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ABSTRACT


Learning a language is not always about learning the grammatical rules of the language but also learning how to use the language in a particular context. When a speaker does not use the language properly in the particular context, the speaker may violate certain values and rules that govern such context. It means that the speaker has to be able to use the language in a proper manner in a social situation. This is important because violating certain rules and values leads to violating the partner of the communication or the hearer. The competence of using language in the proper way to avoid violating other’s value has something to do with politeness. Learning politeness as English as Foreign Language (EFL) student is essential for it concerns the way language is used in a social context. However, learning politeness as an EFL is somewhat challenging. The values contained within the mother tongue of the EFL student may interfere in the process of it. In result, the EFL student may express something in English but it does not contain the English context. In other words, the language is not used in the context properly.

This study analyzed *Yes Man* movie, an American drama-comedy movie. The movie is about the life of Carl Allen who has just transformed into a ‘yes man’ (a man who ought to say yes to any opportunities). The movie provides a lot of social situation. Thus, this movie represents the example of the use of politeness in actual situation. The writer conducts this study to analyze the application of politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson by the four main characters of *Yes Man* and the factors that influence the choice of the politeness strategies.

The writer employed the politeness theories of Brown and Levinson (1987) to discover the politeness strategies used by the four main characters of *Yes Man*. The writer also employed the theories from Brown and Levinson to analyze the factors influencing the choice of the strategies. The writer employed document analysis as the method of this study. The script of the movie became the data source of the study.

Based on the result of the analysis, some conclusions were drawn. All of the politeness strategies were employed by almost all of the four main characters of *Yes Man* movie. The factors underlay the choice of the strategies were the payoffs (the advantages) and the sociological variables which consisted of social distance, relative power and rank of imposition. It is expected that the result of this study will be helpful for readers in general, and specifically for learners and teachers in understanding politeness in English.

**Keywords:** *Yes Man* movie, politeness strategies, payoffs, sociological variables
ABSTRAK


Dari hasil analisis, penulis dapat menarik beberapa kesimpulan. Semua strategi kesopanan bahasa digunakan hampir seluruh karakter-karakter utama. Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi pemilihan strategi antara lain keuntungan untuk penutur, variabel sosiologis yang terdiri dari jarak sosial, kekuasaan dan tingkat pembebanan. Penulis berharap supaya hasil dari studi ini akan berguna untuk pembaca secara umum pembelajar dan pengajar secara khusus dalam memahami kesopanan dalam bahasa Inggris.

Kata Kunci: Yes Man movie, politeness strategies, payoffs, sociological variables
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents six sections, namely the research background, research problems, problem limitation, research objectives, research benefits and definition of terms. The research background consists of the background related to the research. The research problems section is the part where questions are formulated. The problem limitation section limits the scope of the research. The research objective section presents the expected results of the research. The research benefits are the section where the contributions of the research are presented. The last section is the definition of terms of the study which defines key words or phrases that are used in the research.

A. Research Background

People use a language as a tool in social life. According to Holtgraves (2002), language is a method that allows people to interact among themselves. People express their thoughts, convey some messages they have in their mind or even simply praise how others look in any interpersonal interaction by using language. People communicate through language and this is what makes language essential in social life. Therefore, people have to control the use of language in interpersonal communication. This is because improper use of language can harm the participants of the interpersonal interaction. To avoid the improper use of language, people have to adjust the utterances they produce in a particular manner. People have to choose proper words and proper ways to produce an utterance that
is harmless to others. The process of adjusting the utterance and considering what people feel can be identified simply as politeness.

Van Herk (2012) describes politeness as an act of behaving properly in any social interaction and/or treating the interlocutor properly. Basically, politeness is more than just following the norm, custom or protocol. It is not only about how to say please and thank you in a conversation. In her book *Gender and Politeness*, Mills (2003) provides detailed notions which state that politeness is a method of mitigating threats that are inherently carried by a certain act done by the participant of interpersonal interaction. When a speaker does an act that threatens the hearer, it means that the speaker conducts a face threatening act (FTA). Ervin Goffman defines face as a public self image (as cited in Holtgraves, 2002). For that reason, when the speaker produces the FTA, he/she threatens the self image in Goffman’s term or the hearer’s face. Speaker has to simultaneously save the hearer’s face to avoid being considered as impolite or rude. Therefore, politeness is an act of saving others’ faces from FTA.

As an English as a foreign language learner (EFL), the writer is aware that learning English does not only deal with the way sentences or phrases are formed, but also the way the language is used in contexts. The writer also agrees with Van Herk, (2012) that “communicative competence in a language requires knowing not just the words and the grammatical rules, but also the interactional rules of that language”. For that reason, being able to use the language means to be able to communicate in accordance with the grammatical rules and interactional rules. Performing politeness is perceived as an example of that ability. However, for
EFL learners, performing politeness in English is not always an easy matter. Different perspective of politeness due to cultural disparity may interfere in performing the politeness. Robert Lado states that if some principles of a second language are different from student’s native language, problems will likely occur (as cited in Kuo & Lai, 2006). For instance, saying “No, I am not that good” to reply a given compliment about one’s skill is considered as impolite in English speaking community. The expected response to a compliment is saying “thank you” (Daikuhara, 1986, p.123). However, things work quite different in Indonesian community. Modesty in Indonesian culture is essential. A person who gets complimented may give a response to the compliment by saying “No, I am not that good” in order to avoid being boastful.

Taking that phenomenon into account, it is important for EFL learners to learn about politeness in order to be able to produce an utterance politely or to be able to use the language in accordance with the grammatical rules and interactional rules. As an English teacher candidate, the writer is also aware that learning about politeness is essential to English teaching and learning. Bargiela-Chiappini and Kádár (2011) state that culture lays within politeness as a normative concept. Learning about politeness will give a particular exposure of the culture to the target language, in this case English. Kuo and Lai (2006) claim that language and culture are interwoven. Language represents the culture of its speakers and culture simultaneously represents the language as well. For that reason, understanding the concept of politeness will help both the EFL teachers and students in English teaching and learning process.
The focus of this study is to observe and analyze the use of politeness strategies in the movie entitled *Yes Man*. The writer chooses a movie as a media to conduct the research because the movie provides dialogues which show interpersonal relationships. In the dialogues, the characters use the language to communicate. Thus, this movie provides the example of how language is used in social context.

Specifically, the *Yes Man* movie conveys a story about the life of Carl Allen and everything that revolves around him. Carl is a lonely banker with a miserable life. He often says no to any opportunity that comes in his life. Everything changes after he joins a self-development seminar and starts to say yes to any opportunity that comes to him. This movie is chosen for its genre which is drama-comedy. This kind of genre represents daily life situation which consists of some interactions between employer and employee, close friend, new acquaintances etc. These interactions will likely provide a big field of a politeness strategies investigation. Thus the writer as an English teacher candidate is interested to conduct this study using *Yes Man* movie.

**B. Research Problems**

The research problems in this study are formulated as follows:

1. Which politeness strategies are used by the four main characters of *Yes Man*?

2. What are the factors influencing the choice of politeness strategies done by the four main characters of *Yes Man*?
C. Problem Limitation

The focus of this study is the application of politeness strategy and factors that influence the politeness strategies within the interaction of the four main characters of *Yes Man*. The writer classifies the four main characters based on the frequencies of the appearance and also the importance of the role within the plot of the movie. The four main characters are Carl Allen, Peter, Allison and Norman. These characters are chosen for their roles in the movie and also their frequency of appearance. The writer uses the theories from Brown and Levinson (1987) to analyze the data. The data are taken from the *Yes Man* movie script, downloaded from http://www.englishclique.com.

D. Research Objectives

This study is conducted in order to find out:

1. The politeness strategies used by the four main characters of *Yes Man*.
2. The factors which influencing the choice of politeness strategies done by the four main characters of *Yes Man*.

E. Research Benefits

The writer believes that this study will give contributions to English teachers, English teacher candidates, and English learners. For English teachers and English teacher candidates, this study will encourage them to assess not only the grammatical proficiency of the students, but also the students’ proficiency in
using the language in social situations or sociolinguistic aspects of the language, particularly politeness. For English learners, this study will encourage the students to be more aware of how English is used in social situations or the sociolinguistic aspects, particularly politeness. Hopefully, the learners will be able to use appropriate English utterances in appropriate social situations.

The writer also believes that this study will also give contribution to readers and future researchers. This study will give vivid information that will help the readers to understand what politeness is. For the future researchers, this study will help those who will conduct a politeness study. Thus, the writer hopes that this research will be a reference for them.

F. Definition of Terms

In this part, the writer will define some terms that are used in this study. The definitions are:

1. Politeness

Holmes (1996) states that politeness is a behavior that shows positive concern for others and the behavior is somewhat formal, non-imposing and distancing. Basically, this is an action that has concern on doing something which does not intrude or impose others. According to Mills (2003), politeness is an action of showing respect toward a person we are talking to and avoiding any offenses that are directed to him. In other words, politeness concerns how people maintain interpersonal relationship. In this study, the writer will concern the verbal aspect of politeness. Therefore, the utterances where the politeness lays
within (produced by the main characters of *Yes Man*) will be the focus of the study.

2. **Face Threatening Act (FTA)**

   As a prologue of explaining what FTA is, the writer firstly will explain what face is. Goofman describes face as a public self image (as cited in Holtgraves, 2002). It is a positive social value that people claim for themselves. It is a situated identity. Brown and Levinson (1987) in their extension analysis of face propose two notions which are positive and negative face. Positive face is the want of connection or interpersonal relation. Negative face is the want of freedom or being unimpeded. FTA as described by Brown and Levinson (1987) is an act that inherently threatens hearer’s or speaker’s face. This means any act that opposes or threatens the want of the hearer or speaker. In this study, face threatening act is the utterance that threatens the positive or negative face of the speaker or hearer within the interaction of the four main characters of *Yes Man*, Carl Allen, Peter, Norman and Allison.

3. **Politeness Strategy**

   According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategy is a strategy that concerns saving hearer’s face by formulating an expression that is less threatening for the hearer’s face. In this study, politeness strategy is dealing with the way the four main characters of *Yes Man* mitigate their utterances in order to save the hearer’s face. Brown and Levinson classify four main strategies of politeness strategy, namely bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness,
and off record. Therefore, the employment of politeness strategy will be the concern of this study.

This chapter provides important information regarding this study. It consists of the background and reason for choosing the topic. It also describes the research problems, research benefits and the definition of terms. It is expected that this chapter will help the reader in understanding the whole study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The chapter consists of two parts. Those parts are theoretical description and theoretical framework. Theoretical description includes the discussion of pragmatics, speech acts, sociolinguistics, and politeness theories. Theoretical framework summarizes and synthesizes the major theories to solve the research problems.

A. Theoretical Description

This part discusses four major theories of this study, namely pragmatics, speech acts, sociolinguistics, and politeness. This study focuses on the utterances performed by the four main characters of Yes Man and how the utterances are used in accordance with the context. Therefore, pragmatics is included for its purpose of understanding the meaning in context. Pragmatics encompasses speech acts that focus on how language is used in communication. Sociolinguistics is included for its focus that explains how language is used in social context and because politeness is under the scope of sociolinguistic. The last one is politeness which is the primary theory of this study.

1. Pragmatics

Levinson (1983: 9) describes that “pragmatics covers both context-dependent aspects of language structure and principles of language usage and understanding that have nothing or little to do with linguistic structure”. It is about how context contributes to meaning. The context that contributes to meaning
means the way people understand the meaning of a language that is used in a particular context. It is not about how the meaning lays within the language itself. Pragmatics investigates beyond the literal meaning of an utterance.

Leech (1983) describes pragmatics as a study that analyzes the meaning in connection with speech situations. Meaning in pragmatics is defined in connection with speaker or user of the language. Leech (1992) also describes that pragmatics is the study on how language is used to communicate. Pragmatics’ concerns focus on how language is used by people to communicate in a certain situation or context. As an example, a person who wants the air conditioner to be switched on may say “it is hot in here” instead of saying “turn the air conditioner on”. In this case, the speaker does not communicate his or her will literally. If the hearer does not understand the context, the hearer probably will end up doing nothing.

Poole (1999) explains that people communicate more than what they say explicitly. This fundamental difference between what people say and what people actually mean is the main focus of pragmatics. It is defined by what the speaker implies, what the hearer interprets based on the shared knowledge, shared assumption between the speaker and hearer, and the context of the utterance. When the speaker conveys an implicit message through an utterance, the hearer must know the context of the utterance the speaker makes. Therefore the hearer will be able to interpret what the speaker actually means by conveying a message through such utterance.

This study focuses on the use of language in conversation. It means that it concerns how people use language to communicate in such situation and context.
In other word, pragmatics is a necessary theory to be taken into account of this study. Pragmatics defines the way people use the language to communicate in conversation based on the context of situation. Politeness deals with how people use the language according to the context of situation as well. Speaker should know how to convey a meaningful utterance that the hearer can interpret. Both the speaker and hearer should know share the same knowledge that will make them understand the context of situation. Therefore, both the speaker and hearer can be able to use politeness and to understand it.

2. **Speech Acts**

According to Searle (1987), speech act is an utterance that does not only contain performative verbs but also constitute acts. In his theory, Searle (1987) states that speech acts consists of three acts, namely an act of saying something, act of doing something, and act of affecting someone. When a speaker produces utterances, it means that the speaker communicates things carrying actions. Searle (1987) adopts the terms locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts from Austin (1962) to distinguish the acts carried by an utterance. The next few paragraphs explain all of those terms.

a. **Locutionary Act**

According to Searle (1987), locutionary act is an act that contains the actual meaning of the utterance. When the speaker produces the utterance, the speaker is conveying something literally. Locutionary act deals with the surface meaning of the utterance. Sadock (1974) states that this is an act of communicating things. When the speaker says, “The weather is too hot” it means
that the speaker thinks or feels that weather or the temperature is really hot. This utterance also means that the speakers communicate his thought about the weather.

b. **Ilocutionary Act**

Ilocutionary act according to Sadock (1974) is the act of communicating our intent to accomplish things. Ilocutionary act contains the force of an utterance. Speaker communicates the intention to do something by stating an utterance. There are numerous ways of communicating the intention to do a thing. The way people convey the intention or the force of an utterance is called performative. Holtgraves (2002) states that performative is the type of an utterance that is used to perform certain actions. Acts of stating, promising, apologizing, threatening, predicting, complaining, ordering, refusing, and requesting are kinds of performative or the illocutionary act itself. If the speaker says, “It is really hot in here” said in a room without air conditioner and closed windows, it means that he wants the hearer to open the windows. Searle (1987) classifies the illocutionary act into several types namely assertive, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives.

