mr. Farmer was really optimistic with his utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>S/PP 01:02:19,882</td>
<td>Samantha: You seem so calm, so peaceful. Henry: It's what the lake does to me.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Samantha gave a compliment to Henry because he was so calm and peaceful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>H/BOR 01:05:09,819</td>
<td>Henry: Lord. Samantha: What?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Henry shocked at that time because the school band was in his house. The word Lord showed urgency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>S&amp;H/NP</td>
<td>Samantha: I thought you said nobody ever</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Samantha was pessimistic with her utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 111 | S/PP | 01:07:05,668 | Samantha : You're our best researcher, James.  
James : You could not do this without you.  
James : You do plenty without me. | √ | Samantha was optimistic in saying that James was the best researcher. She made James feeling good. She attended to James' wants. |
| 112 | S/BOR| 01:07:21,083 | Samantha : James!  
James : What? | √ | Samantha was really angry. She shouted at him to make him calm. It used to show the urgency situation. |
<p>| 113 | S/NP | Samantha : I don't want to lose you                                  |                       | √ | Samantha acted as a weak. She said that |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01:07:31,994</td>
<td>01:07:31,994</td>
<td><strong>friendship.</strong> James: How can you lose something that you never had?</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>she did not want to lose their friendship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>S/BOR 01:08:12,234</td>
<td>Henry: Where is he? Samantha: Calm down, Henry.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>Samantha asked Henry to calm down. Henry was shocked because the sheriffs took Mr. Tolson to the prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>H/PP 01:08:16,806</td>
<td>Henry: They didn't do nothing to you, did they? Samantha: No, we're fine.</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Henry was worried to Samantha. He used the phrase <em>did they</em> to seek an agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>T/PP 01:13:02,758</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: Anyone know who Antaeus was? Henry: Sure. He was a gigantic wrestler in Greek mythology.</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson presupposed hearers’ knowledge by asking about Antaeus. It showed the use of in-group code. He assumed that the hearers understood and shared the association of that code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>S/PP 01:13:42,331</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson: My message to you is to never quit. Samantha: We are not quitting.</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Samantha repeated a part of Mr. Tolson’s utterance. It showed that she emphasized the part of the utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>T/BOR 01:13:47,603</td>
<td>James: What do you want us to do? Mr. Tolson: Debate Harvard.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>James was confused what needed to do without their coach. Mr. Tolson gave a task to them to debate Harvard or simply said win the competition without him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Henry : Mr. Tolson, sir, with all due respect, um, Harvard ain't going to debate us, not little old Wiley College in Marshall, Texas. Mr. Tolson : They know who we are, Henry.</td>
<td>OR  BOR  PP  NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson used the word we in his utterance. He drew the hearer as a participant on the conversation. Mr. Tolson gave Henry, as a captain in the team, a big support to debate Harvard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>S/PP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson : I've been writing them letters, sending them articles. Samantha : But how do we get a letter back?</td>
<td>OR  BOR  PP  NP</td>
<td>Samantha used the word we in her utterance. She drew Mr. Tolson as a participant in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>H/OR</td>
<td>Henry : You show me where to look because it's not on-- Mr. Tolson : 127 near Waxahachie.</td>
<td>OR  BOR  PP  NP</td>
<td>Henry’s utterance was incomplete. The utterance left the implication of “hanging in the air.” Before finishing the utterance, Mr. Tolson interrupted him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>T/PP</td>
<td>Henry : It's not there. Mr. Tolson : It's there. You just can't find it.</td>
<td>OR  BOR  PP  NP</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson repeated Henry’s utterance. He gave the stress on the sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>J/BOR</td>
<td>James : Shut up. Let's go. Henry : Hey, preacher boy.</td>
<td>OR  BOR  NP  PP</td>
<td>James asked Henry to shut up. Henry was drunk. He made a noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>H/PP</td>
<td>Henry : Where are we going? James : Back to our room.</td>
<td>OR  BOR  NP  PP</td>
<td>Henry used the word we in his utterance. He drew James as a participant in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>J/PP</td>
<td>James : So it doesn't matter how good we are, does it? Henry : What are you talk-- What?</td>
<td>OR  BOR  NP  PP</td>
<td>James used the word we in his sentence. He drew Henry as a participant in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>J/PP 01:22:04,199</td>
<td>Henry : What are you talking about? James : I mean we're just a bunch of Negroes debating each other on subjects we all agree on.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>T/PP 01:23:09,931</td>
<td>James : Where's Samantha? Mr. Tolson : She's not going with us.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>T/PP 01:28:15,636</td>
