

# **THE USE OF PERSON DEIXIS IN RELATION TO POLITENESS FUNCTION**

A case study among the students of English Department Program class 2007, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro  
University Semarang

## **A THESIS**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistics in English Department  
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University**

Submitted by:

**IKE ENDAH RACHMAWATI**

**NIM: A2B007061**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

**DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY**

**2011**

## **PRONOUNCEMENT**

The writer honestly confirms that she complies this thesis by herself and without taking any results from other researchers in S-1, S-2, S-3 and in diploma degree of any university. The writer ascertains also that she does not quote any material from other publications or someone's paper except from the references mentioned.

## MOTTO AND DEDICATION

*It needs more dots to make a gorgeous line,  
Cause one dot is not enough.  
That's have to be the way we think,  
When there are so many points of view,  
We'll see that we have a gorgeous thinking too.*

*This paper is dedicated to*  
My beloved parents and family,  
Lovely friends and everyone who helped me accomplished this paper.  
“A heap of thanks for always supporting and cheering me up”

## APPROVAL

Approved by,  
Thesis Advisor

Drs. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum  
NIP. 19671004 199303 1 003

## **VALIDATION**

Approved by  
Strata 1 Thesis Examination Committee  
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University  
on July 15<sup>th</sup> 2011

### **Chair Person**

Dr. J. Herudjati Purwoko, M. Sc  
NIP. 19530327 198103 1 006

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Alhamdulillah, all my praises to Alloh SWT and Muhammad SAW who always give true spirit and strength so this thesis entitled “The Use of Personal Deixis in Relation to Politeness Strategy” had successfully been completed.

Reverently, the writer would like to express her gratitude to these following parties who always give uncountable supports in finishing her thesis.

1. Dr. Agus Maladi Irianto, MA., the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.

2. Dr. Ratna Asmarani, M.Ed., M.Hum., the Head of the English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
3. Dra. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum., the Head of Linguistics Section, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
4. Drs. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum., her thesis advisor, huge thanks for the time, advice, knowledge, and patience. Those are priceless, Sir!
5. Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum, her academic advisor. Thanks for always give us time to ask a signature.
6. All lecturers and academic officers, thanks for a valuable lesson and help.
7. Her beloved parents, Sahirudin and Siti Kalimah, who always give an extremely huge care, prayer, love and everything she needs. Adik love you so, Ayah, Ibu...
8. Her Mr. Right will be, whoever you are, I put your name on 8, 'cause I love 8 as I love my brother, Alm. Mas Aris that I want you to be like him :)
9. Her brother and sisters, and also nephews, Rama and Alil. Thanks a lot for the joy, your laugh makes anything lighter, Dhek.. Tete love you so...
10. Her closest friends, Garnis and Indri, who always give support and prayer up to now and hope forever. Hey gals! You both are rock!! The moments with you guys are best moments ever. Thank you... :)
11. All her classmates in English Department Program class 2007, thanks for being so lovely, 'cause without you guys this thesis can't be conducted.
12. All sistas, Teh Aam, Iid, Dhek Yoan, Indah. Surprises? Of course we have! :D
13. All people that can't be mention one by one that involve directly or indirectly in finishing this thesis. Thanks a lot for being so kind to me.

The writer realizes that this thesis is still far from perfect. She somehow will be glad to receive any constructive criticism and recommendation to make this thesis better.

Finally, the writer expects that this thesis will be useful for the reader and make the linguistics studies broader and broader.

Semarang, July 2011

The Writer

## **ABSTRAK**

Penggunaan kata yang merujuk pada suatu hal yang berkaitan dengan konteks penutur disebut dengan deiksis. Dewasa ini, Levinson memaparkan lima bentuk deiksis, yaitu deiksis persona, tempat, waktu, sosial dan *discourse* yang sangat bergantung pada interpretasi penutur sehingga disebut bersifat egosentris. Penggunaan deiksis persona merupakan salah satu faktor penting dalam berkomunikasi mengingat seorang penutur tidak hanya berkomunikasi dengan orang yang mempunyai kedudukan ataupun kedekatan personal yang sama.