1) **Assertives**

An assertive is the act of representing an actual state of an affair, to commit a speaker to something which becomes the case. This act is used to state the actual status of a case or to state something which is true. This act consists of the act of stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming, and reporting. Searle (1987) exemplifies this with the utterance, “It is raining.”
2) Directives

A directive is a speech act that is used to make the hearer perform a particular action. Speaker tries to accomplish a thing by making the hearer performs a particular action. It includes the act of requesting, ordering and questioning. Searle (1987) exemplifies this with the utterance, “Close the window?”

3) Commisives

A commissive is the attempt of the speaker to commit to do a particular action in the future. Speaker tries to accomplish particular future action by getting himself perform that. It includes the acts of warning, promising, threatening, and guaranteeing. Searle (1987) exemplifies this with the utterance, “I promise you to take the kids away.”

4) Expressives

An expressive is the act of showing the attitude and emotion toward particular thing. Speaker expresses the emotion or attitude toward particular thing through the utterance. Expressive includes the acts of thanking, complaining, praising, greeting and apologizing. Searle (1987) exemplifies this with the utterance, “I apologize for stepping on your toe.”

5) Declaratives

A declarative attempts to express a declaration to change a state of an affair. By doing this, the speaker produce an utterance that declares something which changes a state of particular affair. Declarative includes the acts of
declaring war, performing marriage and baptism, and pronouncing someone guilty. The example of this act is “I pronounce you husband and wife” (Searle, 1987).

c. Perlocutionary Act

The third terms according to Searle (1962) called perlocutionary act. Perlocutionary is the act of using language as a tool that gives such effect to the hearer. By stating an utterance, the speaker gives a particular effect to the hearer. The kinds of this act are act of persuading, embarrassing, intimidating, boring, imitating or inspiring the hearer (Searle, 1987). The example of this act is the utterance, “You study really hard. I know you can finish the test.”

3. Sociolinguistics

Holmes (2001) explains that sociolinguistic is the study of the relationship between language and society. It concern the way people speak differently in different social context, the function of the language in a social term, and the way language is used to convey social meaning. Stockwell (2002) mentions three points of relation between language and society which state that all language events consist of language in social context, every different social context determines the form of a language and the language used in particular situation determines the nature of the social event. Therefore, language and society are affiliated. Language varies from one speaker to another. This variation or difference in the language use is due to a particular variable. Stockwell (2002) explains that the variable is the social variable. The social variable includes gender, geography, age, occupation, etc.
4. Politeness

Holmes (1996) states that politeness is a behavior that shows positive concern for others and the behavior is somewhat formal, non-imposing and distancing. Basically, this is an action that concerns on doing something which does not intrude or impose others. According to Mills (2003), politeness is an action of showing respect toward a person the speaker is talking to and avoiding any offenses directed to him. In other words, politeness concerns on how people maintain interpersonal relationship. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that politeness is related to psychological state, something that is emotionally invested and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987) propose some strategies to control the psychological state in the interaction.

Before explaining the strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), the writer discusses the notion of face. Face is the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It consists of two terms which are Negative Face and Positive Face.

a. Negative Face

Negative face is term that is used to show a specific desire or the want of an individual. This want or desires refer to the state of being autonomous and free from imposition. It means that every individual has the want to be free from imposition and impediment force toward his action. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that negative politeness is “the basic claim to territories, personal preserve, right to non-distraction”.
b. Positive Face

Positive face is the term that is used to show the desire or want of an individual that refers to the state of being appreciated and approved. An individual in a particular community shows a self image and he wants it to be appreciated and approved. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that positive face is the state when an individual wants his desire to be approved and appreciated by others. It means that an individual wants to be approved, appreciated, and liked by others.

c. Face -Threatening Act

Brown and Levinson state that the notion of face is kind of a universal matter that resides in social interaction (as cited in Holtgraves, 2002). Negative politeness is the desire for autonomy and positive politeness is the desire of connection. Brown and Levinson also state that face becomes a subject of violation in a social interaction (as cited in Holtgraves, 2002). Some acts in a social interaction violate the desire for autonomy and connection or the negative and positive face. As an example, people may violate someone’s negative face by simply ordering this person to do something for him and violate someone’s positive face by simply failing to respond to a greeting. Brown and Levinson (1987) name this term face-threatening act (FTA). FTA is an act that violates or threatens someone’s face. The act can be verbal and non-verbal, but the focus of this study is the verbal one.

Holtgraves (2002) explains that many acts people want to perform are face-threatening acts. If someone produces an utterance that threatens other people’s face, a conflict will arise within the social interaction. This conflict will
damage the interpersonal relationship. Therefore, people should concern the way they produce an utterance. A speaker should concern the word he wants to utter in order to be able to save the face of the hearer. This face saving notion is the essence of politeness strategy.

d. Politeness Strategy

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategy is a strategy that has concern on saving hearer’s face by formulating an expression that is less threatening for the hearer’s face. Brown and Levinson classify four main strategies of politeness strategy, namely bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off record. Bald on record is applied when speaker does not minimize the threat to the hearer face. Positive Politeness is a strategy that concerns on how to fulfill hearer’s positive face. Negative politeness is a strategy that concerns on fulfilling hearer’s negative face. Off record is a strategy that lets the speaker’s utterance ambiguous and therefore leaves the speaker with no responsibility to the act he does.

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that speaker will choose high politeness strategy if the FTA is big. Brown and Levinson also state that the least polite strategy is bald on-record strategy and following in ascending manner are the positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record politeness. Politeness is constituted by two acts which are doing the FTA and not doing the FTA. Basically not doing the FTA is the most polite thing to do, but it means that the speaker will not produce the utterance and it means that he does not verbally communicate. Therefore, people can choose to do the FTA implicitly or explicitly.
Off-record is the strategy where the FTA is implicitly stated. The strategy where the FTA is stated explicitly without any redressive action is the bald on-record. Positive politeness and negative politeness are also on-record but they are not baldly done since the redressive action resides in them. The following sections discuss the deeper explanation of the strategies.

1) Bald on-Record

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), bald on-record is the form of maximally efficient communication. This due to the fact that the threat residing in the FTA is not minimized which make the utterance direct and clear. The primary reason why the speaker uses this strategy is because the speaker wants to do the FTA with efficiency more than he wants to satisfy hearer face.

However, there are two classes that constitute the use of this strategy due to different motives and circumstances speakers have. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that these two classes are the class where the FTA is ignored and not minimized and the class where the face threat is minimized by implication. The class where the FTA is ignored includes the case of great urgency, the case where the speaker’s desire to minimize the threat is small and the case where doing the FTA is for the sake of hearer interests. The case of great urgency is exemplified by the utterance “Help me!” The case where the speaker’s desire to minimize the threat is small is shown in the situation where the speaker is more powerful, does not fear retaliation from the hearer or the speaker just simply wants to be rude. This is exemplified by “Hey, John. Bring me these books,” as said to a younger sibling. The case where doing the FTA is for the sake of the hearer’s interest is
shown in the situation where the speaker concerns the hearer interest as in the utterance “Be careful! The lake is icy.”

The other one is the class where the threat is minimized by the implication. The threat inherently carries by the FTA is minimized by saving hearer’s particular face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). For example, the utterance a speaker makes is an FTA but the utterance implicitly saves the face of the hearer. Saving the face implicitly requires a mutual orientation which includes the attempt of each social interaction participant to foresee what the other participant attempts to foresee (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

When a person with higher power asks the subordinate who is waiting outside his room to come in his room, he produces an FTA but he also implicitly saves the subordinate’s face. The person with the high power or the speaker realizes that the subordinate or the hearer is anxious because he may violate speaker’s autonomy by the act of coming to his room and taking his time. By asking the hearer to get in, he lets the hearer to violate his autonomy and in other word he takes the anxiety away from the hearer and save his face. This type of bald on-record includes welcomings, farewells and the state where the speaker insists the hearer to impose on speaker’s face. The example of welcomings is the utterance that is produced by a host and said to a person who comes to his house as in “Oh you come. Come in.” The example of farewells is “Take a good care of you. Good bye!” The example of the state where the speaker lets the hearer to impose on his face is “Don’t worry about it. Leave it to me” as said to a guest who wants to wash the glass he has just used.
2) **Positive Politeness**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness is a redress directed to the positive face, the want to be approved, accepted and desired. However, positive politeness strategy is not necessarily about redress of particular FTA addressed to any face. Holtgraves (2002) states that positive politeness is an approach based strategy. It is associated with the usage of intimate language. It refers to action of minimizing the distance between the speaker and hearer and also making the hearer feels accepted, wanted and feel good about himself and his interest.

There are fifteen substrategies of positive politeness strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987) classify the substrategies using three big mechanisms of the substrategies. These mechanisms are claiming common ground, conveying that speaker and hearer are cooperators and fulfilling hearer’s want.

a) **Claiming Common Ground**

Claiming common ground includes the act of indicating that the speaker and hearer belong to a particular group. This particular group means a category of persons that share specific desires or wants which includes goals and values. There are three ways to show that speaker and hearer share the specific want. These ways are conveying that hearer’s wants are admirable or interesting for speaker too, claiming in-group membership, and claiming common perspective without referring to in-group membership. This mechanism is exemplified with the substrategies in the following section from Brown and Levinson (1987).
Substrategy one is noticing hearer’s interests, wants, needs, goods, etc. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this act is the speaker’s attempt to notice what the hearer has. It can be in the form of sympathy, care or even compliment. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “What a beautiful vase this is! Where did you get it?” (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Substrategy two is exaggerating interest, approval and sympathy with the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that this can be done by saying something in a way that is higher than its actual status using exaggerating adjective. The example is the utterance, “What a fantastic garden you have!” (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Substrategy three is intensifying interest of speaker’s contribution to hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this is done making good story and dragging the hearer into it. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “I come down 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).

Substrategy four is using in-group identity markers. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that the elements of in-group identity markers are address form, language dialect, jargon, slang and ellipsis. This is exemplified by the utterance, “Here mate, I was keeping that seat for a friend of mine,” (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Substrategy five is seeking agreement. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that seeking agreement means to seek for hearer’s agreement. This is done by
raising safe topic that the hearer will agree with. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “Isn’t your new car a beautiful color!” As said to comment on a neighbor’s hideously huge new car. Instead of stating the unsafe topic, the speaker raises another topic which is safer.

Substrategy six is avoiding disagreement. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that avoiding disagreement can be done by stating false agreement, indirect agreement, white lies and hedging. This substrategy is exemplified with this following dialogue.

A: That’s where you live, Florida?  
B: That’s where I was born. (Instead of claiming what A says as a mistake, he states the fact that she was born there)

Substrategy seven is presupposing to raise and assert common ground. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that presupposing is the act of believing something is true before it is proven. This raises and asserts the common ground of the hearer and speaker. This is exemplified with the utterance “I had a really hard time learning to drive didn’t I?” (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Substrategy eight is joking. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that the use of jokes indicates the shared mutual knowledge. Therefore it is the form of claiming common ground. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “OK if I tackle those cookies now?”

b) Conveying that Hearer and Speaker are Cooperators

Conveying that hearer and speaker are cooperators is the second mechanism of politeness strategy. It refers to the want to convey that speaker and hearer are involved in particular activity. When speaker conveys that hearer and
him are cooperator, they share the goal in particular way. Therefore conveying that they are cooperator is kind of redress for hearer’s positive face. This mechanism is exemplified by the substrategies in the following section based on the examples from Brown and Levinson (1987).

Substrategy one is presupposing speaker’s knowledge of and concern for the hearer’s want. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this substrategy aims to presuppose what the hearer’s want according to the speaker’s knowledge toward hearer’s want. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “I know you love roses but the florist didn’t have any more, so I brought you geranium instead.”

Substrategy two is promise. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that when the speaker makes a promise to the hearer, the speaker has the intention to fulfill hearer’s want. The intention of fulfilling hearer’s want shows that the speaker consider the hearer and him are cooperators. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “I’ll treat you next week.”

Substrategy three is being optimistic. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this substrategy is about how the speaker becomes optimistic regarding the willingness of the hearer to fulfill his want. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “Look, I’m sure you don’t mind if I borrow your typewriter”

Substrategy four is including both speaker and hearer in an activity. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that this substrategy aims to make the speaker and
hearer involve them in the activity and eventually become cooperators. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “Let’s have a cookie, then.”

Substrategy five is giving and asking for reasons. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), giving and asking for reasons shows that speaker and hearer are cooperators in a way that they are cooperating through the act of asking and giving the reason. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify the substrategy with the utterance, “Why don’t we go to the seashore!”

Substrategy six is assuming or asserting reciprocity. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that it can be done by creating mutual advantages among the speaker and hearer. The example of this substrategy according to Brown and Levinson is the utterance, “I washed the dishes last week, so you wash the dishes this week.”

c) Fulfilling Hearer’s want

The last mechanism of positive politeness is fulfilling hearer’s want. Speaker can satisfy hearer’s positive face by actually satisfying hearer’s positive face want. It means that speaker wants hearer’s want for hearer. This mechanism is exemplified with the substrategy based on Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness strategies. Giving gifts to hearer can be in the form of goods, sympathy, understanding and cooperation as in “I just know that your dog died yesterday. I’m sorry to hear that”
3) **Negative Politeness**

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that negative politeness is a redress addressed to negative face. It means that the redress concerns hearer’s freedom of action and autonomy. Negative politeness focuses on the action of minimizing particular imposition carried by the FTA.

