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ABSTRACT


*Dewfall* is a novel written by Triatmoko in 2014. Triatmoko is a Jesuit priest who was born in 1965, in Tanjung Balai, Karimun, Indonesia. He is as a priest in St. Peter Canisius International Catholic Parish in Jakarta. The main purpose of *Dewfall* is a reflective storyline. *Dewfall* is a novel which tells about the epic story of Bisma, also known as Devabrata. However some modifications were made on the original story to support the reflection themes. *Dewfall* is deeply influenced by Hindu and Buddhist mysticism, the influence of Islam, and the similarity to Christian mysticism seen in the unification between Creator and creation. The setting of the story is the Javanese version of the Mahabharata; an era where social structure and stratification is very important. Those influences greatly affect the language chosen by Triatmoko in this novel. Therefore, this novel was chosen due to its language which contains many examples of politeness strategy by Devabrata.

This research is to investigate Devabrata's politeness strategies in a novel entitled *Dewfall* and answer two research problems: (1) What are Devabrata’s politeness strategies applied in *Dewfall*? (2) What are the aspects that influence Devabrata’s choice of politeness strategies in *Dewfall*?

Brown and Levinson is a theory about politeness strategies and Holmes theory about factors affecting the use of politeness strategies were used in this research. In this qualitative research, document analysis was implemented as the method which was associated with discourse analysis since this research was a socio-pragmatic research of a novel.

Based on the analysis result, Devabrata applied all politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson. I also found that the four politeness factors by Holmes were affecting Devabrata’s utterances in *Dewfall*.

*Key Words: Dewfall, Devabrata, politeness strategies, politeness factors*
ABSTRAK


Penelitian ini menyelidiki strategi kesantunan Dewabrata dalam sebuah novel berjudul *Dewfall* dan menjawab dua masalah penelitian: (1) Apa strategi kesantunan yang diterapkan oleh Dewabrata di *Dewfall*? (2) Aspek apa yang mempengaruhi pilihan Dewabrata dalam penggunaan strategi kesantunan di *Dewfall*?

Teori Brown dan Levinson tentang strategi kesopanan dan teori Holmes tentang faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi penggunaan strategi kesantunan, keduaunya digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Dalam penelitian kualitatif ini, metode yang digunakan adalah analisis dokumen, di mana hal tersebut juga dikaikan dengan analisis wacana karena penelitian ini merupakan penelitian sosial-pragmatis dalam sebuah novel.

Berdasarkan hasil analisis, Devabrata menerapkan semua strategi kesantunan yang diusulkan oleh Brown dan Levinson. Belum lagi, saya juga menemukan bahwa empat faktor kesopanan oleh Holmes mempengaruhi ucapan Dewabrata di dalam *Dewfall*.

*Kata kunci:* Dewfall, Devabrata, politeness strategies, politeness factors
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The first chapter is divided into six sections. The first section is the research background, which discusses the reason why this topic was chosen and provides a brief introduction about the theories of politeness strategy. The second section is the research problems which contains two questions. The third section is the problem limitation where the scope of the study was discussed. The fourth section, the research objectives explain the purpose of this study. The fifth section is the definition of terms which contains brief explanation of terms used in this study to make readers understand this study better.

A. Research Background

Politeness is a significant aspect that plays an essential role in keeping the stability of social interaction in a community. People have to consider their politeness in speaking to avoid offending others for it is one of the most essential parts in communication with others. Brown and Levinson (1987) states,

Politeness shows concern for people’s face: the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. Politeness becomes a sensitive aspect for people in their interaction and communication process. (p. 61)

However, people in general hardly understand how important and complicated politeness could be; they tend to underestimate and simplify the meaning of politeness. Holmes (2008) states,
People in general often do not appreciate just how complicated it is, because those people tend to think of politeness simply as a matter of saying please and thank you in the right places. In fact, it involves a great deal more than the superficial politeness routines that parents explicitly teach their children. Such things like diction, tone and grammar should have been highly considered when people talk to others (p. 5).

Therefore this research was made for some reasons. Firstly, it was simply started from my curiosity about how politeness strategies was applied under certain circumstances which influenced by various cultural difference. Secondly, it is already known that in the world of Mahabarata or pewayangan, Devabrata character was famous for his wisdom and polite personality. Hence for a personal reason I am curious how Devabrata applied politeness strategies in his utterances. The last reason is because I do like this topic due to its relativeness to psychological thinking theories of how to read or to find out someone intention based on their utterances.

It has to be noted that this is not the first research related to the politeness strategies. There had been a lot of researches related to politeness strategies such as this research. In the last few years, there are numerous researches in politeness strategy which have been conducted. Each research focused on different subject and field of politeness. For instance, in the political field there was Katherine Matsumoto-Gray (2009) who focused on how politeness could increase degree of imposition in political conversation. In addition, several research which observe and analyze politeness strategy in novels and movies have been conducted as well. For instance, research conducted by Lisa (2015) and Putri (2014), each research has different focus and subjects of research. However, unlike those previous
researches, there are two points that differentiate this research from any previous research about politeness strategy. First, the author of the book is an Indonesian priest named B.B. Triatmojo S.J. Surely due to the writer background, his writing and language style was influenced by Javanese and Indonesian culture. Second, the background of the story in this novel was the Javanese version of Mahabharata which strongly influenced by Buddhism and Hinduism culture. I believe those two points are strong enough to underline the difference of this research compared to other researches. It can be implied that this research not only had different research subject but also this research end up having different research result from any other previous researches.

There are two reasons why *Dewfall* was chosen as the subject of this research. First, *Dewfall* contains a great deal of politeness phenomena which is influenced by various cultures. The cultural reference of this novel is very strong. The background of *Dewfall* itself is the Javanese culture, in which there is a deep underlying influence of Hindu and Buddhist mysticism, the influence of Islam, and the similarity to Christian mysticism that can be seen in the unification between the Creator and creation. Second, I decide not to aim for a perfect or difficult research that could fascinate a lot of people. I simply looking something around me, something familiar, and something that I know well yet that something must be different from any previous researches.

The research on the use of politeness by Devabrata, the main character in *Dewfall*, can eventually be a medium for studying sociolinguistics, specifically about politeness strategies. I believe this research can help English learners to
obtain the concept of politeness. In addition, this research can encourage them to be able to speak English politely in different social contexts. This research can give further data and examples on the use of politeness strategies in speaking.

B. Research Problems

Related to the research background in the previous section, this research investigation is continued by formulating the following research problems:

1. What are Devabrata’s politeness strategies applied in Dewfall?
2. What are the aspects that influence Devabrata’s choices of politeness strategies in Dewfall?

Those questions were proposed in order to know what are the politeness strategies applied by Devabrata and what are the aspects that influenced his choice of using those politeness strategies. To answer those two questions Brown, P., & Levinson, S. and Holmes, J. theories was used as the references. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. explain about politeness strategy, meanwhile Holmes, J. explains about politeness factors.