<td>Henry : I just wanted to show you I could write, too. Mr. Tolson : That's good. Thank you.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>T/NP 01:28:34,355</td>
<td>Henry : Mr. Tolson, it was a rough night. Mr. Tolson : Yes, it was, Mr. Lowe, for all of us.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>H/PP 01:28:40,962</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson : And she walked out on us at the last minute. Henry : No, sir. She did not walk out on us.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>S/OR 01:29:10,358</td>
<td>Samantha : Mr. Tolson, I owe you and my teammates-- Mr. Tolson : You're late. Come in. Sit down.</td>
<td>OR BOR PP NP</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>H/BOR 01:30:20,595</td>
<td>Henry: <em>Come on! Train's leaving.</em> James: <em>Coming!</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>J/PP 01:31:10,311</td>
<td>James: <em>Why didn't you tell us this before?</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Because I didn't want to hear your arguments.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>S/PP 01:31:34,735</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>What are we supposed to do without you?</em> Mr. Tolson: <em>Win.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>S/PP 01:35:51,659</td>
<td>Samantha: <em>We nibble. We do not devour.</em> James: <em>How do you know?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>J/PP 01:37:12,406</td>
<td>Henry: <em>They're setting us up to lose.</em> James: <em>We can't win without him.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>J&amp;S/PP&amp;OR 01:37:46,774</td>
<td>James: <em>but we'll save it for the rebuttal.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Politeness Strategies</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samantha: <em>We're going to save the best for last because you have to leave the audience--</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>to Henry, Samantha, and himself as a debate team. Samantha was also used the word <em>we</em> but her utterance was incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>H/NP</td>
<td>James: <em>It's-- It's obvious to me that we should begin the debate with Gandhi.</em> Henry: <em>That's exactly why I won't do it.</em></td>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>Henry was really optimistic with his statement. The word <em>exactly</em> showed “for sure” strengthen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:38:17,972</td>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>J/OR</td>
<td>James: <em>You're &quot;in charge&quot; does not mean--</em> Henry: <em>So I can make decisions.</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:38:40,194</td>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>James’ utterance was incomplete. Henry interrupted him when he was speaking. It left the implication of hanging in the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>J/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>We're not starting with Gandhi!</em> Henry: <em>Yes, we are!</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:38:43,230</td>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>James used the word <em>we</em>. James included Samantha and Henry as a participant in the activity. <em>We</em> referred to their debate team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>J/OR</td>
<td>James: <em>Do you hear yourself? You sound like a kid!</em> Henry: <em>Well, you are a kid!</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:38:45,799</td>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>James, Samantha and Henry fought about Gandhi for debate competition. James was angry. He asked using rhetorical question with no intention of obtaining an answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>J/PP</td>
<td>James: <em>I'm an idiot?</em> Henry: <em>Yes!</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:38:51,038</td>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>James repeated Henry’s statement. He said that James was an idiot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>H&amp;S/PP&amp;OR</td>
<td>Henry: <em>You're beautiful when you're asleep.</em> Samantha: <em>Henry, I--</em> Henry: <em>Yeah, I know, I know.</em></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:41:22,256</td>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>J/NP</td>
<td>James : <em>Can everybody shut up and go to bed?</em> &lt;br&gt;Henry: James, come on, wake up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>H/BOR</td>
<td>Henry : <em>Come on, James, get up.</em> &lt;br&gt;James : <em>What?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>H/PP</td>
<td>Henry : <em>You're crazy.</em> &lt;br&gt;James : <em>At 14, you're just as good as me.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>H/PP</td>
<td>Henry : <em>The judges will love you.</em> &lt;br&gt;Samantha : <em>No. No. You can't quit.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

Factors Affecting The Characters’ Politeness Found in *The Great Debaters* Movie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>Now that Mr. Farmer has joined us, we can begin. Sit down, Mr. Farmer.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson engaged the conversation in a formal way. He used “Mr” to address James, his student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>Excuse me. We're waiting for you, Mr. Farmer.</td>
<td>Language Styles</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson engaged the conversation in a formal way. He used “Mr.” to address his student, James.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Yes, sir.</td>
<td>Register</td>