There are ten substrategies of negative politeness strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987) classify the substrategies using four big mechanisms of the substrategies. These mechanisms are be direct, don’t presume/assume, don’t coerce, communicate speaker’s want to not impinge on hearer, redress other want derivative from negative face.

a) **Be Direct**

Negative politeness combines the on record strategy and redress directed to the FTA. When it is an on record it means that the utterance is stated clearly and directly. When a speaker produces an utterance in accordance with the negative politeness, it means that speaker wants to achieve his want through the FTA but he also wants to redress it. Therefore the speaker cannot be directly state the FTA because it will threaten the negative face of the hearer. Instead, the speaker can be conventionally indirect. Being conventionally indirect is the substrategy of this mechanism. This substrategy is exemplified in “Can you please pass the salt?” The example is made by Brown and Levinson (1987).

b) **Don’t Presume/Assume**

This mechanism is the form of repressive action toward the FTA addressed to the negative face. This is done by not presuming and assuming that the FTA is
desired or accepted by the hearer. This mechanism is exemplified by the substrategy namely question and hedge. The example is “Won’t you open the door?” This example is made by Brown and Levinson (1987).

c) Don’t Coerce Hearer

Don’t coerce hearer means that the speaker do not persuade hearer to do something forcefully. This can be done by stating an option for the hearer that he may not do the act. This also can be done by assuming that hearer does not want to do the act. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this mechanism by using these following sub-strategies.

Substrategy one is being pessimistic. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that by being pessimistic, the speaker shows the intention of not wanting to coerce hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy is the utterance, “Perhaps you’d care to help me.”

Substrategy two is minimizing the imposition. Brown and Levinson (1987) by minimizing the imposition or the threat toward the negative face of the hearer, the speaker shows the intention not to coerce the hearer. The minimization can be done by choosing some words which shows the minimum state of a matter. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance “Just a second.”

Substrategy three is giving difference. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that giving difference the act of humbling oneself and fulfill hearer’s want of respect. This can be done by using particular addressing form for someone that is superior. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the
utterance (1) Give difference, “Excuse me sir, would you mind if I close the window?”

d) Communicate Speaker’s Want not to impinge on Hearer

Conveying that speaker does not want to impinge on hearer is one of the ways to show that speaker cares for hearer’s negative face. Speaker will communicate that the impingement on hearer’s negative face is not executed lightly. This mechanism is exemplified by the following substrategies.

Substrategy one is apologizing. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that by apologizing the speaker can show the unwillingness to threat the face of the hearer or to impinge on hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “I am sorry to bother you……”

Substrategy two is impersonalizing the speaker and hearer in a conversation. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this substrategy deals with avoiding the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘U’. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “Do this for me.”

Substrategy two is stating the FTA as an instance of general rule. By doing so, the speaker can show that he does not want to impinge the hearer. He omits the fact that he will impinge the hearer by emphasizes a notion that the act he does is a general rule. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “I am sorry, but late-comers cannot be seated till next interval.”

Substrategy three is nominalizing. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that nominalizing is the act of changing a verb into a noun in a sentence. By doing so, the speaker can add more distance and formality. The more formal the
utterance is, the more visible that the speaker does not want to impinge the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “It is our regret that we cannot…..”

e) Redress Other Wants of Hearer’s Derivative from Negative Face

The last mechanism is the redress addressed to the other wants of hearer’s derivative from negative face. This is undertaken by showing that speaker is in debt with hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this with a sub-strategy namely going on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebteding hearer. The example is “I’d be eternally grateful if you would…..”

4) Off-Record

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that off record is a communicative act which contains not only one particular intention. It means that the utterance speaker makes contains more than one clear particular intention. The hearer has to interpret the utterance in order to understand the real meaning. Holtgraves (2002) states that off-record strategy is an indirect communication. This is due to the fact that meaning is not directly obtained by the hearer for he has to interpret it first. The indirectness of this strategy gives a chance for speaker to do the FTA without taking the responsibility for doing it.

When the speaker goes off-record, the speaker communicates in ineffective way because the speaker does not directly state what he actually means. Brown and Levinson (1987) propose two mechanism of applying this strategy. The two mechanisms are inviting conversational implicature and being vague or ambiguous.
a) Inviting Conversational Implicature

When the speaker wants to do an FTA but he does not want to convey it directly, the speaker gives some hints or clue to the hearer to interpret. This is done by inviting conversational implicature and to think of an interpretation that makes the utterance understandable. In other words, the speaker produces an ineffective utterance with a cue. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplified this mechanism with the following substrategies.

Substrategy one is giving hints. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that giving hints is an act of saying something which is not relevant and inviting the hearer to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “This soup is a bit bland”. As said to ask the hearer to pass the salt and “My house isn’t very far away” As said to ask the hearer to come over.

Substrategy two is presupposing prior event. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that it is done by forcing the hearer to search for the relevance of a prior event. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance “I washed the car again today.” As said to convey a criticism to the hearer and to ask the hearer to do it.

Substrategy three is understating. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that this is the act of saying less than what is required. By doing this, the speaker invites the hearer to search for an interpretation. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “He’s all right.” This is an
understatement which implicates that the person the speaker is talking about is awful or fabulous.

Substrategy four is overstating. This substrategy is the opposite of understating. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that overstating is saying more than what is required. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “You never do the washing up.”

Substrategy five is the use of tautologies. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that the use of tautologies encourages the hearer to look for an interpretation from non-informative utterance. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify the substrategy with the utterance, “Your clothes belong to where your clothes belong, my clothes belong where my clothes belong. Look upstairs!” As said to the hearer as a criticism for placing his belonging in speaker’s room.

Substrategy six is the use of contradiction. Brown and Levinson explain that the use of contradiction aims to force the hearer to look up for an interpretation that resides in the contradictive utterance. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “I am happy and I am not happy about that.” As said to the hearer who has just told the speaker that he gets a better job but he has to move from the city. This conveys a complaint and criticism.

Substrategy seven is being ironic. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that being ironic is to state the opposite of what the speaker means. By doing that, the speaker let the hearer interprets what he really means. The example of this substrategy is the “John’s a real genius.” As said after the third person has just done something stupid.
Substrategy eight is the use of metaphors. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that by using a metaphor the speaker hedges his utterance and he invites the hearer to interpret the meaning of his hedged utterance. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “Harry is a real fish.” As said to convey that John swims like a fish or swims well.

Substrategy nine is the use of rhetorical question. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that by using rhetorical question, the speaker ask a question with no intention of getting the answer. By doing this, the speaker also invites the hearer to interpret what he really means. Brown and Levinson (1987) exemplify this substrategy with the utterance, “How many times do I have to tell you?” As said by the speaker as a criticism to the hearer’s action.

b) Being vague or ambiguous

Along with giving the conversational implicature, speaker can also be vague or ambiguous in applying off-record strategy. It means that the speaker produces an ambiguous utterance. By doing that, the speaker uses the technically indirectness. This mechanism is exemplified by these following substrategies from Brown and Levinson (1987).

Substrategy one is being ambiguous. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that purposeful ambiguity can be achieved through metaphor. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “John’s a pretty (sharp, smooth) cookie.” This could be either a compliment or an insult, depending on the speaker intention of stating the connotation sharp and smooth.
Substrategy two is being vague. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that it is about being vague about who the object of the FTA is or what the offence is. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “Looks like someone may have had too much to drink.” As said by the speaker to convey a criticism.

Substrategy three is over-generalizing. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that this substrategy is about conveying general rule that hearer then has to choose whether the general rule applies to him. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “Mature people sometimes help to wash the dishes.” As said by the speaker to convey an order or request.

Substrategy four is displacing the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that speaker can be ambiguous about the object of the FTA is, or he may pretend to address to FTA to someone else and hope that the real target of the FTA will be able to realize that the FTA is addressed to him. This is exemplified in the following case. One secretary in the office asks another secretary in negative politeness to pass the stapler in the circumstances where the professor is much nearer than the other secretary. The face of the professor is not threatened and the professor can choose to help as a bonus for the secretary.

Substrategy five is being incomplete. Brown and Levinson explain that this substrategy deals with the use of unfinished utterance to give the implicature to the hearer. The example of this substrategy is the utterance, “Well, if one leaves one’s tea on the wobbly table…” As said by the speaker to convey an order or request to the hearer.
5) **Factors of Politeness Strategies**

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that there are two factors that influence the application of the politeness strategies. Those factors are the payoffs and the sociological variables of circumstances between the speaker and hearer. The payoffs refer to the result of the strategies and the sociological variables involve three variables namely the social distance, the relative power and the rank of imposition.

a) **Payoffs**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) payoff is the expected results of the politeness strategies. Whenever speaker applies politeness strategies there will be this expected result underlying in the strategies. Therefore, speaker concern this payoff in applying the strategy. In applying the strategies, speaker also expects a result which is advantageous for him. Every politeness strategy has its own advantageous for the speaker. The advantages of the strategies are explained in the next discussion.

By applying bald on-record strategy, the speaker can get several advantages. The speaker can enlist public pressure against the hearer. The speaker can also build a support for his self image. Other people can acknowledge his honesty and outspokenness. Speaker can also avoid the chance to be seen as manipulator, to be misunderstood and he can also have the chance to give a compensation for the face that has been threatened by the FTA.

By applying off-record strategy, the speaker can get several benefits in this way: he can get acknowledgement for his tactfulness and non-coerciveness. He
can avoid being gossiped and taking the responsibility for the FTA he makes. He can also give the addressee an opportunity to be seen as caring toward speaker.

By applying positive politeness, the speaker can minimize the threat of an FTA by stating that he is ‘the same kind’ as the hearer and also that he likes him and desires his want too. Therefore, a criticism that is conveyed with stating that they are ‘the same kind’ can be less threatening. The speaker can also avoid the debt implication of doing the FTA by referring to the relationship between him and the hearer. This accomplished by inviting the hearer in the activity.

By applying negative politeness, speaker can get several benefits. He can show the respect and difference toward the hearer for the FTA he makes. He can also avoid the future debt caused by the FTA. He can maintain the social distance for he avoids the presumed familiarity toward the hearer. At last, he can show that he respects and cares about hearer’s negative face.

b) Sociological Variables

Sociological variables are one of the factors of politeness strategy choice. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), sociological variables consist of social distance, relative power, and the rank of imposition. These variables are important for the measurement of the seriousness of an FTA. This measurement affects the way the speaker uses the politeness strategies. In other word, this measurement will affect the choice of strategies. Each of the measurement variables has their
own values that the hearer knows. In the following section, the writer discusses the explanation of each sociological variable.

(1) Social Distance

Social distance is a variable that concerns frequency assessment of the interaction and also the kinds of material or non-material goods exchanged between the speaker and hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that social distance is “symmetrical social dimension of similarity/difference” that is determined by the two notions discussed previously. The two notions, the frequency of interaction and the exchanged goods are affected by stable attributes such as the age, sex and socio-cultural background, which includes social class and ethnic background.

Holmes (2001) describes that the dimension deals with the judgment the judgment of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Thus, intimacy between the speaker and hearer affects the choice of the strategy. For example, if the speaker and the hearer are intimate, the speaker might use in group membership marker such as ‘man’, ‘bro’, ‘honey’, ‘dude’, etc., which are kinds of positive politeness strategy. In contrary, if the speaker and hearer are distant, the speaker might give difference by abase himself to the hearer which is kind of negative politeness strategy. The more intimate the speaker and hearer are, the more the speaker will choose the least polite strategy.

(2) Relative Power

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that relative power is the degree to which hearer can impose his own want, desire or face over the speaker’s want,
desire or face. Holmes (2001) uses the same term but it is called relative status. It explains about the status of the hearer over the speaker which basically also concerns the power of the hearer over the speaker. The power possesses by the hearer affects the choice of the strategy used by the speaker. If the hearer possesses greater power than the speaker, the speaker will use the strategy which is more polite. In contrary, if the hearer possesses less power, the speaker will use less polite strategy.

(3) **Rank of Imposition**

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that the rank of imposition is the degree of a matter that is considered as the interference to the face of the hearer. This interference is the FTA that the speaker made. In other word, the degree of the FTA defines the rank of imposition. The rank of imposition can be identified by two variables which are the imposition toward the positive face and negative face. For the positive face, the imposition is assessed by the amount of threat given to hearer positive face. For negative face, there are two scales that identify the rank of the imposition namely the imposition requiring services and goods.

**B. Theoretical Framework**

This study aims at analyzing the use of politeness strategies done by the main characters of *Yes Man*. There are two research problems in this study, namely, the kinds of politeness strategies implemented by the main characters of *Yes Man* and the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies in the conversation of the main characters of *Yes Man*. In order to answer the two
research problems, the writer applies the theories of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

The first research problem: “What kinds of politeness strategies are used by the main characters of *Yes Man*?” will be solved using Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness strategies theory. There are four strategies namely bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record strategy. The writer employs the four strategies to classify the utterances done by the main characters of *Yes Man* to analyze the kinds of strategies used by them.

In order to find out the factors affecting the choice of the strategy, Brown and Levinson’s (1987) will also be used in solving the second research problem which is “What kinds of factors influence the execution of politeness strategies done by the main character of *Yes Man*?”, they state that two factors are likely to influence the application of the politeness strategies. These two factors are the payoffs and the sociological variables. The writes analyzes the utterance done by main characters of *Yes Man* in accordance with the two factors to see whether the factors what factors actually influence the choice of the strategies.

Thus, this chapter provides all of the theories needed and related to this study. One theory in particular is politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987). This main theory will be used to analyze the main characters’ utterances to discover what politeness strategies they use in the movie *Yes Man* and the factors affecting the choice of the strategies.
CHAPTER III

METHODODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology used in this study. It consists of six parts namely research method, research setting, research data source, research instruments, data gathering technique, data analysis technique and research procedure. Research method describes what method is used in this study. Research setting describes when this research is conducted. Research data source focuses on the elaboration of the research subjects and also the method of sampling. The instruments and data gathering techniques describe the instruments used in the study. Data analysis technique describes how the data will be analyzed. The last one, research procedure describes the summary of the steps in conducting the study.