C. Problem Limitation

This research was narrowed by some limitations. First, the focus of this research is limited to the use of politeness strategy. In addition, some theories related to the influence of politeness strategies choices are also included within the politeness strategy theories. Secondly, the subject of this research is
Devabrata, the main character of a novel entitled *Dewfall*. This research focused on investigating the use of Devabrata’s politeness strategy in *Dewfall*.

D. Research Objectives

The objectives of this research are:

1. To find out how the politeness strategies are used by Devabrata to interact with other characters in *Dewfall*.

2. To identify the aspects that influence Devabrata’s politeness strategies used to interact with other characters in *Dewfall*.

E. Research Benefits

This research can benefit English learners and readers who study politeness. This research is useful as an additional source of information for other researchers who study about politeness in the future.

1. English Learners

   This research helps English learners understand the politeness strategy theories, expressions, and examples. In many other ways, this research also helps English learners to apply politeness expressions in conversations appropriately.

2. The readers

   This study can provide useful information and enrich the readers’ knowledge about politeness strategy. Furthermore, it also provides additional
information about polite words and sentences used in daily interaction, so that the 
readers can see the examples of applying politeness strategies as well as how to 
demeanor a modest way of speaking and behaving.

3. Future Researchers

This study can give valuable information related to politeness and become 
an academic reference for future researchers who conduct further research in 
sociolinguistics, especially about the politeness strategy.

F. Definition of Terms

In order to find a common ground and avoid misperception, some terms 
which used in this research are defined as follows.

1. Politeness

Richard, Platt, and Webber (1985) state, the term *politeness* is used to 
refer the way of certain language expresses the social distance between the 
speakers and their different role relationship (p. 34). In this research, the term 
*politeness* refers to the sentences which contain politeness strategies in the 
interaction between the main character and other characters. In addition, Holmes 
(1996) states,

Politeness refers to a behavior which expresses positive concern 
for others, as well as non-imposing distance behavior. In other 
words, politeness may take form of an expression of good-will or 
camaraderie, as well as the more familiar non-intrusive behavior 
which is labeled “polite” in every day usage (p. 5).
In other words, politeness is defined as an expression of concern for the feelings of others. It refers to the emotional and social sense of self that every person has and expects everyone to recognize (Yule, 1996, p. 60). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), there are four politeness strategies, namely Bald-On Record, Positive, Negative, and Off-record/Indirect Politeness (p. 92). Those types of politeness are developed in order to save the hearer’s face. The main concern in this research is to find out the character’s politeness expression described as a part of politeness strategy. This research presents the politeness strategy used by Devabrata, the main character in *Dewfall*.

2. **Characters**

Abrams (1999) describes characters as:

the persons represented in a dramatic or narrative work, who are interpreted by the reader as being endowed with particular moral, intellectual, and emotional qualities by inferences from what the persons say and their distinctive ways of saying it-the dialogue and from what they do-the section action (p. 32).

The term ‘character’, single noun, in this research specifically refers to Devabrata. Character itself is described as an individual who shows her or his own behavior qualities, and motivations. Therefore, the term ‘characters’, plural noun, in this research refer to some important characters beside the main character. Those characters are Tara the Goddess of Earth, King Sentanu, Queen Devi Durgandini, a Brahim named Rama Bargava, a boy named Thousand Wind, a man named Dancing Rock, Devi Amba, Wulandari, and Governor Danureja.
3. *Dewfall*

*Dewfall* is a novel consisting of 175 pages written by, Benedict B. Triatmoko, S.J., in 2014. Triatmoko is a Jesuit priest who was born in 1965, in Tanjung Balai, Karimun, Indonesia. He is a priest in St. Peter Canisius International Catholic Parish in Jakarta. The main purpose of the story in *Dewfall* is a reflective storyline. *Dewfall* is a novel which tells about the epic story of Bisma, also known as Devabrata. However, some modifications were made in the original story to support the reflection themes. *Dewfall* is deeply influenced by Hindu and Buddhist mysticism, the influence of Islam and the similarity to Christian mysticism seen in the unification between Creator and creation. The setting of the story is the Javanese version of the Mahabharata; an era where social structure and stratification is very important. These influences greatly affect the language chosen by Triatmoko in this novel. Therefore, this novel is chosen due to its language which contains many examples of politeness strategies by the characters.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There are two main parts provided in this chapter. The first part is the theoretical description which includes the discussion of pragmatics, speech acts, sociolinguistics and politeness theories. The second part, the theoretical framework, is used to synthesize all the theories elaborated in the theoretical description in order to correlate the theories to the current study.

A. Theoretical Description

In this study, there are some theories used as guidelines. There are four parts that will be discussed. They are pragmatics and sociopragmatics, sociolinguistics, politeness strategies, and the factors which influence the main characters in a polite speech. Pragmatics and sociopragmatics were related with the meaning of utterance in the context influenced by social and cultural background of the speaker. Sociolinguistics is presented to clarify the topic discussed. Politeness strategies are the basic theory used to analyze the application of politeness strategies used by Devabrata. Afterwards, the factors which influence Devabrata to speak politely are also described.

1. Pragmatics and Sociopragmatics

Searle (1969) states “speaking is performing speech acts, acts such making statement, giving commands, asking questions, making promises and so on” (p. 16). In communicating with each other, people usually use speech acts like
imperative, direct or indirect speech. They use a kind of speech which is usually influenced by their own culture. Therefore, the importance of paying attention to the meaning in a context of speaking in conversational will lead speakers to be successful to express meaningful utterances and hearers to interpret utterances correctly. This research focuses on Devabrata’s utterances in *Dewfall*. It has to be noted carefully that Devabrata’s utterances were greatly influenced by the writer point of view as a priest, Javanese, Hindu and Buddhist cultures. The language used under the influenced of those factors might have some different or particular ways to convey their meanings. Therefore, in order to be able to interpret the true meaning of Devabrata’s utterances it is important to understand the basic theory of pragmatics and sociopragmatics and take a point of view as a Javanese speaker which influenced Hindu and Buddhist cultures.

Levinson (1983) delineates pragmatics as “the study of the ability of language user to pair sentences with contexts in which they would be appropriate” (p. 24). It implies that pragmatics cannot be alienated from context and principles of language usage. In the different terms, Cruse (2006) says that pragmatics deals with non-truth conditional aspects where context must be taken into account (p. 136). Context is understood here in a broad sense that includes participants in the speech event, their interrelations, knowledge, goals, social and physical setting of the speech event. Also, pragmatics deals with aspect of meanings that are not ‘locked up’ but which are ‘worked out’ on particular occasions of use. ‘Worked out’ means that an utterance, which conveys a meaning, only can be applied in
certain occasion only, and may not applicable in the other occasion. Pragmatics deals with the use of the meanings description. Cutting (2002) enhances,

pragmatics is the study of language which focuses in interactional sociolinguistics, which combines the conversation, with a pragmatic approach, study socio interaction and giving importance to context, function and social norms, conventions and principles (p. 3).