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mencari tahu bagaimana strategi berkomunikasi para mahasiswa dalam menggunakan deiksis persona. Penelitian dalam skripsi ini bersifat deskriptif dengan menggunakan data primer. Metode simak dengan teknik simak libat cakap adalah metode yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data. Populasi dalam penelitian ini

adalah mahasiswa jurusan Sastra Inggris angkatan 2007, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Diponegoro Semarang, sedangkan sampel diambil dari sebagian populasi dengan menggunakan teknik *purposive sampling*. Sedangkan untuk menganalisis data digunakan metode padan referensial dan metode padan pragmatis.

Dari penelitian studi kasus yang telah dilaksanakan, dapat diambil kesimpulan bahwa deiksis persona pertama yang digunakan adalah aku, saya, dan kita, sedangkan untuk deiksis persona kedua adalah kamu, *kowe*, beliau, serta nama mitra tutur. Di sisi lain, untuk deiksis persona ketiga yang digunakan adalah dia, *deknen*, beliau, nama orang ketiga serta persona kekerabatan. Penggunaan tersebut sangat dipengaruhi oleh tinggi rendahnya kedudukan serta kedekatan antara penutur dan mitra tutur sehingga muncul penggunaan deiksis persona yang tidak pada umumnya. Sementara itu, maksim kesopanan yang muncul adalah maksim kearifan (*tact maxim*) dan maksim kerendahhatian (*generosity maxim*).

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

### 1. Background of the Study

Communication is one of the most important matters for living things, especially for human. We have to communicate in order to help us fulfill our needs, because we cannot get what we want if we do not say it. Communication itself can be done by two ways, verbal and non-verbal. Sending message via email and writing letter are the examples of non-verbal communication, in which the parties involving in the communication are not doing the communication orally or both parties do not (have to) meet each other. Communication media is the most important thing in non-verbal communication. Although verbal communication sometimes also needs media, communicating via telephone for example, however the parties involving in the verbal communication still have other choices to communicate that is communicating directly.

In such communication, there have to involve at least 2 (two) parties, one party is considered as the speaker and the other one as the addressee. Additionally, it will be better if communication is done communicatively. It is said as communicative if both parties that are involved in the communication understand what is talking about, – what the speaker said and what the addressee heard –. However, people involved in such communication do not always come from the same background, such as: gender, education, social background and status and also age, so they may use various language styles in speaking and sometimes it makes the sentence they utter is hard to understand or seems strange to another party who involves in the speech event.

Imagine if we say “*How are you?*” when the lights starts to blackout and there are more than 1 (one) addressee. We may not get a direct answer from the addressees because they cannot get which “*you*” that we are talking to. Or as if we say: “*Are you okay there?*” when we ask to our friend in distance. We choose the word “*there*” instead of “*here*” because it strongly refers to how the condition of the addressee is. The word *you* and *there* here, indicate that there is a system in language which is meant to point person, time and also place, that is called as *Deixis*.

In having a communicative communication, the right usage of deixis becomes an important factor in building a success communication. Besides, the use of politeness is also important, because people cannot utter any utterance without looking for their

addressee.

Let's have a look on the following sentence:

X: Waktu kita mau nulis, kalau mau konsul ke Bu Nunung gimana?

X: *When we begin to write, it is okay if we consult it to Bu Nunung?*

The example above shows the word "kita" refers the speaker and also "Bu Nunung" refers the addressee. In a glance, we may not find where the mistake of the sentence is, though there is a misuse of the person deixis. The word "kita" should include the addressee also, but in this sentence, the speaker intended to exclude her. However, the word "Bu Nunung" is a right choice to have a polite sentence since "Bu Nunung" is the speaker's lecturer.

The use of deixis and its combination to politeness become flagging topic to be studied because they are used in almost all aspects in our daily conversation, and it will be more interesting if the speakers are university students that are known that university students rich in diversity, from the language, social life and etc.

The phenomenon above leads the writer to analyze more about **The Use of Person Deixis in Relation to Politeness Function.**

## 2. **Research Question**

The research questions of this study are:

1. How is the use of person deixis by university students?
2. How is the communication strategy among the university students regarding the use of person deixis?
3. What are the social factors behind the use of certain person deixis by the university students?