A. Research Method

The writer’s focus in this study was the politeness strategies used by the main characters of Yes Man. More specifically, the two research problems in this study were (1) Which politeness strategies are used by the four main characters of Yes Man? (2) What are the factors influencing the choice of the strategies done by the four main characters of Yes Man? This study concerns the way the four main characters of Yes Man implement the politeness strategies in their conversation in the movie. Thus, this study is a study about how language is used in a social context as depicted in the movie.
Since it concerns how language is used, this is a descriptive qualitative study. It describes the politeness strategies employed by the main character of *Yes Man*. It is considered qualitative study since it aims at understanding human behavior and the reasons that govern such behavior as it is stated by Denzin and Lincoln (2005). The goal of this qualitative research was a holistic picture and depth of understanding, rather than a numeric analysis of data (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 2002). Similarly, the objectives of this study were to analyze and to understand the politeness strategies employed by the main characters of *Yes Man* and the factors affecting the choice of the strategy. Further, Miles and Huberman (1994) state that qualitative data is in the form of words rather than numbers and it concerns some fields like social science, anthropology, and political science. This study used data that were in the form of words since those data were taken from the utterances made by the four main characters.

This study discussed the utterances of the four main characters of the movie *Yes Man* which carried politeness strategies. The utterances were the prototype of how language was used in context. The writer analyzed the how the four main characters used the language to communicate and employed politeness strategies specifically. According to Fasold and Connor-Linton (2006), the use of language above and beyond the sentence is a discourse, a linguistic branch. Thus, this study is a discourse analysis for it concerns how people use language in a real world. In addition, Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) state that the focus of discourse analysis are the organization of ordinary talk and everyday explanations.
and the social actions performed in them. All of the utterances of the main characters were analyzed using the politeness theories explained in chapter II in the form of narrative description and interpretation. This would result identification of the politeness strategy and the factors underlay the choice of the strategy afterward.

B. Research Setting

The analysis of the Yes Man movie was started from November 5th, 2014 until March 10th, 2015. The writer spent four months in analyzing the script of the movie. The four months data tabulation process included the state of analyzing the script, categorizing the characters’ utterances, identifying the underlying factors of the choice of the politeness strategies and writing up the report of the study.

C. Research Data Source

The research data source of this study was the script of Yes Man movie, where the utterances of the main characters were analyzed as the data. There were four main characters from whom the writer took the utterances. The main characters were Carl Allen, Peter (Carl’s best friend), Norman (Carl’s coworker), and Allison (Carl’s girlfriend). Those characters were chosen because they had important roles and they also had more portions of dialogue within the movie.
D. Research Instruments

The first instrument of this qualitative research was the researcher as human instrument. Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that researcher as human instrument is an instrument that is the only flexible enough instrument to follow the complexity and the dynamism of human experience, as the data of a qualitative research. The researcher or the writer collected and analyzed the data. In supporting the process of data analysis and collection, the writer employed information taken from books, journals, and internet.

The second instrument of the research was the movie script of Yes Man. The movie script was the document that is needed as the material of qualitative research. Miles and Huberman (1994) stated that documents could be public records, textbook, letters, films, tapes, diaries, themes, reports and so on. The writer selected some utterance made by the four main characters containing politeness strategy from the script. The script was taken from www.englishclique.com. The selected utterance taken from the script of Yes Man were used to analyze and answer the first research problem which was “What kind of politeness strategies are used by the main characters of Yes Man?” and the analysis result was employed to answer the second research question which was “What factors influence the execution of politeness strategies done by the main character of Yes Man?”
E. Data Gathering Techniques

To collect the data, the writer firstly observed the *Yes Man* movie as doing an observation is one of the sources of data in qualitative research study (Merriam, 2002). The writer searched for the script of the movie on the internet. Then, the writer analyzed the script as the form of document which is also kind of source of data. After the writer got the script, the writer selected and collected the dialog in which the characters applied the politeness strategies. Further the writer only collected the utterances from the four main characters which were Carl Allen, Peter, Norman and Allison. In selecting the utterances, the writer employed a table consisting 4 classifications of politeness strategies.

Table 3.1: The Number of Politeness Strategies Produced by the Four Main Characters of *Yes Man*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Politeness Strategy</th>
<th>Bald on Record</th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Off Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Data Analysis Technique

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), there are three steps of data analysis in qualitative research. The qualitative data analysis steps consist of data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions or verification. The writer discusses the explanation for the steps mentioned previously in the next section.
1. **Data Reduction**

Data reduction refers to the process of selecting focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Firstly, the writer selected the utterance containing politeness strategy done by the four main characters from the script. Then, the writer classified the utterance by using the framework of politeness strategy. By doing so, the speaker abstracted and simplified the document. The writer transformed the original wide document into a sharp, sort, focused and organized document.

To reduce the data, the writer employed a process namely coding. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), coding is a process of combining and differentiating the data found by the researcher and the reflection he makes. In this process, the writer applied the codes as assistance to analyze the data. The codes used in the study were the codes related to the first research problem which was the kinds of strategies used in the movie *Yes Man*. Bald on-record was labeled with BOR. Positive politeness was labeled PP. Negative politeness was labeled with NP and off-record was labeled with OR.

2. **Data Display**

Data display refers to the organized, compressed information that leads to conclusion drawing and action. Miles and Huberman (1994) state that looking at the display helps the researcher to understand an affair so that he can take a decision to do the further action. In this study, the data related to the politeness
strategy were put into a table (see appendix) which helped the researcher in taking actions and conclusions.

3. Conclusion Drawing or Verification

The last step was conclusion drawing and verification. The last step refers to the act of concluding the final conclusion. Miles and Huberman (1994) state that from the state of collecting the data, the researcher begins to decide what things mean and has an early conclusion which means conclusion that is light and still vague. However this conclusion is increasingly clear and grounded.

G. Research Procedure

In doing the research, the writer had to do several steps. The steps were:

1. Analyzing the script

The first step was analyzing the script. The writer analyzed the script to collect the data which was in the form of utterance in the script. The writer made sure that the script was the authentic one. Then the speaker search for the utterance that contained politeness strategy. The writer analyzed all of the utterance to find the answer for the research problems.

2. Categorizing the characters’ utterances

The second step was categorizing the characters utterances. The speaker classified the utterances in accordance with the politeness strategies framework of Brown and Levinson (1987). They were bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record. Each of the utterances was put into the four
categories and given the codes to assist the writer in analyzing the data. The categorization is shown in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>Politeness Strategies (BOR, PP, NP, OR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Identifying the factors of politeness strategies within the utterances**

By using the table of the categorization of politeness strategies employed by the main characters, the writer continued the procedure by identifying the factors that influence the choice of the strategy. The writer employed Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory about factors in choosing the politeness strategy. There are two basic factors in choosing the strategy namely payoffs and sociological variables. The payoffs vary from one strategy to another. The sociological variables include the social distance, the power and the rank of imposition. Thus, the writer provided explanations about the choice of the strategies in analyzing the choice of the strategy.

4. **Writing up the report**

The last one was reporting the result of analysis. At this step, the writer discussed the finding in the research of the use of the politeness strategies within the movie *Yes Man* which focused on how it was done and what factors were behind this in accordance with Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness strategies.
CHAPTER IV  
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the research finding and discussions in order to answer the research questions that have been formulated in the first chapter. The first research question is the politeness strategies used by the main characters of *Yes Man*. The second research problem is the factors influencing the application of politeness strategy done by the main characters of *Yes Man*.

A. The Politeness Strategies Used by the Main Characters of *Yes Man*

This section describes the result of the analysis of the utterances of the four main characters of *Yes Man*, namely Carl Allen, Peter, Norman and Allison. From the utterances, the writer identified the politeness strategies were used by them. The four main characters employed the strategies in accordance with the politeness strategies theory of Brown and Levinson (1987). Bald on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness and Off Record were applied by all of the four main characters. Norman as an exception only applied three of the politeness strategies. Norman did not execute Off Record in his utterances. The politeness strategies found in *Yes Man* are illustrated in the table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Politeness Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More elaborate descriptions of the research findings and discussions on them will be presented in the following part. The writer will discuss the analysis of the application of the politeness strategy in a descending sequence from the most frequent strategy to the least one.

1. Positive Politeness

Positive politeness is one of politeness strategies that functioning as a redress directed to the addressee’s positive face. However, it is not necessarily redressive act of a particular face want threatened by FTA. The essence of positive politeness is to fulfill one’s positive face. In other words it is to claim a particular degree of familiarity with the addressee. It is associated with the usage of intimate language. It refers to the action of minimizing the distance between the speaker and hearer and also making the hearer feels accepted, wanted and feel good about himself.

Positive politeness was applied by all of the main characters. It was applied by the main characters whenever they were in a conversation with people they put interest in. The application of the strategy was shown by the use of three positive politeness mechanisms namely claiming common ground, conveying that speaker and hearer are cooperators and fulfilling hearer’s want. The most apparent sub-strategies of those mechanisms were the use of in-group identity marker, the use of joke, slang, white lies, promise and offer, and giving gift to hearer.

Claiming common ground is one of the positive politeness mechanisms. It is about how the speaker indicates himself and the hearer as a group of individuals that share specific wants, goals and values. Some instruments of claiming
common ground demonstrated in the movie were the use of in-group identity marker, the use of joke, slang, white lies, and the intensification to the hearer’s interest. The writer analyzed the instruments starting from the use of in-group identity marker. Dialogue 1 shows the conversation between Carl and Peter that consists of group identity marker. The group identity marker or the positive politeness is labeled with the code ‘PP’.

**Dialogue 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>: 00:00:32 – 00:01:06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>: Video Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>: Carl is answering Peter’s call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>: Carl and Peter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carl** : No (rejects the call). No means no (accidentally presses the answer button). *Bonjour.*

**Peter** : Carl, I know it’s you.

**Carl** : Oh, hey man (PP). I had your number dialed and was about to press send. Did you block your number?

**Peter** : Yeah, I did. You never answer when I don’t.

On a particular evening, Carl Allen was about to rent some movies when he suddenly got a call from his best friend Peter. Carl had a problem in living his social life after he got divorced with his ex-wife. He had been trying to avoid any contact except the one in his working life. Peter at the time was about to invite him to a party. In answering the call, Carl used the address form ‘man’ which is one of the in-group identity markers. Address form is one of the ways of conveying an in-group membership. Carl said, “Oh, hey man” to Peter. The address form ‘man’ indicated that Carl claimed a common ground with Peter and in other word he minimized the distance between him and Peter since they were
best friends. The address form ‘man’ is frequently used by close friends or at least person who is trying to get close to someone.

In the dialogue 1 Carl used ‘man’ as an indicator that he considered Peter as a close person to him. There were some other types of address form which were applied in the movie such as ‘guys’, ‘boy’, ‘brizzo’, ‘honey’, ‘buddy’ and ‘gang’. Friendly nicknames also indicate the closeness or the intimacy between the speaker and hearer. In the movie, the friendly nickname was exemplified by the shortened name such as Norm which was the shortened Norman, Pete which was the shortened Peter, and Car which was the shortened Carl.

Another example of claiming common ground is the use of joke. The use of joke indicates that the shared background knowledge exists between the speaker and the hearer. Joking also shows that the speaker puts the hearer at ease or to free the hearer from worry. By doing this, the speaker keeps the hearer’s positive face from the threat. Dialogue 2 shows the conversation between Norman and Carl that consists of joke. The joke or the positive politeness is labeled with ‘PP’.

**Dialogue 2**
- **Time**: 00:05:57 – 00:06:2
- **Setting**: Brea Federal Savings and Loan office
- **Situation**: Norman is giving a greeting to Carl
- **Participants**: Norman and Carl

**Norman**: Carl Allen has reported for duty? (PP)
**Carl**: I’m not a soldier, Norman.
**Norman**: You are a soldier on the front line of finance (laughing).

Carl worked in Brea Federal Savings and Loan Bank as a junior loan officer and Norman was his supervisor. In one scene, Norman greeted Carl by
using a joke. In a military way, Norman said “Carl Allen has reported for duty?” This approach was done by Norman because he wanted to put Carl at ease and therefore kept his positive face from the threat as well as illustrated in the dialogue.

The use of slang in a conversation is also one of forms of claiming common ground. The use of slang indicates the shared knowledge as well as an in-group identity marker. By using slang in referring to a thing, the speaker recalls the shared knowledge he has with the hearer. By having the shared background knowledge, the speaker associates himself to the hearer or puts himself in the same group as the hearer. Dialogue 3 shows the conversation between Norman and Carl that consists of the use of slang. The slang which is part of positive politeness is labeled with ‘PP’.

**Dialogue 3**

**Time**: 00:59:55 – 01:00:19  
**Setting**: Brea Federal Savings and Loan office  
**Situation**: Carl is being summoned by the man from the bank corporation  
**Participants**: Norman and Carl

**Carl**: What is going on, Norm?  
**Norman**: Something going down on a big scale. A guy from corporate is here. Don't look. He wants to talk to you. I think it's about all those loans you've been approving.  
**Carl**: Eww, well, we had a nice run. I might get shitcanned, Norm.(PP) Anyway, don't worry about it. I'm sure it will lead to something good.  
**Norman**: Hey, I'm part of this too.  
**Carl**: No.  
**Norman**: I stood by and let it happen.

Carl was called by the man from the corporation of the bank. He used the slang while talking to Norman. Carl and Norman did not know why the man from the corporation called him. Norman told him that it could be about all those loans
Carl had been approving. Previously, Carl had gone to ‘Yes Seminar’ and he made a covenant that he would say yes to everything he encountered. Therefore, he approved every single loan proposal from the applicants. Carl assumed that he might get fired because of that. However instead of saying get fired, he said, “I might get shitcanned, Norm.”

In dialog 3 Carl used the slang ‘shitcan’ in telling Norman that he might get fired by the man from the bank corporation. Both Carl and Norman knew what ‘shitcan’ meant. The event means that they shared the same knowledge. As Brown and Levinson (1987) state that the use of slang is associated with the recalling knowledge of the speaker and hearer about the object or the thing they are referring the slang with. The slang would be meaningless or misunderstood if Norman did not know what ‘shitcan’ was.

The last example of apparent instrument of claiming common ground that appeared in this movie is the use of white lie. White lie is applied due to the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s positive face. When the speaker has to state an opinion or idea that will damage the hearer’s positive face but he does not want to damage the face at all or does not want to mitigate the threat, he will say the opposite or the manipulation of his opinion or idea. In other word, the speaker lies. Since the lie is dealing with one’s positive face it is considered as white lie. The white lie in the movie can be seen in the scene where Carl and Peter were having an argument. This scene is represented in dialogue 4. The white lie is labeled with ‘PP’ as the part of positive politeness.
Dialogue 4
Time: 00:10:08 – 00:10:38
Setting: Carl’s house
Situation: Carl is watching a movie and Peter suddenly comes
Participants: Carl and Peter

Carl: (Cell phone is ringing) Jesus, Pete. I’m not in or I’m busy (rejects the call). Oh come on. You’re halfway through. Just snap it off already (commenting at the movie then he runs to the door since the doorbell rings). (Opens the door) Pete. Hey. Where have you been?