The term ‘sociopragmatics’ was coined by Leech (1983) to describe the study of the ways in which pragmatic meanings reflect specific “local” conditions on language use. It is a sub-field of pragmatics that distinguished from the study of more ‘general’ pragmatic meaning. Leech (1983) states the main concern of sociopragmatics is ‘how communication of pragmatic meaning involves speaker’ presentation of their identities’ (p. 159).

It can be concluded that pragmatics and sociopragmatics were concerned about how language was used to achieve speaker’s goals throughout a meaningful conversation and convey information in different social contexts, also the reasons why they used it in particular ways in a certain context.
2. Sociolinguistics

Trudgill (1983) states, “sociolinguistics is a part of linguistics dealing with language as a social cultural phenomenon” (p.32). This theory is supported by Radford, et al. (1999) who state “sociolinguistic is the study of relationship between use and the structure of society” (p. 21). There are three factors which influence the ways of speaking. Those factors are social backgrounds of both speaker and addressee, the relationship between a speaker and an addressee, and the context and manner of the interaction.

Language is produced and used by societies. It is obvious that language is varied in societies. Llamas and Stockwell (2009) state, “societies differ from each other and change over time” (p. 21). It also indirectly indicates that language is very variable. As Trudgill (1983) says,

One of the main factors that lead to the growth of Sociolinguistics research has been the recognition of the importance of the fact that language is very variable phenomenon, and that this variability may have as much to do with society as with language (p. 32).

From Trudgill’s (1983) theory above, he conveys that in order to use a language effectively, people need to be involved in a society. People who speak the same language may come from different social backgrounds. Those people are usually called as speech community (Spolsky, 1998, p. 24). Therefore, when people communicate with each other, there is a need to pay attention to the sociolinguistic aspects like knowing when to speak or be silent and what kind of expression can be used in certain cultures. Those can be the way of being polite
because speakers can know how to use a language in certain context by considering the interlocutors

3. Politeness Strategies

Politeness has been the main issue in the use of any language. Holmes (2001) states, "Being linguistically polite involves speaking to people appropriately in the light of their relationship to you." (p. 268). It means that a polite speaker makes his addressee feel comfortable. He considers the feelings of his addressee and the relationship between them. When using a language, a speaker is required to have cultural knowledge if they want to succeed in communicating appropriately within the society because the degree of politeness of one culture differs from another culture. As Brown and Levinson (1987) say, speakers need to acknowledge and show awareness of a face and the sense of self and the addressees.

There are two types of politeness proposed by Holmes (2001) they are positive politeness and negative politeness (p. 268). Positive politeness is solidarity-oriented. It emphasizes shared attitudes and values. It deals with positive face; the need to be accepted or liked by others, treated as a member of the group and to knew hearer's wants are shared by others. Positive face refers to speaker's self—esteem. While negative politeness focuses more on expressing speaker thoughts appropriately in terms of social distance and respecting status differences. It deals with negative face; the needs to be independent have freedom
of action, and not to be imposed on by others. This indicates that negative face refers to speaker's freedom to act something.

It is common that speakers need to respect other’s expectations regarding self-image, taking account of their feelings, and avoiding face threatening-acts (FTAs). Brown and Levinson (1987) state, “FTAs are acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker” (p. 65). Avoiding FTAs can be done by avoiding saying anything at all. A speaker can act like having difficulty, sighing loudly, and shaking his head. Brown and Levinson (1987) develop four politeness strategies namely Bald-on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off Record, for the main purpose of dealing with FTAs.

a. Bald on Record

Bald on record is a strategy of doing an act ‘baldly’, without redress, involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way as possible. For example, for a request, saying 'Do X!'. Normally, an FTA will be done in this way only if the speaker does not fear any retribution from the addressee, for example in circumstances where (a) speaker and hearer both tacitly agree that the relevance of face demands may be suspended in the interest of urgency or efficiency; (b) where the danger to hearer's face is very small, as in offers, requests, suggestions that are clearly in hearer's interest and do not require great sacrifices of speaker (e.g., 'Come in' or 'Do sit down'); and (c) where speaker is vastly superior in power than hearer, or can enlist audience support to destroy hearer's face without losing his own.
b. Positive Politeness

Positive politeness is orientated toward the positive face of hearer, the positive self-image that the speaker claims for himself. Positive politeness is approach-based; it 'anoints' the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respects, speaker wants hearer's wants (e.g., by treating the hearer as a member of an in-group, a friend, a person whose wants and personality traits are known and liked). The potential face threat of an act is minimized in this case by the assurance that in general, speaker wants at least some of hearer's wants. For example, a speaker considers hearer to be in important respects, 'the same' as the speaker, with in-group rights and duties and expectations of reciprocity, or by the implication that the speaker likes the hearer so that the FTA does not mean a negative evaluation of hearer's face in general.

Figure 2.1 Chart of strategies: Positive Politeness

For larger chart please take a look at appendix p. 63.
c. Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is orientated mainly toward partially satisfying (redressing) hearer's negative face, hearer basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination. Negative politeness, thus, is essentially avoidance based and realizations of negative-politeness strategies consisted in assurances that the speaker recognizes and respects the addressee's negative-face wants and will not (or will only minimally) interfere with the addressee's freedom of action. Hence, negative politeness is characterized by self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of hearer's self-image, centering on hearer want to be unimpeded. Face-threatening acts are redressed with apologies for interfering or transgressing, linguistic and nonlinguistic deference, hedges on the illocutionary force of the act, impersonalizing mechanisms (such as

Figure 2.2 Chart of strategies: Negative Politeness

For larger chart please take a look at appendix p. 64.
passives) that distance speaker and hearer from the act and other softening mechanisms that give the addressee an 'out', a face-saving line of escape, permitting hearer to feel that hearer response is not coerced.

d. Off-record

For larger chart please take a look at appendix p. 65.

A speaker goes on record in doing an act A if it is clear to participants what communicative intention led the speaker to do A (i.e., there is just one unambiguously attributable intention with which witnesses would concur). For instance, if the speaker say 'I (hereby) promise to come tomorrow' and if participants would concur that, in saying that, the speaker did unambiguously express the intention of committing himself to that future act, then in this terminology the speaker went 'on record' as promising to do so.
In contrast, if a speaker goes off record in doing A, then there is more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that the speaker cannot be held to have committed himself to a particular intent. So, for instance, if the speaker say 'Damn, I'm out of cash, I forgot to go to the bank today', the speaker maybe intending to get the hearer to lend me some cash, but the speaker cannot be held to have committed himself to that intent (as hearer would discover were he could challenge speaker with 'This is the seventeenth time you've asked me to lend you money'). Linguistic realizations of off-record strategies include metaphor and irony, rhetorical questions, understatement, tautologies, all kinds of hints as to what a speaker wants or means to communicate, without doing so directly, so that the meaning is to some degree negotiable.