## 3. **Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study are:

1. To explain person deixis that is used by university students.
2. To describe the communication strategy among the university students regarding the use of person deixis.
3. To describe the social factors behind the use of certain person deixis by the university students.

## 4. **Previous Study**

The previous study on this research is the study concerning about the use of deictic expression and had been conducted by Sari Wulandari (2008) entitled "*The Use of Deictic Expression at Early Pre-Operational Stage Children (case study on children who live at Jalan Masajaya Plaju Palembang)*".

In her thesis, she analyzed the use of deictic expression by two sisters (siblings) at early pre-operational stage and not only analyzed the use of person deixis but also time and spatial deixis. In addition, she connected her research with the context, reference, and cognitive development in children. The side that differentiates this research to her is that this research concerns about the use of politeness and also social factors as the

communication strategy behind certain use of person deixis by the university students, not the children.

## **5. Organization of the Writing**

### **Chapter I : INTRODUCTION**

This chapter consists of background of study, research question, purpose of the study, previous study and organization of the writing.

### **Chapter II : REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

This chapter consists of theories used to describe definition of deixis, types of deixis, aspects of speech situations, definition of politeness, maxims of politeness, and PDR (Power, Distance, and Rank of Imposition).

### **Chapter III : RESEARCH METHOD**

This chapter consists of the type of the research, source of collecting data, method of collecting data, population and sample, and method of analyzing data.

### **Chapter IV : THE USE OF PERSON DEIXIS IN RELATION TO POLITENESS FUNCTION**

This chapter consists of the description of the use of person deixis by university students in relation to politeness.

### **Chapter V : CONCLUSION**

This chapter consists of the conclusion of the whole writing and also the suggestions relate to the writing subject.

## **CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **2.1. Definition of Deixis**

When people say something, they may not only intent to say it, but also mean something behind the utterances they say, and the actions performed via utterances are called as speech acts (Yule, 1996: 47). Therefore, people not only produce strings of words as sentences, but also utterances that are intended to achieve their intention. Deixis, as one of the communication strategies also belongs to speech acts.

Yule (1996: 9) defines deixis as technical term for one of the most basic things we do with utterances. In addition, Cruse defines that deixis signifies different things to different people (2000: 319). It shows that deictical words have no exact referent (Purwo, 1990: 17). Essentially, deixis relates to the way in which languages encode or grammaticalize features of the context of utterance or speech event, and thus relates to the ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context of

utterances (Levinson, 1983: 54). Any linguistic varieties applied to accomplish this 'pointing' are called a *deictic expression* or *indexicals* (Yule, 1996: 9). However, to explicate the importance of a deictic information for interpreting utterances is possibly best exemplified by what happens when such information is incomplete, as what has been stated by Fillmore (1975: 38-9) in Levinson (1983: 54). Take a look at the example of deictic expression below:

1) I'll bring you a gift and put it here tomorrow.

From the example above, the speaker uses the word 'I' to point at himself or herself, in other words, 'I' refers to the person who is currently speaking. The speaker uses the word 'you' to point at the intended addressee or hearer. The word 'here' indicates the place of speaking and 'tomorrow' indicates the time after the utterance is spoken. Suppose it was not directly said to certain people but it was written in a note that people find somewhere, the message will mean nothing because that people cannot get complete information of who the speaker is, when and where the exact time and place is.

Deixis, in prior time, was divided into three categories: person, place and time deixis. But now, there are two more deixis categories listed in Levinson (following Lyons, 1986, 1977a, and Fillmore, 1971b, 1975), that are social and discourse deixis (1983: 62).

In addition, it could be said that deixis is systematized in egocentric way considering the speaker as central point that relates everything to his point of view and also considering the deictic centre that are supposed to be as follows: (i) the central person is the speaker, (ii) the central time is the time at which the speaker produces the utterance, (iii) the central place is the speaker's location at utterance time, (iv) the discourse centre is the point which the speaker is currently at in the production of his utterance, and (v) the social centre is the speaker's social status and rank, to which the status or rank of addressees or referents is relative (Levinson, 1983: 63-4).