Peter: You haven't been getting my calls?


Peter: You are so full of shit (calls Carl’s cell phone).

Carl: Oh, here it is (takes the cell phone from his pocket).

Carl was watching a movie on the TV when suddenly Peter came to his house. Peter was upset because Carl had not answered his call previously. That day was important to Peter because that day was his engagement party. Carl did not show himself to the party. He wanted to remind Carl about that day but Carl never answered the call he had made. When Carl was asked about the call, he said that he did not know anything about it because he had lost his cell phone. However, it turned out that Carl lied and it was proven by Peter himself by once more calling Carl’s cell phone that was obviously in Carl’s trouser pocket.

Dialogue 4 was taken from the beginning of the movie so Carl still felt irritated to have or to join social activity. Carl knew that there were some calls from Peter but he just did not want to answer that. Carl could have said that he did not want to answer the call but he did not. He manipulated his idea by demonstrating white lie instead. By doing that, Carl saved Peter’s positive face. If Carl said that he did not want to answer the call, it would threatened Peter’s positive face.
Another mechanism of positive politeness is conveying that speaker and hearer are cooperators. This mechanism deals with conveying the cooperation that exists between the speaker and hearer. It means that the speaker and hearer are related in relevant activity and they are cooperatively connected by that. The sub strategy of conveying that the speaker and hearer are cooperators is the use of offer and promise. The use of offer and promise indicates the cooperation a speaker gives to the hearer. By giving an offer or a promise, the speaker shows a good intension of fulfilling hearer’s want. The speaker wants the hearer to get the want and will help to obtain the want.

The use of promise was shown in the dialog where Carl was visited by Peter. It was in the same scene as the scene where Peter came to ask Carl about the reason of his absence at Peter’s engagement party. Peter had called Carl but Carl did not answer. Carl lied about the call, but he completely forgot about the engagement party. Carl promised Peter that he would go to another event. Dialogue 5 shows the conversation. The use of promise is labeled with ‘PP’ as the part of positive politeness.

Dialogue 5
Time : 00:10:45 – 00:10:02
Setting : Carl’s house
Situation : Peter is telling Carl that he missed the engagement party
Participants : Carl and Peter

Peter : You know what buddy? You missed my engagement party tonight.
Carl : Oh no. Oh shoot. You are kidding? That was tonight? I am so sorry, man. I totally gapped it. Listen, I'll make it up to you. I promise. I swear. You pick the day. Any day you want. We'll go out. We'll swashbuckle. (PP)
Peter : What does that even mean?
Carl : I don't know.
Peter invited Carl to the engagement party. It meant that Peter wanted Carl to come to the engagement party. The invitation was the form of positive face want Peter had. Going to the event would show that Carl respected or valued Peter’s positive face. However, Carl did not do that. Carl gave the threat to Peter’s positive face by forgetting to come to the engagement party. To fix the mistake he made, Carl promised Peter a make up day for the engagement party. By doing that, Carl showed an intention to fulfill Peter’s positive face wants.

Along with the promise, offer is also a sub-strategy of conveying that speaker and hearer are cooperators. When a speaker gives an offer to the hearer, he shows the intention of fulfilling hearer’s positive face as well. This exemplifies by the scene where Carl was in a bar and he tried to get to know Allison. Allison was Car’s crush. They met accidentally when Carl’s car ran out of gas. Allison helped Carl in getting the gas some moments before they met at the bar. She was also vocalist of a band that regularly performed at the bar. After she finished performing with the band, Carl approached her and offered a drink. Dialogue 6 shows how the conversation was. The offer is labeled with ‘PP’ as it is part of the positive politeness.

**Dialogue 6**

**Time**: 00:44:45 – 00:45:34

**Setting**: Bar

**Situation**: Carl is trying to get to know Allison

**Participants**: Carl and Allison

**Allison**: Can I have a water? (Asking the bartender and then look at Carl that is sitting next to her) hey, out of gas make out guy.

**Carl**: Did we make out? Oh, right, we did. Now I remember.

**Allison**: What are you doing here?

**Carl**: Is this crazy or what?

**Allison**: It’s so crazy. Are you stalking me?
Carl: No, I would never do that. By the way, your new LR furniture, it looks great from the yard. Hey, uh, great, uh, gig, whatever.
Allison: Thanks.
Carl: Strong lyrics. Do you just make that stuff up?
Allison: It gots me personal experience.
Carl: Do you want a drink? (PP)
Allison: Oh, I can’t. I have to wake up early so I have to go but..
Carl: Aw.. Really?
Allison: But you can walk me to my scooter.

In dialogue 6, Carl offered Allison with a drink. By giving the hearer a gift or a present, the speaker is fulfilling the hearer’s positive want. The drink that was about to be given to Allison was kind of gift or present. Carl showed the intention of fulfilling Allison’s positive face want by offering her a drink. In other word, Carl gave the cooperation to Allison.

The last mechanism of positive politeness strategy is fulfilling hearer’s want. In the previous part, the writer discusses offering that shows an intention of fulfilling hearer’s want. In this part, the writer discusses the actual fulfilling hearer’s want. Giving gift is an instrument of fulfilling hearer’s want. In the movie, the gift is in the form of sympathy, understanding, and cooperation.

This was demonstrated in some conversations done by the characters. Sympathy was the most frequent form of gift that was used by the characters. Some of the characters used compliment in demonstrating sympathy. One of the examples is the conversation between Peter and Carl when they were in the bar. Carl played the dance arcade game in the bar and he won. Peter says, “Carl that was so awesome” (PP). This compliment was kind of care directed to Carl, which was also kind of intangible gift.
Another example of intangible gift was demonstrated by Carl. This was in the conversation between Carl and Allison when they were secretly at the Hollywood an open stage. They were talking about their job and what made them happy in their life. Dialogue 7 shows the scene where that event happened. The sub-strategy is labeled with ‘PP’.

**Dialogue 7**

**Time**: 00:58:25 – 00:59:00  
**Setting**: Hollywood Bowl (an open stage)  
**Situation**: Carl and Allison are talking about their life.  
**Participants**: Carl and Allison

**Carl**: How many people can this place even hold?  
**Allison**: I think 17,000.  
**Carl**: So each one of us invites…(cut by Allison)  
**Allison**: No need. I know our music isn't that mainstream, but I love doing it. It's like my photography. I know there isn't much demand for blurry photos taken while running, but…(not finishing her words)  
**Carl**: I wasn't going to say anything.  
**Allison**: You know, who cares? The world is a playground. You know that when you're a kid, but somewhere along the way everyone forgets it.  
**Carl**: I love your music. (PP)

In dialogue 7, Allison explained that her music was not that mainstream. In responding that, Carl said, “I love your music”. Carl showed an admiration to the thing possessed by Allison. By doing that, Carl gave the intangible gift and he cared for Allison’s positive face.

### 2. Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is a strategy that is addressed to hearer’s negative face. It focuses on redressing an action that contains threat to hearer’s negative face. Negative politeness demonstrates the function of a redressive action in minimizing the imposition of an FTA that is unavoidable. Negative face is one’s desire of being not imposed or the desire of freedom to act. Thus, negative
politeness is the way a speaker minimizes the imposition addressed to that desire. Negative politeness is also the way to maximize the social distance and it is generally used to put a social brake in the interaction.

The negative politeness was used by all of the characters. The strategy was used when the characters were aware that the action they were about to do was kind of threat to the hearers’ negative face. As an example, the strategy was demonstrated when the characters were about to ask or to order something from the hearer. There were 5 mechanisms of negative politeness namely being direct, avoiding presumption/assumption, avoiding coercion to the hearer, communicating speaker’s want to not impinge on hearer and redressing other wants of hearer’s. However, the last two strategies were not found in the movie. The most apparent sub-strategies of those 3 mechanisms were being conventionally indirect, using questions and minimizing imposition.

Conventional indirectness is the way of conveying thing which has meaning more than or different from what it literally means. One of the examples of this strategy was demonstrated in the scene where Carl and Peter were in the bar with Roney, their best friend. Carl was apologizing for not wanting to see them in the past few months. Carl was also explaining that at the time he was in a ‘yes’ program that required him to say yes to anything that came to him. Peter saw this as an opportunity to get another drink. He knew that when Carl was asked to pay for the bill, he would not say no. Once the waitress passed by, Peter asked for another round of drinks. Dialogue 8 shows how the conversation was. The label ‘NP’ indicates the negative politeness.
Dialogue 8
Time: 00:30:53 – 00:31:33
Setting: Bar
Situation: Carl is apologizing and explaining his situation now.
Participants: Carl and Peter

Carl: I have been such a dick and a douche. More of a douche than a dick probably. I'm sorry. I should have been there. I mean really.
Peter: You're preaching to the choir, Carl.
Carl: I'm telling you man. Things are different.
Peter: So wait, you have to say yes to everything?
Carl: Yeah, exactly. It's like you said, I wasn't open to stuff, and now that I am, things are changing for me. It's like the era of yes has begun.
Peter: Alright. Look, if it gets you out of the house I'm all for it. (See the waitress is passing by) excuse me. Can we get another round of drinks? (NP) Actually, we're going to start a tab, and our good friend here, Carl Allen, will be taking care of it. You're okay with that right buddy?
Carl: Yes, yes I am.

In dialogue 8, Peter said, “Can we get another round of drinks?” to the waitress. This question was kind of conventional indirectness. When Peter asked that question to the waitress, he did not mean to ask about their ability of getting another round of drinks. The question conveyed something more than its literal meaning. What Peter actually meant by asking that was an order for the waitress to bring another round of drinks. By doing that, Peter redressed the threat to the negative face that was carried within the actual message.

Presuming and assuming the wants of the hearer are the things that have to be avoided in negative politeness strategy. Avoiding those two are the mechanisms of negative politeness. The sub-strategy of this mechanism that frequently demonstrated in the movie was the use of question. One of the examples of the use of question was in the scene where Carl brought a lot of oranges and he gave it to his clients in the bank. There was a long queue in front of his office. He greeted the clients and began to give the oranges to some clients.
in the front line. After he gave the oranges to some clients, he gave the basket of oranges to a client and he said, “Pass those out, will you?” Carl demonstrated the avoidance of presuming and assuming by that. He did not presume or assume that the hearer might want to do that but he asked the hearer and gave the hearer option instead. Therefore, the hearer could choose to do the act that was asked by Carl or not and in other word, the infringement toward the hearer autonomy was lowered.

The last mechanism of negative politeness found in the movie was avoiding coercion to the hearer. One of the sub-strategies of this mechanism is minimizing the imposition of the FTA directed to the hearer’s negative face. This was accomplished by demonstrating euphemism. The scene where Peter was in the office and Norman suddenly called him showed the demonstration of euphemism. Carl was in his office talking to Lee, his best friend that wanted to get a loan. Norman came in because the guy from the corporate came to see Carl. Dialogue 9 shows how the conversation was. The negative politeness is labeled with ‘NP’.

**Dialogue 9**

**Time**: 00:59:41 – 00:59:50

**Setting**: Brea Federal Savings and Loan office

**Situation**: Carl and Lee are having a conversation when Norman suddenly comes.

**Participants**: Carl, Lee and Norman

**Carl**: (Walks into the room and sees Lee is there) Lee?

**Lee**: Hey.

**Carl**: What up? My brizzo? (Sees Lee’s upset face) That is not right, is it?

**Norman**: (Comes in the office) Carl, I need you for a second. (NP)
In dialogue 9 Norman said, “Carl, I need you for a second.” By saying that, Norman minimized the imposition of the FTA he made. The action of asking Carl to go with him was the threat to Carl’s negative face. It threatened Carl’s autonomy. The ‘for a second’ was the euphemism used by Norman to reduce the threat of the FTA.

3. Bald on Record

Bald on record is a direct way of conveying things. The usage of this strategy is related to speaker’s want of ignoring the face of the hearer. In other word, it is related to the want of not satisfying the hearer’s face. However, there are two circumstances in applying this strategy due to the different motives the speakers have. They are the circumstance where the face threat is not minimized at all and the circumstance where the face threat is minimized by implication.

Bald on record strategy was used by all of the main characters. Peter and Allison ware the characters that used it the most for they used it for three times in the movie. The utterances produced by Peter, Allison and the other characters contained the two circumstances. The circumstance where the face threat was not minimized was demonstrated in some cases like the case of great urgency, the case where speaker’s want to satisfy the hearer’s face is small and the case where the absence of the threat minimization. The circumstance where the face threat is minimized by implication was demonstrated in some cases where the speaker insists that the hearer may impose speaker’s negative face and the hearer may transgress on speaker’s positive face.
The circumstance where the threat is not minimized is driven by the want of maximum efficiency and it is known by both the speaker and hearer. The case of great urgency demonstrates that circumstance. One of the examples of this case was found in the scene where Carl and Allison were in their spontaneous trip in Lincoln, Nebraska. Dialog 10 shows how the scene was. The bald on-record strategy is labeled with ‘BOR’.

**Dialogue 10**

**Time**: 1:11:53 – 1:12:21  
**Setting**: A village in Lincoln, Nebraska  
**Situation**: Carl and Allison are walking in the path when it suddenly rains.  
**Participants**: Carl and Allison

- **Carl**: I can’t believe I tripped like that (commenting on the previous visit at the chicken slaughterhouse).  
- **Allison**: Huh, it seemed that you fainted.  
- **Carl**: No, I told you my foot caught a nail.  
- **Allison**: Oh, okay. I thought it was all the chicken beaks in the bucket.  
- **Carl**: Don’t. Please. Oh God, it starts to rain (covers Allison with his jacket). I’ll protect you. Come on. Hurry. There’s no time to lose. We have to find shelter. Come on. Get in here (BOR) (gets into the barn).