4. Factors Affecting Politeness Strategies

The last theory used in this research is about the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies. According to Holmes (2001), “the use of language politely by speakers and addresses is determined by four dimensions, namely social Distance scale, status scale, formality scale, and referential and affective function scales.” (pp. 9-11) Those factors are going to be explained as follows:

a. The Social Distance Scale

Holmes (2001) states this scale is concerned with participant relationships (p. 9). She adds that emphasizing how well people know someone is a relevant factor in linguistic choices. In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987) state that “Social distance is a symmetric social dimension of similarity/ differences within
which S (speaker) and H (hearer) stand for purpose of this act” (p. 76). On the other hand, this scale is solidarity—oriented. Intimacy between speaker and addressee affect their solidarity as shown in Figure 2.1. For example, Devabrata calls his beloved one Amba instead of Princess Amba.

![Figure 2.4 The social Distance Scale (Holmes, 2001, p. 9)](image)

b. The Status Scale

Holmes (2001) expresses that this scale is also concerned with participant relationships. Relative’s status can affect some linguistic choices. If an addressee is a man and superior, he will be called Sir. It means that he has higher status than the speaker as seen in figure 2.2. For example, Devabrata refer Rama Bargawa as Guru instead of his sure name.

![Figure 2.5 The social Status Scale (Holmes, 2001, p. 9)](image)
c. The Formality Scale

Holmes (2001) underlies this scale is related to the setting or type of interaction. She also says that it is useful in assessing the influence of the social setting or type of interaction on language choice. Formality is one of language styles. Generally, degrees of formality are determined by solidarity and status relationship (Spolsky, 1998). However, setting or type of interaction can influence the language choice by ignoring the status relationships between speakers and addresses. The more formal the setting or interaction is, the higher the formality will be. The scale can be seen in Figure 2.3. For example, the first time Devabrata meet Governor Danureja in his palace, Devabrata call him by his full tittle. It is done by Devabrata to show his respect and to show that he is an honorable man.

![Formality Scale Diagram](image)

Figure 2.6 The Formality Scale (Holmes, 2001, p. 9)

d. The Referential and Affective Function Scales

Holmes (2001) describes that these two functional scales: referential function and affective function are related to the purposes or topic interaction. Holmes (2001) states “In general the more referentially oriented an interaction is, the less it tends to express the feelings of the speaker” (p. 10). It means those functional scales measure the ratio between information content and emotions or
attitudes of speakers. Holmes (2013) adds that both functions must be expressed in an utterance (p. 3). One of these functions may be primary. For example, Devabraa conversations with Amba tend to put the emphasis on affective function or affective content rather than referential function or informative content. To be more precise, the scales are illustrated in Figure 2.4.

![Figure 2.7 The Referential and Affective functions Scale](Holmes, 2001, p. 10)

**B. Theoretical Framework**

The research analyzes the use of politeness applied by Devabrata, the character of *Dewfall* novel. I summarize and synthesize all the theories used in the analysis of the research to solve the research problems: (1) What are Devabrata’s politeness strategies applied in *Dewfall*? (2) What are the aspects that influence Devabrata’s choice of politeness strategies in *Dewfall*?

Based on the theoretical description, theories from some linguists were applied to understand the relation among pragmatics, sociolinguistics and politeness strategies. I need to understand the meaning of each utterance in order to be able to classify the utterances into the four politeness strategies. Firstly, I
need to understand the theory of pragmatics since it is "the study of how language is used to communicate" (Leech, 1992, p. 19) in order to understand the meaning of Devabrata’s utterances. In analyzing the use of Devabrata’s politeness strategies in *Dewfall*, sociolinguistics theory in order was applied to make clear the topic. Radford, et al. (1999) explained “sociolinguistics is the study of relationship between the use of language and society” (p. 1). It is used since the analysis of the use of politeness strategies and the factors is under sociolinguistics study. Subsequently, the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) about politeness strategies and Holmes (2001) theory about the factors which influence the characters in speaking politely were used to solve those research problems. To solve the first research problem, Brown and Levinson (1987) theory of politeness strategies were applied. There are four politeness strategies, namely Bald-on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off Record. Devabrata’s politeness strategies in *Dewfall* based were analyzed based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory. To solve the second research problem Holmes (2001) theory was applied. There are four factors that affect the main characters in speaking, namely social distance, status, formality, and referential and affective functions. The factors which can influence Devabrata’s politeness strategies in speaking politely were analyzed based on Holmes' (2001) theory.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the methodology used to obtain the data of the research was discussed. There are six parts in this section. They are: research method, research setting, research subject, instruments and data gathering technique, data analysis technique, and research procedure.

A. Research Method

This research was focused on the politeness strategy applied by Devabrata, the main character in Dewfall novel. The methodology was employed to find out the answers of the two problems: (1) What are Devabrata’s politeness strategies applied in Dewfall? (2) What are the aspects that influence Devabrata’s choices of politeness strategies in Dewfall?

The research was a qualitative research because the data were in the form of words and sentences. It was not dealing with numerical measurement or statistic procedure. Sutopo (2002) explains that in qualitative research, the data collected were usually in form of words, sentences or pictures in which the meaning is more significant than number (p. 35).

This research used linguistic information as the data. Dornyei (2007) states, “qualitative research involves data collection procedure that results primarily in open ended, non-numerical data which is then analyzed primarily by non-statistical method” (p. 24). So, this research does not use statistical procedure.
B. Research Setting

Overall it took more than one year to completely finish this research and presented it. However during that one year period, I am not always doing the research. For about eight months I spent it to read the novel, gather the data, and analyze the data. The analysis of Devabrata’s utterances in *Dewfall* took eight months. It was started on February 2016 until September 2016. During those periods, I spent two and half months in analyzing the script. Finishing the technical process of data tabulation in the two and half months, and also reading the novel, categorizing the Devabrata’s utterances, interpreting the data, and writing the report. While due to certain circumstance, there is a time when I am not continuing my research at all. It is probably for about 3 months or more, I was not so sure either. The last few months, on January and February 2017, I spent my time to finalized my research and prepared to present my report it in the thesis defense.

C. Research Subjects

*Dewfall* was a novel taken as the research subject of this study. The main data of this research were taken from Devabrata’s utterances in *Dewfall*. Devabrata, also known as Bisma, was the main character in *Dewfall*. He was a crowned prince of Hastinapura, son of King Sentanu. However, there were other characters in the novel that played important roles in influencing the Devabrata choice of politeness strategies. As for example there were Tara the Goddess of Earth, King Sentanu as Devabrata’s father, Queen Devi Durgandini as
Devabrata’s stepmother, a Brahmin named Rama Bargava as Devabata’s teacher or guru, a boy named Thousand Wind, a man named Dancing Rock, Devi Amba as Devabrata’s lovers, Wulandari who loved Devabrata but eventually became his sister, and Governor Danureja as the antagonist in Dewfall. It was important to know each role of those characters and their relations with Devabrata in order to be able to understand Devabrata’s choice of politeness strategies.