<td>Since Mr. Tolson was a professor in Willey College, the students called him “sir” or “Mr. Tolson”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Good evening, Mr. Tolson.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>James greeted Mr. Tolson. James spoke in the formal way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>You smell very good, Mr. Farmer.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson gave a compliment to James. He spoke to James in the formal ways and called him “Mr. Farmer”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Thank you, sir.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Since Mr. Tolson was a professor in Willey College, the students called him “sir”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>You're very welcome.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson engaged the conversation in the formal way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>Brilliant, Mr. Burgess.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson gave a compliment to Burgess. He used “Mr.” to address his student, Burgess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>Tell me the irony in the name &quot;Bethlehem Steel Corporation.”</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson asked his student to explain a certain topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>You know, there's never been a female on the debating team, ever.</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>The topic of the conversation related to college, specifically debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>You'll argue the negative.</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>The topic of the conversation related to college, specifically debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dad</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>James called his father by using “dad”. The conversation took place in the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer</td>
<td>That's it. Thank you, Junior.</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer called his son by using “junior”. The conversation happened in their house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>We're trying to get to know each other, Mr. Lowe.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson ran the conversation in formal way. He used “Mr.” to call his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>I was trying to get to know you, Mr. Tolson.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Since Mr. Tolson was a professor in Willey College, the students called him “sir” or “Mr. Tolson”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong></td>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>You're a good dancer.</td>
<td>Slang and Solidarity</td>
<td>Samantha gave a compliment to James even she did not say it seriously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer</td>
<td>Junior? Are you just going to stand there?</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer used “junior” to call his son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer</td>
<td>Because you're 14 years old, Junior, You've got plenty of time for girls later.</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer used “junior” to call his son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer</td>
<td>Don't go questioning what I just said, boy!</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer used “boy” to call his son. For him, James was still a boy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>You do the research. I'll write the arguments.</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>The word research and arguments showed Mr. Tolson revealed register and domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>My politics are my business, Mr. Burgess, and I promise you that they will not endanger the team.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson spoke to Burgees in a formal way. He addressed Burgees using “Mr.” even he was his student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Farmer</td>
<td>Congratulations, Melvin.</td>
<td>Slang and Solidarity</td>
<td>Mr. Farmer called Mr. Tolson as Melvin. It showed that they have a close relationship, a friendship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>Well, your son is doing a great job. His research is impeccable.</td>
<td>Slang and Solidarity</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson and Mr. Farmer talked about Mr. Farmer’s son, James.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>We’re gonna go get Mr. Tolson and Samantha, head back to the campus, and have a pep rally.</td>
<td>Slang and Solidarity</td>
<td>James spoke to Henry in informal way because they had a close relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>You know what? You go get Tolson, and I'll meet up with y'all later on campus.</td>
<td>Slang and Solidarity</td>
<td>Henry used a slang word “y’all”. It showed slang and solidarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong></td>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>You're our best researcher, James. We could not do this without you.</td>
<td>Slang and Solidarity</td>
<td>Samantha had a close relationship with James. She gave a compliment to James. It showed that they had a close relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td>Yes, it was, Mr. Lowe, for all of us.</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Mr. Tolson engaged the conversation in a formal way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Harvard ain't going to debate us, not little old Wiley College in Marshall, Texas.</td>
<td>Register and Domain</td>
<td>The word Harvard and debate indicated specific activity and name of a college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29.</strong></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Can everybody shut up and go to bed?</td>
<td>Language Style</td>
<td>Instead of saying “shut up and go to bed”, James used the word can to ask for something.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>