Carl and Allison went to the telephone museum, shooting course, American football match and chicken slaughterhouse. After some trips in the city, they decided to visit the rural area or the village. While they were walking in the path in the middle of the field, they talked about the experience they got in chicken slaughterhouse. Previously, they got the chance to do a small tour in the chicken slaughterhouse. The guide told them about some bad things that might happen if the employee did not do the job properly such as someone got a beak in their bucket or a mouthful of tendons. Carl fainted when he heard those things but he did not admit that. Carl and Allison ended up arguing whether he fainted or not.
then the rain came. It was a hard rain so Carl took Allison to the barn. In taking Allison to the barn, Carl demonstrated the case of urgency.

In dialogue 10, Carl said, “Get in here” to Allison. This utterance contained an FTA which was not redressed or in other word the threat was not minimized at all. The choice of not minimizing the utterance was because of the urgency that Carl faced. They were in the middle of the field when the sudden rain came. The rain was hard and if they did not run to the barn immediately, they would get wet. This condition was the urgency that Carl faced. Therefore, he did not redress the threat and went baldly on the utterance.

Another case that demonstrates the circumstance where the threat is not minimized is the case where the speaker’s want to satisfy hearer’s face is small. This case can be due to some conditions such as the speaker is powerful, the speaker does not fear retaliation from the hearer and the speaker wants to be rude. However, the third condition was the only condition found in the movie. In the scene where this case was demonstrated, Allison was mad at Carl and she wanted Carl to get away from her. Dialogue 11 shows how the conversation was. The bald on-record strategy is labeled with ‘BOR’.

**Dialogue 11**

**Time**: 1:18:36 – 1:18:45  
**Setting**: The city’s airport  
**Situation**: Carl is trying to talk to Allison at the airport.  
**Participants**: Carl and Allison

**Carl**: (Running towards Allison) Allison! Please, can we talk for a second?  
**Allison**: Get away from me (BOR)(walks away).  
**Carl**: Okay (stops following Allison).  
**Allison**: Farther (shouts).  
**Carl**: Yep (runs to another direction).
Previously, Carl and Allison were caught by FBI agents for being suspicious. Before Carl had this spontaneous trip, Carl had joined some courses like flying course, Korean course and other courses. Carl also had granted a loan for a farmer who made an organic fertilizer. Carl, in the same time was an active member of the matchmaker site Persianwifefinder.com. Those things were the result of saying ‘yes’ to any opportunity that came to him. However, those things were suspicious for the FBI agents. The FBI agents accused Carl of being involved in terrorism. Carl managed to call his attorney who was also his best friend, Peter. Peter explained that Carl’s suspicious activities were due to the ‘yes’ program. Hearing that, Allison thought that everything they had done all this time was just because that program and it made her upset. After Peter finished explaining the real situation, the agents finally let them go. Allison directly got out from the room without saying anything. Allison chose not to sit near Carl and Peter when they were in the airplane as well. When they finally arrived at their city’s airport, Carl tried to catch Allison and tried to talk to her. However, Allison did not want to talk to Carl at all. In avoiding him, Allison applied the bald on record strategy.

Allison was mad and upset because of the truth about Carl she had just known. Therefore, she produced the rudeness to express her mood. The rudeness Alison made is shown in Allison’s line when she said to Carl to get away from her. The utterance Allison made showed the circumstance where the threat was not minimized. It was the case where the speaker’s want to satisfy hearer’s face is small.
The last case of the circumstances where the face threat was not minimized is the case of the absence of minimization. This likely occurs where doing the FTA is the hearer’s interest. Therefore by doing this, the speaker shows the care for the hearer. This case happened in the scene where Carl and Allison met for the very first time. The conversation is shown in dialogue 12. The bald on-record strategy is labeled with ‘BOR’.

**Dialogue 12**
- **Time**: 00:26:29 – 00:26:57
- **Setting**: Elysian Park
- **Situation**: Allison is about to leave Carl after giving him a ride
- **Participants**: Carl and Allison

**Allison**: Can I have my helmet back now?
**Carl**: I’m still wearing it aren’t I? (Gives the helmet back)
**Allison**: Thanks. Are you okay?
**Carl**: Yeah, I’m good, unless you want to stick around and make out.
**Allison**: What? (Shocked)
**Carl**: What did you say?
**Allison**: (Walk towards Carl without saying anything)
**Carl**: Hey, I… (Kissed by Allison)
**Allison**: Have a good night (BOR) (walks away and smile).

After joining the ‘yes’ seminar, Carl decided to start to say yes to anything that might come to him, including a homeless guy that asked for a ride to Elysian Park. On the way home after giving a ride for the homeless guy, his car ran out of gas. He had to walk quite far to find the nearest gas station. Carl met Allison for the very first time at this gas station. Allison decided to give Carl a ride with her scooter. Carl was finally able to turn the engine on. When Allison was about to leave, Carl tried to flirt with Allison. It worked and he got a kiss from Allison. Allison left but before leaving she demonstrated the case where doing the FTA is the hearer’s interest.
In dialogue 12, Allison said, “Have a good night”. By saying that, Allison applied the bald on record strategy. Allison did not redress the utterance she made. It was a direct FTA addressed to Carl negative face. The utterance Allison made implied that she wanted Carl to have a good night. It meant that Allison did that for the sake of Carl’s interest which also meant that Allison cared about Carl.

Another circumstance in applying bald on record strategy is the circumstance where the face threat is minimized by implication. This circumstance is demonstrated in some cases such as the case where the speaker insists that the hearer may impose speaker’s negative face and the hearer may transgress on speaker’s positive face. The example of the case where the speaker insists that the hearer may impose the speaker’s negative face are welcoming and offering. The example of the case where the speaker insists that the hearer may transgress on speaker’s positive face is farewell. However, this case was not found in the movie.

Welcoming and offering were demonstrated several times in the movies. Norman demonstrated welcoming in the scene where Carl visited his apartment. Norman invited Carl to his hat and/or party at his apartment while they were in the office. Carl said yes to the invitation and decided to go there with Allison. The theme of the party was Harry Potter, so they dressed as Harry Potter and Hermione Granger. The conversation is shown in dialogue 13. The bald on-record strategy is labeled with ‘BOR’.

**Dialogue 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>00:53:17 – 00:53:35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Norman’s apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Carl and Allison come to Norman’s hat and/or costume party.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants: Carl, Norman and Allison

Norman: (Opens the door and casts a spell towards Carl and Allison)
Expelliarmus! Just kidding.
Carl: That's okay, I blocked it and deflected it back.
Norman: Kaching! Wow, cool costume, my man.
Carl: The only one they had left was for toddlers (pointing at his vest). This is Allison, with her wand made from a sequoia.
Allison: You must be Norman.
Norman: Yeah, nice to meet you. Thanks for coming. Come in. (BOR)

In dialogue 13, Norman said, “Come in” which was kind of direct imperative. Norman did not redress the utterance he made. The utterance he made implied that he gave the allowance for the hearer to impose his negative face. By asking people get into his apartment, he let his autonomy got imposed by the existence of the people inside his apartment. When people were in his apartment, he could not really act as he wanted.

Offering was shown in the scene where Carl became a volunteer in a social work to help the homeless. The social work was dealing with giving the homeless free lunch. Carl was in charge of giving the soup. The homeless were queuing in front of the food stalks and once a homeless reached the soup section and Carl said, “Come and get it”. In this situation, Carl did a direct imperative which meant that he applied the bald on record strategy. Carl was offering the soup to the homeless and he let his negative face be imposed by the homeless since he had to take and prepare the soup for the homeless.

4. Off Record

Off record is doing a communicative act which is done in such way that is somehow unclear and makes the act has more than one clear intention. In other word, it is using language in indirect way. It allows the speaker to do the FTA
without taking the responsibility of doing that. The examples of the off record strategy that could be found in the movie were being ironic and giving hints.

Off record strategy was used eight times by three of the characters with Norman as an exception. Carl applied the strategy the most. In the scene where Carl was in the bar and saw his ex-wife Stephanie was making out with her new boyfriend, he demonstrated being ironic. The situation is shown in dialogue 14. ‘OR’ is the label of off-record politeness strategy.

**Dialogue 14**

**Time** : 00:03:20 – 00:03:50
**Setting** : Bar
**Situation** : Carl was having conversation with his friends in the bar and he saw Stephanie was making out with her new boyfriend.
**Participants** : Carl, Peter, Roney and Lucy

*Peter* : Carl, does that work for you?
*Carl* : Yeah, we’ll figure it out?
*Peter* : What’s there to figure it out?
*Carl* : Oh God. Look who’s here.
*Peter* : I’m not falling for that Carl. What’s to figure out?
*Roney* : Carl, It’s open bar. What’s the problem?
*Carl* : I’m serious. Stephanie’s at the bar.
*Lucy* : The Stephanie?
*Carl* : Yes, my ex. She’s at the bar.
*Peter* : Oh God. That is Stephanie.
*Roney* : Looks like she’s with someone there too.
*Carl* : Yeah, they seem to be thriving. Good for her. Oh look, they’re touching each other's genitals. Isn't that amazing? I'm so glad I came out. Love it. (OR)OK, you know what? I gotta go.

Previously, Peter asked Carl to join him to get some drinks at the bar. Carl tried several excuses to refuse it but he ended up joining the drinking time. At the bar, they met Roney and Lucy, Peter’s fiancée. Peter told Carl and Roney that he had just had engagement with Lucy and he invited them to the engagement party on the following day. Carl seemed not interested with the invitation so he made up
an excuse by saying he would figure it out. While they were having a conversation, Carl saw Stephanie was in the bar as well. Carl saw her while she was kissing her new boyfriend. Carl was actually still in love with her. Carl demonstrated being ironic right after seeing them kissing.

In dialogue 14, Carl demonstrated being ironic by saying “Oh look, they're touching each other's genitals. Isn't that amazing? I'm so glad I came out. Love it.” Carl was still in love with Stephanie. Saying that he was happy seeing Stephanie made out with her new boyfriend was the opposite of what he actually felt. Carl was not happy and he even wanted to leave the bar. Carl stated something which was the opposite of the actual meaning of his utterance or in other word Carl stated something ironically. Carl actually complained about his friend inviting him to the bar that he ended up seeing his ex-wife made out with someone. Carl used off record strategy to avoid the responsibility of his action.

Another example of off record found in the movie was giving hints. Giving hints is saying something that is not explicitly relevant and inviting the hearer to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance. It was demonstrated in the scene where Carl was invited to Norman’s hat and/or wig party. In this scene, Carl was told by Norman that he would not get any promotion. To cheer Carl up, Norman invited him to a costume party. Carl was still in the state of avoiding any social contact. Carl had not gone to the ‘yes’ seminar too, so that he still could say no to things. He rejected the invitation by demonstrating giving the hints. Dialogue 15 shows the situation. The off-record strategy is labeled with ‘OR’.
Dialogue 15
Time: 00:06:35 – 00:07:10
Setting: Office
Situation: Norman tries to cheer Carl up and invites him to a costume party but he rejects that.
Participants: Carl and Norman

Norman: At least you didn’t get shitcanned. You know what that means?
Carl: Fired?
Norman: Oh, how did you know what that means? You heard me say that before?
Carl: No, it's a pretty common expression.
Norman: In my circles, I made it up.
Carl: It is catching on.
Norman: This will cheer you up. I'm having a get-together at my place. It's a funny hat and/or wig party.
Carl: Oh, man! Sucks I'm going to be out of town. (OR)
Norman: You don’t know what day it is.
Carl: When is it?
Norman: Friday.
Carl: I’m out of town.

In dialogue 15, Carl rejected the invitation given by Norman by saying a thing which was not related to the invitation. Carl let Norman interpreted the utterance. The utterance contained the hint of the actual meaning. Carl could not go to the costume party. Instead of saying no directly to the invitation, Carl said that he was going to be out of the town. Carl’s plan to leave the city was the hint for Norman. By interpreting this utterance, Norman knew that Carl would not be able to join the party.

B. The Factors influencing the Application of Politeness Strategies by the Main Characters of Yes Man.

This section discusses the factors influencing the application of politeness strategies done by the main characters of Yes Man based on Brown and Levinson
(1987) theories. There are two factors that influence the application of the politeness strategies: the payoffs and the sociological variables of circumstances between the speaker and the hearer. The payoffs refer to the result of the strategies and the sociological variables involve three variables namely the social distance, the relative power and the rank of imposition.

1. Payoffs

Payoffs are the advantages or the results of the politeness strategy. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), when a speaker applies the strategy, the speaker expects a certain result that is advantageous for him. Bald on record gives the speaker a chance to be clear, perspicacious and to demonstrate non-manipulativeness. Positive politeness gives the speaker the chance to satisfy hearer’s positive face. Negative politeness gives the speaker the chance to satisfy hearer’s negative face. Off record gives the speaker the chance to satisfy hearer’s face in a greater degree and to avoid the responsibility of the FTA he does. The deeper discussion about the payoffs found in the movie were explained in the next part. The writer will discuss bald on-record payoffs first, and then followed by positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record payoffs.

a. Bald On-Record Payoffs

The idea of bald on record payoffs is giving the speaker a chance to be clear, perspicacious, and efficient and to show demonstrable non-manipulativeness (Brown and Levinson: 1987). This was exemplified in dialogue 10 and dialogue 11. In dialogue 10, Carl demonstrated bald on record strategy based on this payoff.
Dialogue 10
Time: 1:11:53 – 1:12:21
Setting : A village in Lincoln, Nebraska
Situation : Carl and Allison are walking in the path when it suddenly rains.
Participants : Carl and Allison

Carl : I can’t believe I tripped like that (commenting on the previous visit at the chicken slaughterhouse).
Allison : Huh, it seemed that you fainted.
Carl : No, I told you my foot caught a nail.
Allison : Oh, okay. I thought it was all the chicken beaks in the bucket.
Carl : Don’t. Please. Oh God, it starts to rain (covers Allison with his jacket). I’ll protect you. Come on. Hurry. There’s no time to lose. We have to find shelter. Come on. Get in here (BOR) (gets into the barn).

In dialogue 10, Carl said, “Get in here” to Allison when it started to rain. Carl could not avoid the responsibility of doing FTA to Allison. Carl did not redress it because he wanted to be clear, perspicacious and efficient. The situation was kind of unpredictable and it happened suddenly so it was better for Carl to be clear, perspicacious and efficient or otherwise they would get wet for the sprinkle turned into hard rain in a short moment.