D. Data Gathering Technique

Devabrata’s utterances were the main data source in this research. It was taken from Dewfall. The utterances were collected as data to answer two research problems in this research. At this stage, all of Devabrata’s utterances in Dewfall through reading were gathered. After that, Devabrata’s utterances which contain politeness strategies were selected. Finally, those selected utterances were analyzed.

E. Data Analysis Technique

The methodology used analyze the data in this research was a document analysis. Best (1981) believes, in many areas of investigation, documents are important sources of data (p. 48). Ary, et al. (2002) explain that document analysis is applied as the methodology for it provides narrative description and interpretation (pp. 22-25). In this research, Devabrata’s politeness strategies were descriptively presented and interpreted. Ary, et al. (2002) define content or document analysis as a research method applied to written or visual materials for
the purpose of identifying specified characteristics of the materials (p. 442). The materials are usually in form of newspapers, scripts, textbooks, advertisements, and any other types of documents.

The analysis process is described as follows. First, Devabrata’s utterances were taken from Dewfall. These utterances were analyzed furthermore in order to know how the speaker conveyed their messages and intentions and then responded to their interlocutors in speaking. Next, the utterances were classified into four politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), namely Bald-on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and off Record. Merriam (2009) states that intensive analysis can be started if the data set is inventoried, organized, and coded for easy retrieval and manipulation (p. 207). Therefore, a classification table was used to Devabrata’s utterances classification into four politeness strategies become easier. Afterwards, Devabrata’s utterances were analyzed using Holmes’ theory (2001). All Devabrata’s utterances were read thoroughly and identified carefully in order to find out which factors affect Devabrata’s politeness strategy in Dewfall.

F. Research Procedure

This research had several steps to conduct. Ary, et al. (2002) state that there are seven stages in research (p. 29). Those stages were selecting the research problem, reviewing the literature, designing the research, collecting the data, analyzing the data, interpreting the finding and starting conclusions and reporting results. The procedures can be seen in Figure 3.1.
1. **Selecting the Research Problem**

The very first step of this research was selecting the research problems. There were two research problems chosen, they were: (1) What are Devabrata’s politeness strategies applied in Dewfall? (2) What are the aspects that influence Devabrata’s choice of politeness strategies in Dewfall?

2. **Reviewing the Literature**

In this step, some sociolinguistic books were reviewed; especially the one which related to politeness strategy and the factors influenced it. After reading some related literature, two theories which become the basic of this research were found. Those theories are; Brown and Levinson (1987) theory of politeness strategies and Holmes (2001) theory about the factors which influence the characters in polite speech. Moreover, I also read some theories that support those theories and help me answer the research questions.
3. **Designing the Research**

   Based on the research problems and the reviewed literature, I began to design the big picture of the research. This research was a document analysis. The main discussion was about politeness strategies which fell under the scope of sociolinguistics.

4. **Collecting the Data**

   The main data of this research was Devabrata’s utterances. This data were collected through the process of reading *Dewfall*. I tried to understand the content, sequences, and the situation of Devabrata’s utterances by reading throughout the novel carefully and trying to understand the storyline. In addition, in order to be able to select Devabrata’s utterances, the reading activity was done four times.

5. **Analyzing the Data**

   After the data were gathered, the next step was analyzing Devabrata’s utterances which contain politeness strategies. In order to do this, I had to understand each utterance carefully and refer it to the Brown and Levinson (1987) theory of politeness strategies. After the Devabrata’s utterances which contain politeness strategies had been identified, the existing utterances were categorized in accordance with the politeness strategy theories proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), they are bald-on record politeness, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record politeness (p. 91). Each utterance was put accordingly
into the appropriate type of politeness strategy. The purpose of this grouping was to make the data analysis more systematic and at the same time answer the first research question.

6. **Interpreting the Findings and Stating Conclusion**

After finishing the categorizing step, the data analyzing were began using Holmes (2001) theory about the factors which influence the characters in speaking politely. The purpose of this analysis was to answer the second research question. Finally, the conclusions were drawn and the report on the research was written.

7. **Reporting Result**

The final step was presenting the findings and the research results in thesis defense before English Language Education Study Program examiner. This was done to show my responsibility as a researcher who conducted this research and to acquire feedback from the expert.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the research findings and discussion were presented in order to solve the two research problems which have been formulated in Chapter I. The first research problem is “How does Devabrata use the expressions of politeness strategy to interact with other characters in Dewfall?” The second research problem is “What are the aspects that influence Devabrata’s choice of politeness strategies in the novel?” There are two parts of the data presented; part A presents the findings and discusses the use of politeness and part B discusses the factors determining the use of politeness strategies.

A. Devabrata’s Politeness Strategies Applied in Dewfall

Devabrata’s utterances were analyzed by using politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson (1987). Yet, it has to be remembered that Devabrata’s utterances were greatly influenced by the writer point of view as a priest, Javanese, Hindu and Buddhist cultures. Those factors might greatly influenced Devabrata’s utterances in some particular ways to convey the meanings. Therefore, in order to be able to interpret the true meaning of Devabrata’s utterances and analyzed it using politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson (1987), it is important to use the basic theory of pragmatics and sociopragmatics and take a point of view as a Javanese speaker which is influenced by Hindu and Buddhist cultures.
Based on the analysis, Devabrata applied all of the four politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) in his utterances. To be more specific, there were 192 utterances produced by Devabrata. The use of each politeness strategy by Devabrata was explained more as follows.

1. **The Application of Bald-on Record**

Bald-on Record strategy is used when a speaker knows the addressee extremely well and wants to show that he/she has power over that person (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The speaker directly threatens the addressee’s positive or negative face. The impact of this strategy can shock or even embarrass the addressee. Thus, this strategy is the lowest polite one.

Based on the findings, Devabrata used Bald on record as a strategy of doing an act ‘baldly’, without redress, involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way as possible. For example, a request saying 'Do X!'

The FTA was done in this way because Devabrata did not fear any retribution from the addressee. For instance, it can be seen in the following circumstances.

First, Devabrata as the speaker and hearer both tacitly agreed that the relevance of face demands may be suspended in the interests of urgency or efficiency; this strategy was used when Devabrata needs attention very soon, especially before anything else because it was important. In cases of great urgency or desperation, redress would actually decrease the communicated urgency. For example:

(a) “Listen!”

(b) “Watch out!”
Now, the examples above are compared to the non-urgent utterance ‘Please listen to me’. (a) The word listen with an exclamation point showed that there was no other choice in that situation. The speaker needed the hearer to listen. In (b), the speaker used the expression to warn the hearer of danger or accident that seemed likely to happen.