The important point is that deixis has to do with the predetermination of many different aspects of the circumstances surrounding the utterance inside the utterance itself (Levinson, 1983: 55).

### **2.1.1. Person Deixis**

Levinson (1983: 62-8) stated that person deixis deals with the predetermination of the role of participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is uttered and it is reflected directly in the grammatical categories of person.

According to Verhaar, person deixis that can be considered as 'truly' deictic are personal pronoun, first and second person pronoun (1996: 402). Besides, Cruse stated that other than first person, known as speaker and second person, known as addressee, another important participant in the speech situation, neither speaker nor hearer are also included to person deixis, that are known as third person (2000: 319).

However, as stated by Burling and Ingram in Levinson (1983: 69), pronominal systems also can be considered deictic. Those pronominal systems are as follows: for first person, speaker inclusion (+ S); for second person, addressee inclusion (+ A); and for third person, speaker and addressee exclusion (- S, - A). Besides, in many languages, there are two first person pronouns plural known as exclusive and inclusive 'we'. As the term,

exclusive 'we' includes speaker and other, but excludes the addressee (+S, -A), whereas inclusive 'we' includes speaker, other and addressee or /+S, +A/. Let's take a look at the example below:

- 2) Let's go to the cinema
- 3) Let's go to see you tomorrow (?)

The first sentence is inclusive as it includes the addressee, while the second one is exclusive as it excludes the addressee. In the fact that -'s in the word "let's" stands for 'us', it may be inappropriate for the second sentence because the word 'us' is considered inclusive while the second sentence is exclusive as it also mentions the pronoun 'you' (Levinson, 1983: 69).

### 2.1.2. Place Deixis

Place deixis, as in Levinson (1983: 62) is defined as "the encoding of spatial location *relative* to the location of the participants in the speech event". Place deixis deals with proximal (close to speaker) or distal (close to addressee) dimension (Levinson, 1983: 62). Take a look at the example below:

- 4) How are the things, *there*?

The deictic expression 'there' above, does not simply mean 'how are things at some place distant from the speaker', but it means 'how are things where the addressee is' (Levinson, 1983: 80).

Besides, place deixis (or in Yule it is said as spatial deixis), also deals with coding time or CT and also receiving time or RT. Thus, the word 'there' that basically means 'distal from speaker's location at CT', can also be interpreted as 'proximal to addressee at RT' (Levinson, 1983: 80).

Therefore, it is true that pragmatic basis of place deixis is a psychological distance meaning physically close objects will tend to be treated by the speaker as psychologically close, and reverse (Yule, 1996: 13). Let's have a look at the following example:

- 5) I was looking at this little puppy in a cage with such a sad look on its face. It was like, 'Oh, I'm so unhappy *here*, will you set me free?'

The word 'here' above signifies that the intended cage is not actually in the physical location near to the speaker, but it is considered near, as the speaker tries to perform the role of the puppy (Yule, 1996: 13).

There are some pure place-deictic words in English that are differentiated by

proximal and distal dimension, i.e. the adverbs *here* and *there*, demonstrative pronouns *this* and *that*, and also the verbs *come* and *go* and *bring* and *take* (Levinson, 1983: 79-84).

### 2.1.3. Time Deixis

The predetermination of temporal points and spans *relative* to the time at which an utterance was spoken (or a written message inscribed) is called as time deixis (Levinson 1983: 62).

As place deixis, time deixis also deals with CT and RT (Levinson, 1983: 62). Time deixis is generally grammaticalized by the form of adverbs of time, like *now*, *then*, *yesterday* and of tense (Levinson, 1983: 62).

Present and past tense in time deixis (temporal deixis as Yule called) differentiate proximal and distal form (Yule, 1996: 15), e.g.:

- 6) a. I *live* here now.
- b. I *lived* there then.

When somebody uttered (6a), it means that the deictic center is close to him or is considered proximal because he is still involved in a current situation at which he uttered the utterance or the situation is still in a progress, while (6b) is considered distal as the situation does not exist anymore.

### 2.1.4. Discourse Deixis

Discourse deixis deals with “the encoding of reference to portions of the unfolding discourse in which the utterance (which includes the text referring expression) is located” (Levinson, 1983: 62).