Another payoff of bald on-record is showing demonstrable non-manipulativeness. This payoff is demonstrated in dialogue 11. In this dialogue, Allison employed bald on-record strategy. She chose to do the strategy to show the demonstrable non-manipulativeness.

Dialogue 11
Time: 1:18:36 – 1:18:45
Setting: The city’s airport
Situation: Carl is trying to talk to Allison at the airport.
Participants: Carl and Allison

Carl : (Running towards Allison) Allison! Please, can we talk for a second?
Allison : Get away from me (BOR)(walks away).
Carl : Okay (stops following Allison).
Allison : Farther (shouts).
Carl : Yep (runs to another direction).
Allison was angry with Carl right after he told her that he had to say yes to every opportunity that came to him. Allison could not accept that fact and she was so mad that wanted Carl to leave her. Allison said, “Get away from me” to Carl without redressing the utterance first. Allison was being clear and she showed the demonstrable non-manipulativeness. She did not redress nor manipulate real message. She could just said something which was less threatening than saying it in bald on record way. She could have just said it in negative politeness or even off record way. She did not do that since she wanted to show her anger by being clear and showing the non-manipulativeness.

b. Positive Politeness Payoffs

Positive politeness’ payoff deals with satisfying hearer’s positive face in some respects. This payoff was exemplified in dialogue 1 where Carl was having conversation with Peter. Carl demonstrated positive politeness strategy and the choice of the strategy based on the payoffs.

**Dialogue 1**
**Setting:** Video Store
**Situation:** Carl is answering Peter’s call
**Participants:** Carl and Peter

*Carl*: No (rejects the call). No means no (accidentally presses the answer button). *Bonjour.*

*Peter*: Carl, I know it’s you.

*Carl*: Oh, hey man (PP). I had your number dialed and was about to press send. Did you block your number?

*Peter*: Yeah, I did. You never answer when I don’t.

In dialogue 1, Carl said, “Oh, hey man” to Peter. The address term ‘man’ Carl used indicated as an in group identity marker. Carl showed that he considered Peter as someone who was in the same common ground with him. Carl chose this
strategy because he wanted to consider himself to be ‘the same kind’ with Peter. By doing that, Carl also showed that he wanted Peter’s want and desire since he considered himself to be ‘the same kind’ with Peter. In other word, Carl wanted to satisfy peter’s positive face.

Another example of positive politeness’ payoff was exemplified in the scene where Carl attended to Norman’s costume party. Norman demonstrated the positive politeness strategy and this was affected by the payoffs of fulfilling the positive face desire of Peter. Dialogue 12 shows how the conversation between them was.

**Dialogue 12**

**Setting:** Norman’s apartment

**Situation:** Carl and Allison come to Norman’s hat and/or costume party.

**Participants:** Carl, Norman and Allison

Norman: (Opens the door and casts a spell towards Carl and Allison) Expelliarmus! Just kidding.

Carl : That's okay, I blocked it & deflected it back.

Norman: Kaching! Wow, cool costume, my man. (PP)

Carl : The only one they had left was for toddlers (pointing at his vest). This is Allison, with her wand made from a sequoia.

Allison : You must be Norman.

Norman: Yeah, nice to meet you. Thanks for coming. Come in.

Carl wore Harry Potter themed costume and he got a compliment from Norman. In giving compliment to Carl, Norman said, “Wow, cool costume, my man.” In the utterance made by Norman, it was obvious that Norman used the address term ‘my man’ as an in group identity marker. However the focus of the analysis was not the address term but more to the compliment. The compliment Norman gave indicated that Norman valued what Carl had. In other word,
Norman satisfied Carl’s positive face. Therefore, in applying the strategy, Carl expected the payoff which was being able to satisfy Peter’s positive face.

c. Negative Politeness Payoffs

Whenever speaker wants to satisfy hearer’s negative face, the speaker applies the negative politeness. This statement summarizes the essence of negative politeness payoff which is satisfying hearer’s negative face. Speaker can get several payoffs or advantages by doing this strategy. The first example was found in dialogue 7.

Dialogue 7
Setting: Bar
Situation: Carl is apologizing and explaining his situation now.
Participants: Carl and Peter

Carl : I have been such a dick and a douche. More of a douche than a dick probably. I'm sorry. I should have been there. I mean really.
Peter : You're preaching to the choir, Carl.
Carl : I'm telling you man. Things are different.
Peter : So wait, you have to say yes to everything?
Carl : Yeah, exactly. It's like you said, I wasn't open to stuff, and now that I am, things are changing for me. It's like the era of yes has begun.
Peter : Alright. Look, if it gets you out of the house I'm all for it. (See the waitress is passing by) Excuse me. Can we get another round of drinks? (NP) Actually, we're going to start a tab, and our good friend here, Carl Allen, will be taking care of it. You're okay with that right buddy?
Carl : Yes, yes I am.

Carl was in the bar apologizing for the mistakes he had done to Peter. They celebrate it by drinking a lot of liquor. Peter had not had enough liquor, so he asked for more to the waitress. In asking for more liquor, Peter said, “Can we get another round of drinks?” Peter demonstrated the conventional indirectness which redressed the threat carried in the order. Peter could show the respect to the
waitress by not directly conveyed the FTA to her. In order words, he could manage to satisfy the hearer’s negative face.

Another example of this payoff was shown in the scene where Carl, Peter, and Lucy, Peter fiancée were in the restaurant having lunch together. In this dialogue, Peter employed negative politeness strategy. In choosing the strategy, Peter considered satisfying Carl’s negative face or the negative politeness payoff. This is exemplified in dialogue 16.

**Dialogue 16**

**Time:** 00:52:31 – 00:52:48  
**Setting:** Restaurant  
**Situation:** Carl is having a lunch together with Peter, Lucy and Faranoosh.  
**Participants:** Carl, Peter and Lucy

Lucy : My friends are being really lame, and nobody’s offered to throw me a bridal shower.

Peter : Hey, I have an idea. Carl, would you like to throw Lucy a bridal shower? (NP)

Carl : Yeah, sure. Why not? That would be great. I’d love that.

Peter : Problem solved.

Lucy told Peter and Carl a problem she encountered at the time. Peter and Lucy were about to get marry, but none of her friends offered her a bridal shower. Peter asked Carl whether he could give her the bridal shower. In asking Carl, Peter said “Carl, would you like to throw Lucy a bridal shower?” By doing that, Peter gave Carl an option to choose. Peter redressed the FTA he made for Carl. By doing so, it explained that he chose the strategy for the sake of Carl’s negative face which also explained the essence of the negative politeness payoff.

d. **Off-Record Payoffs**

If the speaker wants to satisfy hearer’s negative face to a degree greater than the other strategies do and he can avoid the responsibility of the FTA he does,
the speaker chooses off record strategy. These are the essence of the off record payoffs. This payoff was exemplified in the scene where Carl and Allison were mistakenly arrested by the FBI agents. To solve the misunderstanding, Carl asked for help to his attorney who was also his friend, Peter. In this scene, Peter employed off-record strategy based on the off-record payoff. Dialogue 17 shows how the scene was.

**Dialogue 17**

*Time:* 01:16:11 – 01:16:45  
*Setting:* Security room  
*Situation:* Carl and Allison are caught by the FBI agents  
*Participants:* Carl, Peter, Allison and 2 FBI agents

**Peter**: Several months ago, my client attended a self-empowerment seminar that requires him to say 'Yes' to any request that's presented. So all the activity that appears suspicious, the flying lessons, ...the spontaneous trip taking it's all because he must say 'Yes' to any opportunity.. He is really in to it.

**Allison**: You just say 'Yes' everything? Are you kidding me?

**Carl**: It's not what it sounds like.

**Allison**: Oh really? How does it sound? Because I'd really love to hear it. (Get's mad)

**Peter**: I'm wondering if there's a better setting for this back and forth?. (OR)

**Agent 1**: Yeah, maybe we should speak privately. Come on inside. (Go out with Peter and the other agent)

While overcoming the misunderstanding, Carl revealed that he had to say yes to everything. Allison was upset and mad about that. Carl and Allison had a fight in the middle of the interrogation done by the FBI agents. Peter thought that the situation was not good, so he asked the FBA agents to discuss the matters in another room. In asking the FBI agents to get out from the room, Peter said, “I’m wondering if there’s a better setting for this back and forth.” This utterance was kind of off record strategy. Peter stated an utterance that was not explicitly relevant. The actual message in the utterance was an FTA to the FBI agents’
negative face which was not stated explicitly. Peter did not state it explicitly because he wanted to save the FBI agents’ face. It could be analyzed that the reason behind the choice of the strategy was satisfying hearer’s negative face in a degree greater than what negative politeness did.

Another off record payoff was exemplified in dialogue 13, where Carl and his friends were in the bar. Carl at the time was in the state of avoiding any social interaction but his friends insisted on taking him to the bar. In this scene, Carl employed an off-record strategy based on the off-record politeness payoff.

**Dialogue 14**

**Time** : 00:03:20 – 00:03:50

**Setting** : Bar

**Situation** : Carl was having conversation with his friends in the bar and he saw Stephanie was making out with her new boyfriend.

**Participants** : Carl, Peter, Roney and Lucy

**Peter** : Carl, does that work for you?

**Carl** : Yeah, we’ll figure it out?

**Peter** : What’s there to figure it out?

**Carl** : Oh God. Look who’s here.

**Peter** : I’m not falling for that Carl. What’s to figure out?

**Roney** : Carl, It’s open bar. What’s the problem?

**Carl** : I’m serious. Stephanie’s at the bar.

**Lucy** : The Stephanie?

**Carl** : Yes, my ex. She’s at the bar.

**Peter** : Oh God. That is Stephanie.

**Roney** : Looks like she’s with someone there too.

**Carl** : Yeah, they seem to be thriving. Good for her. Oh look, they're touching each other's genitals. Isn't that amazing? I'm so glad I came out. Love it. (OR)OK, you know what? I gotta go.

Carl ended up going to the bar and when he got there he saw his ex-wife Stephanie. Carl was still in love with her, so when he saw her with her new boyfriend he got jealous. In expressing his unpleasantness he said, “Oh look, they're touching each other's genitals. Isn't that amazing? I'm so glad I came out.
Love it.” Carl was still in love with Stephanie so it was a criticism addressed to his friend. In criticizing his friend, Carl stated an ironic utterance. This kind of utterance left the hearers to interpret what the utterance actually meant. By doing that, Carl could get away from the responsibility of damaging the face of his friends.

2. Sociological Variables

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the measurement of the seriousness of an FTA is affected by three sociological variables namely the social distance, the relative power and the rank of imposition. These variables have particular value and it is known by the speaker and hearer. Each variable has different values that affects the measurement of the seriousness of the FTA and affects the choice of the strategy eventually. In the following section, the writer will discuss the findings related to these sociological variables within the movie Yes Man.

a. Social Distance

Brown and Levinson (1987), state that social distance is “symmetrical social dimension of similarity/difference”. This social dimension is determined by the assessment of the frequency of the interaction and also the kinds of goods (material or non-material) which are swapped between the speaker and hearer. The assessment is determined by stable social attributes such as the age, sex and socio-cultural background, which includes social class and ethnic background. Holmes (2001) describes that this dimension is dealing with the judgment of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Thus, intimacy between the
speaker and hearer affects the choice of the strategy. For example, if the speaker and the hearer are intimate, the speaker might use in-group membership marker such as ‘man’, ‘bro’, etc, which is kind of positive politeness strategy. In contrary, if the speaker and hearer are distant, the speaker might give difference by abase himself to the hearer which is kind of negative politeness strategy. The more intimate the speaker and hearer are, the more the speaker will choose the least polite strategy.

As seen in dialogue 1, where Carl was answering the call from Peter, Carl used the address term ‘man’ for Peter. The address term ‘man’ is one of the instruments to claim the in-group identity member which also means to claim common ground. By doing that, Carl demonstrated positive politeness.

**Dialogue 1**
**Time:** 00:00:32 – 00:01:06  
**Setting:** Video Store  
**Situation:** Carl is answering Peter’s call  
**Participants:** Carl and Peter

**Carl** : No (rejects the call). No means no (accidentally presses the answer button). *Bonjour.*

**Peter** : Carl, I know it’s you.

**Carl** : Oh, hey *man* (PP). I had your number dialed and was about to press send. Did you block your number?

**Peter** : Yeah, I did. You never answer when I don’t.

Carl and Peter are best friend. Peter tried to invite Carl to the bar since he wanted to introduce him to his fiancée. However, Carl was not in the mood to go to the bar. Carl was still in the state of not wanting to socialize since he got divorced from his ex-wife. Therefore he decided to reject the call from Peter. When he accidentally pressed the answer button he used the address term ‘man’.
This indicated that Carl considered Peter as a close person or a person with the same common ground. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) the least polite strategy is bald on record, followed in ascending order by positive politeness, negative politeness and off record politeness. Carl chose politeness strategy because Peter is his best friend. The relationship between them is intimate. Therefore Carl chose the less polite strategy. Another case which shows the tendency of using less polite strategy in an intimate relationship is in the scene where Peter came to Carl’s apartment and got mad at him. Previously, Carl was invited to Peter’s engagement party but Carl did not come. Carl used a lot of excuses and that drove Peter crazy. Carl used excuses to avoid the social interaction. In replying that, Peter said, “I don’t want to hear another excuse, Carl. Do what you want.” This utterance is the bald on record strategy, the least polite strategy. Peter stated something which was bald and threatening to Carl’s face. This was because Peter and Carl were best friends and they had intimate relationship.

b. Relative Power

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that relative power is the degree to which hearer can impose his own want, desire or face over the speaker’s want, desire or face. Holmes (2001) uses the same term but it is called relative status. It explains about the status of the hearer over the speaker which basically also concerns the power of the hearer over the speaker. The power possesses by the hearer affects the choice of the strategy used by the speaker. If the hearer possesses greater power than the speaker, the speaker will use the strategy which
is more polite. In contrary, if the hearer possesses less power, the speaker will use less polite strategy.

The scene where Carl in the office showed the case of the choice of the strategy that was affected by the power that the hearer possessed. In dialogue, Carl was in his office meeting the clients. One of the clients turned out to be his friend, Lee. Lee planned to take a loan to buy something, but before he could actually mention the name of the thing that he would like to buy, Carl was summoned by Norman. In this dialogue Carl employed negative politeness strategy.