Second, where the danger to hearer's face was very small, as in offers, requests, suggestions that are clearly in hearer's interest and do not require great sacrifices from Devabrata (e.g., 'Come in' or 'Do sit down'), Devabrata used this strategy to give task to the hearer in order to get the desired result. Face redness may be felt to be irrelevant when the focus interaction is task-oriented (Brown & Levinson, p. 97). For example ‘Give me the nails’, the speaker gave the hearer task to take the nails and give it to the hearer. As for suggestion or sympathetic advise, Brown and Levinson (1987) state in doing FTA, the speaker conveys that he or she does care about the hearer (and therefore about the hearer’s positive face), so that no redness is required (p. 98). Sympathetic advice or warning is also considered as bald on record. For example:

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

In (a), the speaker warned the hearer to be careful because there was a dangerous man. The word ‘careful’ was used to give an attention to what the hearer was doing so that the hearer will not get hurt by the dangerous man. In (b), the speaker gave a sympathetic expression that the hearer’s slip was showing.
Third, it was where Devabrata was vastly superior in power to hearer. In other words, it could enlist audience support to destroy hearer's face without losing his own. It can be seen at the circumstance of granting permission for something. This strategy was used when Devabrata gave or allowed the hearer to do something so that the hearer was allowed to do it. For instance, ‘**Yes, you may go**’. It indicated the permission/agreement/acceptance to go to the destination that the hearer wanted. Further example and complete conversation can be seen in dialogue 1.

**Dialogue 1**

Robber : Old Man, on behalf of the Governor, I’ve come to collect on your promise. Oh, who is this young man you’ve got here? Do you think he can protect you, huh?
Old Farmer : I beg your pardon, sirs, I have tried my best to persuade my daughter, but she resisted.
Robber : Don’t you worry, Old Man, I can carry her on my back.
Devabrata : **Back off!**
Robber : How dare you! Do you dare to challenge the power of Thousand Hill Tigers?
Devabrata : You cowards! You call yourselves the Thousand Hill Tigers, but you dare only challenge farers and the weak. **Shame on you!** Why do you come here with thousand bandits just to catch a woman? I would rather call you all kitchen cats.
Devabrata : They are now developing strategy called lobster claw.
Wulandari : (nodded)
Devabrata : You should know the weak spots of this strategy. These people seem to have been very well trained. Do you know what you are supposed to do? Lead your father to move to the direction I told you.

In dialogue 1, Devabrata used the words **“Back off!”**. It shows that Devabrata did not fear retribution from Robber. Devabrata used Bald on record and doing an act ‘baldly’, without redress, involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible. This was a case with great urgency and desperation, Devabrata needed the Robber’s attention very soon before
anything else, so he communicated without redressing the Robber. Slightly different from the words “You cowards!” and “Shame on you”. In these words Devabrata redressed the Robbers, and the situation was less urgent. However it was also considered as Bald on record because Devabrata was vastly superior in power to hearer. He can enlist audience’s support to destroy hearer’s face without losing his own. And above all, these words also showed that Devabrata did not fear retribution from Robber.

2. The Application of Positive Politeness

This strategy was commonly used to attend the addressee’s interests, needs, wants, and goods (Brown & Levinson, 1987). On the other hand, it was used to satisfy the addressee’s positive face.

Positive politeness was used by Devabrata when he was orientated toward the positive face of hearer, the positive self-image that the speaker claims for himself. Positive politeness was approach-based; it 'anoints' the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respects, Devabrata wanted hearer's wants. For instance by treating the hearer as a member of an in-group, a friend, a person whose wants and personality traits are known and liked. The potential face threat of an act was minimized in this case by the assurance that in general Devabata wanted at least some of hearer's wants. For example, that Devabrata considered hearer to be in important respects, 'the same' as him, with in-group rights and duties and expectations of reciprocity, or by the implication that Devabrata likes
hearer so that the FTA does not mean a negative evaluation in general of hearer's face. Further example and complete conversation can be seen in dialogue 2.

**Dialogue 2**

| Devabrata | Wulandari, it looks like the roads we have travelled have come to an end. I shall have to continue my personal journey and you may back to the rest of your family |
| Wulandari | I simply don’t know what should I say. Thank you seems to be inadequate to show how much I owe you. |
| Devabrata | You do not owe me anything. I just have to do what I ought to do. Nothing’s special. I bet you would have done the same thing if you were in my position |
| Wulandari | Yes I know, but I have made you do something you did not want to do at the residence of the Governor. |
| Devabrata | Yes but you were not responsible for what I did. I was the one who did it. You have nothing to do with it. I am responsible for what I have done. Now, I have to heal my own soul |
| Wulandari | Deva, may I go with you please! |
| Devabrata | I am a rover. How can I support your life? You are such a beautiful girl that I might have troubles along the way. People will be lining up just to catch a glimpse of your beautiful face. |
| Wulandari | After the house was burnt down I have no other place to go for shelter. I don’t mean to ask you for another favor. I have received too much from you. But do you know anyone who could probably give me a job or something? |
| Devabrata | I have thought about it since the moment I met you. You have special talents. Should you consider learning more about being a warrior, I suggest that you go to palace of Hastinapura. Find a man named Prime Minister Mahesa Kara. Show him this medal. He should know what to do |
| Wulandari | Ah! |
| Wulandari | I beg you forgive me. I didn’t know you are the Crown Prince of Hastinapura. |
| Devabrata | Get up, you are true warrior! |
| Devabrata | You shall bear my reasonability to defend truth, show pride, and protect the weak. Don’t disappoint me when we meet again one day |
| Wulandari | Yes, your will shall be done, your highness |

In this conversation Wulandari faced a situation where she fell in love with her savior, Devabrata, and at the same time she had nothing to go back to
after her house was burned down by the Robber. She was hoping that she could accompany Devabrata in his journey. However, Devabrata wanted to leave Wulandari because he had no such feeling for Wulandari. Being aware of Wulandari’s situation, Devabrata used positive politeness strategy by using in-group identity markers and seeking agreement.

The most noticeable thing in this dialogue was that Devabrata treated Wulandari as a member of an in-group, a friend, a respected person, by repeatedly using the words “I” and “you” in the conversation. By doing this Devabrata considered Wuladari as ‘the same’ as himself, whether by in-group rights and duties or expectations of reciprocity. It also implicated Devabrata tried to avoid the retribution from Wulandari so that the FTA did not mean a negative evaluation in general of Wulandari face. For short, Devabata did not wanted to hurt Wulandari’s feelings through his speech. Devabrata also sought agreement by offering solution and rising assert common ground related to Wulandari condition. This strategy was used by Devabrata as a way to indicates his understanding towards Wulandari’s needs, feelings, hopes and thus partially to redress the imposition of FTA’s.