Discourse deixis, somehow, is often compared to anaphora. However, discourse deixis and anaphora is quite different since discourse deixis is located in a pronoun which refers to a linguistic expression or part of discourse itself, while anaphora is located in a pronoun which refers to the same entity as a prior linguistic expression refers to (Levinson, 1983: 86).

Let’s have a look at the following example:

- 7) A: That’s a rhinoceros
- B: Spell *it* for me
- 8) *Harry*’s a sweetheart; *he*’s so considerate

The example (7) above is an example of discourse deixis. There, the word ‘it’ is not functioned to refer or replace the entity, i.e. a rhinoceros, but it is used to mention the rhinoceros itself. It is different from the concept of anaphora in (8) where ‘he’ is functioned to refer the referent ‘Harry’.

However, discourse deixis is not showing proximal or distal, like place deixis does,

but it is more like showing the token-reflexivity of a sentence (Levinson, 1983: 86).

### 2.1.5. Social Deixis

Levinson describes social deixis as the predetermination of social differences that are relative to participant-roles, mainly aspects of the social correlation that is possessed between the speaker and addressee(s) or speaker and some referent (1983: 63).

Social deixis is divided into two basic kinds that are relational and absolute (Levinson, 1983: 90). The relational social deixis is manifested through this certain relationship (Levinson, 1983: 90-1):

- a) speaker and referent (addressee honorifics by referring him)
- b) speaker and addressee (addressee honorifics without referring him)
- c) speaker and bystander (bystander or audience honorifics)
- d) speaker and setting (formality levels or social activity).

While absolute social deixis are in the form of (Levinson, 1983: 91):

- a) authorized speaker (forms reserved for certain speaker)
- b) authorized hearer (restriction of most title, e.g. *Your Honor*).

Social deixis, however, truly cannot be separated from the concept of **honorifics**. Furthermore, honorifics concerns about the relative rank or respect between speaker, referent, and also bystander (Levinson, 1983: 90). Social deixis is sometimes encoded in person deixis, and it is related to the different social status (higher and lower) between speaker and addressee. Moreover, it also deals with familiar and non-familiar addressee in some languages, as French, Spanish, and Javanese have. The T/V distinction in French is a well known example for this. 'Tu' is used to address familiar addressee and 'Vous' for non-familiar (or with higher status) one. In Spanish it is called 'Tu/Usted' and in Javanese the term 'Kowe/Sampeyan/Panjenengan' is included in this distinction. It also could possibly lie in a verb, as 'Mangan/Dhahar' in Javanese.

- |                                     |                            |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 9) <i>Panjenengan sampun dhahar</i> | “Have you taken your lunch |
| 10) <i>Kowe wis mangan?</i>         | /dinner/breakfast?”        |

Both sentences above have the same meaning, but they are uttered in different way considering the addressee or bystander. Sentence (9) could be uttered to pay more respect to the hearer. On the other hand, sentence (10) could be uttered to make the situation more relax. Uttering sentence (10) does not mean that a speaker does not respect the hearer. It might be used to make the situation more relax. However, sentence (10) could only be used between the same position or close relationship between speaker and hearer.

## 2.2. Aspect of Speech Situations

In conducting such speech acts, both speaker and hearer have to engage in a mutual circumstance so the intention can be succeeded. The certain circumstances that determine the interpretation of a performed utterance are called as speech events (Yule, 1996: 48).

Speech events or speech situations are classified into five factors (Leech, 1983: 13-

4):

1. *Addressers or addressees* which signify to whom the utterance by speaker is addressed to.
2. *The context[1] of an utterance* which include relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance.
3. *The goal(s) of an utterance*
4. *The utterance as a form of act or activity: a speech act.*
5. *The utterance as a product of verbal act*

### 2.3. Definition of Politeness

When a speaker wants to attain a goal, a speaker has to perform a good communication strategy in order to not offend someone else's feeling but does not cost himself too, so the goal can be successfully achieved. Politeness, as many linguists suggest, is one of the important parts to do so. There are some experts discussing politeness, Brown and Levinson, Lakoff and Leech are some of them. However, in this chapter, the writer will use Leech theory since Leech provides 'strategies' to pay respect to someone else by uttering appropriate expression.