Dialogue 18
Time : 01:00:01 – 01:00:32
Setting : Office
Situation : Carl is summoned by Norman
Participants : Carl and Norman

Carl : I might get shi*t canned, Norm. Anyway, don’t worry about it. I’m sure it will lead to something good.
Norman : Hey, I’m part of this too.
Carl : No.
Norman : I stood by and let it happen.
Carl : Norm
Norman : You were feeling it. You were in the loan zone, remember?
Carl : Yes, I was.
Norman : And I was watching you.
Carl : Yeah you were.
Norman : But I’m afraid it’s caught up with us. Right now you and I have to face the music. Come on.
Carl : Can I have one minute? (NP)

Norman told him that the man from the corporation was looking for Carl. When they were about to go to the man, Carl asked Norman permission to see Lee for a moment. In asking the permission from Norman, Carl said, “Hey, can I have one minute?” The utterance made by Carl was kind of negative politeness. Carl
was junior loan officer and Norman was his senior. This meant that Norman has
greater power than Carl. Therefore, in stating his want, Carl used the more polite
strategy, was negative politeness strategy. Carl want was kind of threat to
Norman’s face and Carl realized that he could not really impose his want directly
at Norman’s face.

Another example of this case is the scene where Carl was in the bar with
Peter and some of his friends. Peter came to the bar with his fiancée, Lucy. They
had just got engaged so they tried to invite some of peter’s friend to their
engagement party. When they were discussing about the engagement party,
Stephanie, Carl’s ex-wife entered the bar with her new boyfriend. In dialogue 19,
Peter employed bald on-record strategy.

**Dialogue 19**

**Time** : 00:03:25 – 00:03:52

**Setting** : Bar

**Situation** : Carl is the bar with his friend when suddenly Stephanie comes.

**Participants** : Carl, Peter, Roney and Lucy

---

**Carl** : Oh God, look who’s here.

**Peter** : I’m not falling for that Carl. What’s to figure out?

**Roney** : Carl, it’s an open bar. What’s the problem?

**Carl** : I’m serious. Stephanie’s at the bar.

**Lucy** : The Stephanie?

**Carl** : Yes, my ex. She’s at the bar.

**Roney** : Oh God, that is Stephanie. Looks like she's with someone there too.

**Carl** : Yeah, they seem to be thriving. Good for her. Oh look, they're
touching each other's genitals. Isn't that amazing? I'm so glad I came
out. Love it. OK, you know what? I gotta go.

**Peter** : No, Carl, you are going to stay. (BOR)

Carl, who was still in love with Lucy, could not really see this thing. He
decided to leave the bar afterward. Peter could not really accept Carl’s decision to
leave the bar so he told Carl not to go. In telling Carl not to go, Peter said, “No,
No. Carl, you’re gonna stay.” The utterance Peter made was bald on record. This kind of strategy is a direct threat toward the hearer face. The threat was not redressed because Peter was aware of the power possesses by Carl. Carl did not possess power that was greater than Peter’s power. In fact, they possessed the same power since they had equal status. Therefore, Peter decided to impose his own want over Carl’s want.

c. Rank of Imposition

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that the rank of imposition is the degree of a matter that is considered as the interference to the face of the hearer. This interference is the FTA that the speaker made. In other word, the degree of the FTA defines the rank of imposition. The rank of imposition can be identified by two variables which are the imposition toward the positive face and negative face. For the positive face, the imposition is assessed by the amount of threat given to hearer positive face. For negative face, there are two scales that identify the rank of the imposition namely the imposition requiring services and goods.

Speaker will choose high positive politeness strategy whenever he produces such kind of great amount of threat to the hearer’s positive face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The threat of the positive face can be shown in the act of creating a social distance with the hearer. In the movie, there are several example of this case. The use of in group identity marker such as ‘man’, ‘honey’, ‘my brizzo’, ‘buddy’, and ‘gang’ showed that the positive face of the hearer were saved by the characters who applied those thing. The characters would give the hearer compliment to acknowledge hearer’s possession. Jokes were found as well
as the way to maintain hearer’s positive face but mostly, the characters would show the act of kindness to avoid creating social distance toward the other characters.

One of the example of avoiding social distance toward the hearer was mostly in the scene where Norman and Carl were having a conversation. Norman is Carl’s senior but he does not want to have that kind of senior-junior relationship. He wants to have a best friend-like relationship. Dialogue 20 shows how the conversation was.

**Dialogue 20**

**Time**: 00:05:56 – 00:06:57

**Setting**: Loan Bank

**Situation**: Norman is trying to get close to Carl

**Participants**: Carl and Norman

---

**Norman**: Carl Allen has reported for duty? (PP)

**Carl**: I’m not a soldier, Norman.

**Norman**: You are a soldier on the front line of finance. (PP)

**Secretary**: Norman, Line 1 (telling him that he gets a phone call)

**Carl**: You want to get that in the privacy of your office?

**Norman**: No, I’ll just get it here (picks the phone on Carl’s table up and talks to his superior). You’re with Norman….Are you sure, because … Ok…Whatever you say (ends the conversation). Remember that promotion we were talking about?

**Carl**: Yeah.

**Norman**: That’s not going to happen. I tried to fight for you on the phone there. It was between you and Demco and they went with Demco.

**Carl**: I don’t care. I didn’t really want the job badly. I just figured after 5 years I’d be the logical choice, but whatever.

**Norman**: Well hey, look at it this way, At least you didn’t get shitcanned (PP). You know what that means?

**Carl**: Fired?

**Norman**: Oh, how did you know what that means? You heard me say that before?

**Carl**: No, it’s a pretty common expression.

**Norman**: In my circles. I made it up.

**Carl**: Well, it’s catching on.

**Norman**: This will cheer you up (PP). I’m having a get-together at my place. It’s a funny hat and/or wig party.
In dialogue 20, Norman tries to get close to Carls. Norman used a lot of positive politeness strategies which is labeled with ‘PP’. At the beginning of the conversation, Norman created the soldier joke to ease Carl. Then he used the slang ‘shitcanned’ which shows that he wanted to have the same common ground with Carl. Norman also presupposed Carl’s want or desire by saying “This will cheer you up”. All of the positive politeness strategies Norman did shows that he avoided creating social distance toward the other characters.

In defining the imposition of the negative face, there are two scales namely the imposition requiring services and goods. Whenever the speaker wants services or goods that might threaten the hearer’s autonomy, the speaker will choose negative politeness strategy or even off record strategy. This exemplified in the movie when the characters wanted to get services or goods from the other characters. One of the examples was when Norman said, “So, we’re kind of short on Sat staff. Is there any way you could come in?” to the Carl when Carl was enjoying his Saturday break time. The example of the threat that was lessened by the off record strategy was Peter’s utterance when he was in the airport security room. Carl and Allison were caught by the FBI agents but both of them ended up having a fight in the security room. Peter could not stand the fight so he asked the FBI agent to discuss the matter in other room. Dialogue 17 shows how the conversation was.
Dialogue 17

**Time**: 01:16:11 – 01:16:45

**Setting**: Security room

**Situation**: Carl and Allison are caught by the FBI agents

**Participants**: Carl, Peter, Allison and 2 FBI agents

**Peter**: Several months ago, my client attended a self-empowerment seminar that requires him to say 'Yes' to any request that's presented. So all the activity that appears suspicious, the flying lessons, ...the spontaneous trip taking it's all because he must say 'Yes' to any opportunity.. He is really in to it.

**Allison**: You just say 'Yes' everything? Are you kidding me?

**Carl**: It's not what it sounds like..

**Allison**: Oh really? How does it sound? Because I'd really love to hear it.

(Get's mad)

**Peter**: I'm wondering if there's a better setting for this back and forth? (OR)

**Agent 1**: Yeah, maybe we should speak privately. Come on inside. (Go out with Peter and the other agent)

In asking the FBI agents, Peter said. “I'm wondering if there’s a better setting for this back and forth.” This is an off-record strategy. Peter wanted to satisfy hearers’ negative face, greater than a negative politeness strategy would. Peter did not directly ask the FBI agents to move but he gave the clue for them to interpret. By doing that, Peter respected hearers’ autonomy in the highest level.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of two parts namely conclusions and recommendations. Conclusions deals with the summary of this study. Recommendations consist of input for future researchers and language learners to conduct further studies on the same topic.

A. Conclusions

This study was conducted to analyze the use of politeness strategies by the main characters of Yes Man. It specifically aimed at analyzing the use of four politeness strategies and the factors underlay within the strategies. The writer applied politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) to find out the politeness strategies used by the main characters of Yes Man and the factors affecting the strategies. The four main characters were Carl Allen, Peter, Norman and Allison.

The main characters of Yes Man used four politeness strategies namely bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record. The most frequent strategy was positive politeness. It was used by all of the main characters as well. The characters cared for other characters’ positive face which meant to maintain a close relationship.

The factors underlay the choice of the strategies were the payoffs and the sociological variables which consists of social distance, relative power and rank of imposition. All of the strategies could be analyzed with the two instruments, the
payoffs and the sociological variables. For bald on record the payoff was mostly the want of the speaker to be direct and efficient. For positive politeness, the payoff was the desire to maintain social closeness toward the hearer. For negative politeness, the payoff was the want to respect the hearer. For off-record strategy, the payoff was the want to avoid the responsibility of the FTA. The sociological variables were the factors that mostly related each other. It varied depended on the context.

B. Recommendations

In this part, the writer gives recommendations regarding this study. These recommendations are addressed to the language learners and the future researchers. The writer expects that these recommendations will help them in learning this topic or conducting a research with this topic.

1. To Language Learners

Studying politeness for English as Foreign Language learners are really important. Politeness is a prototype of how language is used in a social context or in a real context. By studying politeness, the language learners can grab the sense of the language which properly used. The learners should practice politeness in order to be able to use the language properly in social context and to avoid placing the local context in English utterances.

2. To Future Researchers

The writer would like to present the suggestion to the future researchers to conduct the research regarding politeness. This study was aimed for analyzing the
use of politeness strategies and the factors affecting it. The writer expects that the future researcher can conduct a research in the existence of double or even multiple strategies within an utterance and the factor affecting this phenomenon. The future researcher can use the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) as it has been applied widely.
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APPENDIX

The list of Politeness Strategies Produced by the Main Characters of Yes Man Movie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Politeness Strategy (BOR, PP, NP, OR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Oh. Hey, man.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Oh, man that sounds great. I wish I could join you.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Any other night would have been great. Darn it to heck!</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I'm not at the video store. I'm in my apartment.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Yeah, we'll figure it out.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Oh look, they're touching each other's genitals. Isn't that amazing? I'm so glad I came out. Love it.</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>See you, guys.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Gee, that sounds great, but I can't.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Oh, man! Sucks I'm going to be out of town.</td>
<td>PP or OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I know that, Marv, but you have no equity.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Wow, that sounds wild.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Yeah, it's me. I just felt like calling you. I was missing you I guess. Weird, huh?</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>God, no. Oh, I totally lost my phone.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Listen, I'll make it up to you. I promise. I swear. You pick the day. Any day you want. We'll go out. We'll swashbuckle.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>That's okay, I'm just auditing.</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Oh, great.</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I guess.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Yes, I just kind of went with my gut on it, Norm.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Norm, that’s amazing. Oh, my God.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I’m telling you man. Things are different.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Oh boy, you guys are really into this shit.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>What can I do for you?</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Come and get it.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Hey, uh, great, uh, gig, whatever.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Do you want a drink?</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Hey, after we jog we should get a Red Bull.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Let’s get into ship-shape.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I know. It’s so frustrating.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I love your music.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Pass those out, will you?</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>What up? My brizzo?</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Can you hang on a minute, Lee?</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I might get shit-canned, Norm.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Anyway, don’t worry about it.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Hey, can I have one minute?</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>I’d like two tickets on the first plane out of here, please.</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Get in here.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Allen</td>
<td>Allison! Please, can we talk</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>for a second?</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Wow, that's amazing, because his mouth is moving in exact sync with what you're saying.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Carl, get outside.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>So, we are really excited for you to be here Carl, because we have an announcement to make.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Honey, show him.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>No. No. Carl, you’re gonna stay.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>You know what buddy? You missed my engagement party tonight.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>I know, Carl. I know that Stephanie left you and I know that you have issues because of it but this isn’t about you. It's about me.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>I don't want to hear another excuse, Carl. Do what you want.</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>I'm just telling you, that if you don't change your life, you're going to end up a lonely guy. A lonely guy, Carl.</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Hey, Rooney. Come here for a second.</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Excuse me. Can we get another round of drinks?</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Carl, that was so awesome.</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Throw this away for me, will you?</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Hey, honey.</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Carl, would you like to throw Lucy a bridal shower?</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>I'm wondering if there's a</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>better setting for this back and forth.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>This is the best wedding shower ever, man.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Hey, buddy, you alright?</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Carl Allen has reported for duty?</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>You are a soldier on the front line of finance.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>I tried to fight for you on the phone there.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Well hey, look at it this way. At least you didn't get shit-canned.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>This will cheer you up. I'm having a get-together at my place. It's a funny hat and/or wig party.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Carl, it's your buddy Norman.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>So, we're kind of short on staff. Is there any way you could come in?</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Oh, nice. I like your style, Car</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>I saw the raise in it for you too. Bump up your salary to sixty-five.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Wow, cool costume, my man.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Come in.</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>We've got drinks, you know, chips, dips, and good people, just like you two.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Pace yourself</td>
<td>BOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Alrighty gang.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Carl, I need you for a second.</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>See you there buddy.</td>
<td>That’s a good look.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Can I call you Soo?</td>
<td>Did you just run out of gas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Well, do you need a ride?</td>
<td>Hopefully the color will return to your face sometime soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Can I have my helmet back now?</td>
<td>So you okay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have a good night.</td>
<td>Can I have a water?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hey, why don’t you come to my class tomorrow?</td>
<td>I've been thinking and I know it's crazy, especially for me, but maybe when we get back we should move in together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oh, good. What a relief because I thought you lied all the time, but it's just sometimes, that's really excellent.</td>
<td>Get away from me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oh, wow, thanks. My knight in shining armor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>