3. The Application of Negatives Politeness

Negative Politeness is a strategy which is used by a speaker to satisfy the addressee’s negatives face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It lessens the imposition on the addressee by being less when ordering something. Therefore, hedges and questions are often used in this strategy.
Using negative politeness, Devabrata recognized and respected the addressee's negative-face wants. Also, he minimalize interfere with the addressee's freedom of action. Hence, Devabrata’s negative politeness was characterized by self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of hearer's self-image, centering on hearer want to be unimpeded. In this strategy, Devabrata’s Face-threatening acts were redressed with apologies for interfering or transgressing, with linguistic and nonlinguistic deference, with hedges on the illocutionary force of the act, with impersonalizing mechanisms such as passives that distance Devabrata and hearer from the act, and with other softening mechanisms that gave the addressee an 'out', a face-saving line of escape, permitting hearer to feel that hearer’s response was not coerced.

Dialogue 3

Devabrata : What’ve I done wrong to you, Mother, why don’t you care for me anymore
Durgandini : You shouldn’t have been born, as this is against my will
Devabrata : I don’t understand, Mother, I didn’t ask to be born. How can I be wrong?
Durgandini : Listen to me, Deva, don’t ever think that just because you are Crown Prince, you deserve to get everything. I never like you and never will. Because of you, your father, King Santanu, will never forget his love for your mother, and that’s hurts me.
Devabrata : I do hope you make no mention of my mother who I have ever seen; nevertheless I love her from the bottom of my heart.
Durgandini : What? You’re a snob! Do you think only your mother can give birth, huh?

In dialogue 3, Devabrata was confronted his step mother who despised him, Devi Durgandini. As the Queen of Hastinapura and the wife of King Santanu who was Devabrata’s father, Devi Durgandini apparently did not like Devabrata.
The reason was her negative thought for Devabrata presence which possibly would remind her husband about his old love who passed away on the process of giving birth to Devabrata. In this situation Devabrata was less superior in power compared to Devi Durgandini due to his relationship status with Devi Durgandini. It went without saying, if Devabrata tried to confront her, he will not be able to enlist audience support and destroy hearer’s face, and instead he will lose his own. It also implied that Devabrata feared retribution from Devi Durgandini. Due to this condition, Devabrata used negative politeness strategy to confront Devi Durgandini. Devabrata recognized and respected Devi Durgandini negative-face wants. Also, he minimalized interferes with her freedom of action. Devabrata actions were centering on hearer want to be unimpeded and bind by formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of Devi Durgandini self-image. He chose to think positively about Devi Durgandini by assuming her as someone who had no willing to comply any acts to him as predicted. It was shown by his choice of words when he said; “why don’t you care for me anymore” and “I do hope you make no mention of my mother who I have ever seen”.

4. The Application of Off Record

Indirect Politeness or Off Record is a strategy which depends on the ability of an addressee to catch the meaning of a speaker’s utterance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It is known as the most polite strategy because it usually uses hints in ordering something, uses contradictions, uses incomplete utterances, overstates
something, and over-generalizes something. This strategy forces the hearer to understand the meaning of what speaker says.

Devabrata went off record when there was more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that he cannot be held to have committed himself to a particular intent. In linguistic realizations of off-record, Devabrata used strategies include metaphor and irony, rhetorical questions, understatement, tautologies. He also used all kinds of hints as to express what he wanted or meant to communicate, without doing so directly so that the meaning was to some degree negotiable.

**Dialogue 4**

Devabrata : Father would you allow me to travel to faraway places
King Santanu : What are you looking for, Son? You can get everything you want here in this place.
Devabrata : My soul is like the water current of the Holy River ... it cannot rest before it reaches the sea
King Santanu : In the vast ocean, your soul will lose its significance.
Devabrata : Pardon me, Father, in ocean my soul might, in fact, find its unlimited source of energy
King Santanu : Well, as your wish, my son. So, be it done as you will.
Devabrata : Thank you father!

In dialogue 4, Devabrata made purposeful ambiguity using metaphor and made King Santanu interpret Devabrata’s intended meaning by himself. The words “My soul is like the water current of the Holy River ... it cannot rest before it reaches the sea” meant that Devabrata wanted to go to a journey and he would not rest until he found what he was searching for. Devabrata communicated without doing so directly, so that the meaning was to some degree become negotiable. This strategy was rarely used by Devabrata unless he had a
conversation with someone who had strong chemistry with him. So far, he only used this strategy when he spoke with his father King Santanu and Princess Amba.

B. The Factors Affecting Devabrata’s Politeness Strategies in Dewfall

According to Holmes (2001), there are four dimensions affecting the use of politeness strategies. They are social distance scale, status scale, formality scale, and referential and affective scales. Those scales can be a measurement to assess speaker’s politeness. Related to the scales mentioned by Holmes (2011), Devabrata’s relationship with each character in Dewfall can be seen in table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Characters’ Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>King Santanu</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>King of Hastinapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Devi Durgandini</td>
<td>Step mother</td>
<td>Queen of Hastinapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Devi Amba</td>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>Princess of Giyantipura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Wulandari</td>
<td>Stranger, Sister</td>
<td>Peasant, Archer warrior of Hastinapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Rama Bargava</td>
<td>Guru (teacher)</td>
<td>Brahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Thousand wind</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Dancing rock</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Old farmer</td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>Farmer, wulandari father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wamuka &amp; Arimuka</td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>Prince, Amba brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Governor Danureja</td>
<td>Stranger, Enemy</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Thousand Hill Tiger Robbers</td>
<td>Stranger, Enemy</td>
<td>Robber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Camp guard</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>Soldier of Sobalapura Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Devabrata’s relationship with other characters in Dewfall
Table 4.1 showed Devabrata’s relationship with other characters in Dewfall. Each relationship influenced Devabrata’s politeness strategies choice. As mentioned previously in Holmes’ (2001) theory, politeness strategies choice was greatly influenced by social distance, status, formality, and referential and affective function.

1. Social Distance

As Holmes (2001) concludes, social distance is solidarity-oriented. It means the use of politeness will be lower when a speaker and the addressee have a close relationship and vice versa. This theory is supported by Brown & Levinson (1987) who state that the degree of politeness will be lower when the social distance is close.

In Dewfall, Devabrata’s politeness strategies were highly affected by social distance. As can be seen previously, Devabrata significantly employed Positive Politeness rather than other politeness strategies in his utterances. This was happened because of the social distance between Devabrata and the other characters. The relation between Devabrata and each character may vary, but most of them started as a stranger. This condition made Devabrata significantly employed Positive Politeness to show his manner, gave a positive impression and avoided hearer’s negative face.

2. Status

As Holmes (2001) states, status determines linguistic choices. A speaker will choose some terms regarding the status of the addressee — whether he is
superior or subordinate. Status mentioned here was not only about age, but also about social status and gender. As *Dewfall* took setting in the ancient Java, social structure and stratification is highly valued. This condition made a person’s status become very important and cannot be underestimate. A person with lesser status cannot talk impolitely to someone with higher status, just like the younger person must not talk impolitely to older person. A woman must also talk politely and respect man. For instance, a farmer should talk politely to a Governor or a Knight because they have higher status than the farmer.

In *Dewfall*, Devabrata status was Crown prince of Hastinapura Kingdom, son of King Santanu, King of Hastinapura. Crown prince was descendant of the King which soon will replace the King himself to rule the kingdom. As the Crown prince, he has the second highest status right after the King and Queen. It implies that any people with lesser status, which means all the characters except Goodness Tara, King Santanu and Queen Durgandini, should show respect when talking to him. However, Devabrata chose to go into a journey to search the utpala flower and distinguished his status as a rover. There were only few certain characters, namely, Rama Bargava and Wulandari that were allowed to know who Devabrata really was. As a rover Devabrata showed respect and spoke as polite as possible to all characters, as long as the interlocutors showed respect and good attitude towards him. Exceptional case goes for Devabrata and Rama Bargava. Even though Rama Bargava knew that Devabrata was a prince. Still, Devabrata asked him to become his teacher and took Devabrata as his student. Therefore, though
Devabrata was a prince he has to respect his teacher. In this case Rama Bargava had higher status than Devabrata.

3. Formality

Holmes (2001) emphasizes that formality is influenced by settings and types of interaction, not the status relationship between speaker and addressee. In Dewfall, mostly the setting was informal – the formal dialogue only happen few times, and mostly because of the interaction types. One of the dialogues was between Devabrata and Amba when they first time meet. Both Devabrata and Amba introduced themselves to one another. At that moment, Devabrata used the following words to show the formality that happen; “Hello young lady, let me know who you are” and “I am Devabrata, a traveler”.

4. Referential and Affective Functions

Holmes (2001) exclaims language can serve two functions—referential and affective. It can convey information and express the feeling of its speaker as well. Devabrata utterances were affected by referential and affective functions. Nevertheless, one of those functions was more dominant depending on the purpose of the topic interaction. For example, “You may ride the horse if you want”. Referential function was obviously provided in Devabrata’s utterances. He conveyed information that he allowed Amba to ride his horse if she wanted to. Meanwhile, there were some utterances containing Positive Politeness that served affective function. Devabrata’s utterance: “Don’t be afraid, Amba” served
affective function. He expressed his attention to Amba felling who was worried about him. Another example was when Devabrata met Wulandari after a long time. He uttered: "I'm glad to see you again". His utterance contained Positive Politeness to express his happy feeling for Wulandari because he had a chance of meeting with her again.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of three parts; they are: conclusions, implications and recommendations. The first part presents summary of the study. The second part deals with implication in language teaching and learning. The third part suggests recommendations for future studies related to politeness phenomena.

A. Conclusions

As it had been mentioned in chapter I, in this research there were two research questions proposed: First, what are Devabrata’s politeness strategies applied in Dewfall? Second, what are the aspects influence Devabrata’s choices of politeness strategies in Dewfall? Those questions was proposed in order to know what are the politeness strategies applied by Devabrata and what aspects influenced his choice of using those politeness strategies. To answer those two questions Brown, P., & Levinson, S. and Holmes, J. theories were used as the references. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. explain about politeness strategy, meanwhile Holmes, J. explain about politeness factors. This research was about an analysis of politeness on Devabrata’s utterances in Dewfall.

The research shown that Devabrata use all of the four politeness strategies, namely Bald-on Record, Positive Politeness, Negatives Politeness, and Off Record. But mostly Devabrata tends to use positive politeness in his speech rather than any other politeness strategy. Meanwhile, Devabrata rarely used off records
strategy. It had to be noted that the background of Dewfall is greatly influenced by
the writer’s point of view as a priest and a Javanese man, as well as Hindu and
Buddhist mysticism culture. It means that under those influence positive
politeness seems to be chosen rather than the other strategies.

In addition Brown and Levinson’s (1987) who state that politeness is
determined by context, society and culture, Devabrata’s utterances were also
affected by factors proposed by Holmes (2001). Those factors are social distance,
status, formality, and two functions of interaction: referential and affective.
However, there is no specific influence of one factor only. Instead, all factors
were influenced Devabrata’s politeness choice in certain degree. There are minor
factors and a most dominant factor. As a result, the most dominant factor decides
the final outcome of Devabrata’s politeness choice decision.

B. Implications

Politeness is essential in language teaching and learning. The use of
politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987) could be a good
strategy in order to be able to speak appropriately in the light of relationship
between speaker and hearers. Teacher and students can apply those politeness
strategies based on certain social contexts in order to maintain their relationship.
When a teacher needs a help from a student to clean up the whiteboard, the
teacher can apply negative politeness in asking for help, e.g. “Would you clean up
the board?” The sentence is considered as a polite form because it contains would
you which has become a common polite expression of asking for help in English.
Furthermore, the sentence is structurally complex and minimizes the imposition on the student who is being asked for. In case of asking for help, using Negative Politeness will be an appropriate strategy rather than using Bald-on Record, “Please, clean up the board!” Yet, when it comes to give instructions, which is supposed to be clear and direct, the use of Bald-on Record could be the distinctive. In conclusion, the appropriate use of politeness strategies is very helpful for teacher and students, especially on language teaching and learning process.

C. Recommendations

Since the study conducted was about the use of politeness strategies by Devabrata, the main character of Dewfall, I would like to give some recommendations as regards the benefits of this study to English learners, English teachers, and future researchers who learn, teach, or conduct study on politeness strategy as well.

1. English Learners

Politeness has been known as a complicated thing to deal with when speak to speech community. As English learners, pragmatic competence and sociolinguistic competence are required in order to be able to speak appropriately and maintain relationships. Thus, I encourage English learners to be more aware to recognize the language use in certain social contexts since politeness does matter in a society. It will help them to use politeness appropriately.
2. English Teachers

_Sorry, please, excuse me, and thank you_ are not the only terms which can represent politeness. For instance, it can sound less polite when an adult speaker uses _please_ in ordering something. I encourage English teachers to pay attention to pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects when they are teaching their students, especially in designing teaching materials and exercises. English teachers can help their students practice language in contextualized language functions. English teachers can also provide situational tasks which need language functions to be expressed. It will make their students aware of selecting the best ways to express themselves and responding to _interlocutors_ appropriately due to given contexts and sociocultural norms.

3. Future Researcher

_Culture holds great influence to language, especially when it is related to politeness degree. There are various cultures in the world. Each has their own uniqueness and they might have different politeness degree from one to another. I encourage future researchers to conduct analysis related to the influence of culture to politeness strategies. Better analyses regarding politeness phenomena in certain cultures, especially in the use of politeness strategies and the factors affecting it, proofed very useful to increase people awareness of the language that they are used. Hopefully by doing such kind of research, it can help people to become more civilized in the manner of speaking._
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