According to Leech, politeness is marked in the way the participants managed and structured a conversation without ignoring the content of the conversation itself (1983: 139). Politeness is closely related to Maxim or Cooperative Principle. For without having the politeness principle, the cooperative principle will make false predictions. In addition, maxims figure an important part of the description of linguistic meaning as they explain how the speakers often 'mean more than they say' (Leech, 1983: 9).

There are 4 (four) Cooperative Principles that mentioned by Grice (1975) in Leech (1983: 8):

- a. Quantity : Give the right amount of information
- b. Quality : Try to make your contribution one that is true
- c. Relation : Be relevant
- d. Manner : Be perspicuous

Cooperative Principles shows a clear partition between the sense of an utterance and its force though Cooperative Principles (CP) and Politeness Principles (PP) will operate variably in different cultures, social situation, and among different social classes (Leech, 1983: 10). It precisely shows that every language bring their own rule.

In the fact, CP is not universal to language. CP needs PP to be an essential complement rescuing CP from any ambiguity (Leech, 1983: 80). Take a look at the following example:

- 11) A: We'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we?  
B: Well, we'll all miss BILL.

The above sentence implies that the B actually will not miss Agatha. But she/he chose to violate maxim of quantity by not saying full sentences '...but not Agatha' in order to uphold the PP (Leech, 1983: 81).

According to Leech, PP might be originated in a broad way, i.e.: decreasing the expression of impolite beliefs and increasing the expression of the polite one, in which

polite and impolite beliefs are determined based on the relevant scale of values that favorable or unfavorable for the hearer (1983: 81).

Still according to Leech, while CP allows one participant in a conversation to communicate under an assumption that the other participants will be cooperative, PP retains the social symmetry and friendly relation whether or not the interlocutors are being cooperative (1983: 82).

In conclusion, politeness is “an important missing link between the CP and the problem of how to relate sense to force” (Leech, 1983: 104).

## **2.4. Maxims of Politeness Principles**

Politeness relates to a correlation between two participants that could be labeled as *self* and *other* (Leech, 1983: 131). As same as CP, PP that is stated by Leech also has maxims. The maxims of PP are as follows:

### **2.4.1. Tact Maxim**

When using tact maxim, the speaker minimizes cost to *other* (negative side) and maximizes benefit to *other* (positive side). Tact maxim lies on impositives and commissive (Leech, 1983: 132). Take a look at the example below:

12) Can't you shut up?

13) I'd keep my mouth shut (if I were you).

From the example that is taken from Leech (1983: 108) above, it can be seen that sentence (12) seems impolite because it contains “extreme irritation” to the hearer, while (13) seems more polite because it sounds like a beneficial advice for the hearer.

### **2.4.2. Generosity Maxim**

Generosity maxim minimizes benefit to *self* and maximizes cost to *self*. As in tact maxim, generosity maxim also lies on impositive and commissive (Leech, 1983: 132). However, generosity maxim is less powerful than tact maxim because in generosity maxim, the impositive can be softened by omitting the reference to the hearer's cost so it will be more polite (Leech, 1983: 134). Here is the example of generosity maxim:

14) Could I borrow this electric drill?

The sentence above slightly more polite than we say *Could you lend me this electric drill?* It is because in sentence (14), it appears as if there is no sacrifice that will be given by the hearer from the offer that is requested by the speaker (Leech, 1983: 134).

### **2.4.3. Approbation Maxim**

Minimize dispraise of *other* and maximize praise of *other* become the main point that remains in approbation maxim (Leech, 1983: 132). In addition, the approbation maxim exclaims that the speaker have to ‘avoid saying unpleasant thing about others, and more particularly, about *h*’ (Leech, 1983: 135). Approbation maxim can be seen in expressive

and assertive (Leech, 1983: 132). As dispraising of *h* or a third party is considered bad-mannered, so people have to use indirectness strategies with the intention of mitigating the effect of criticism (Leech, 1983: 135). Let's have a look at the following example:

15) A: Her performance was magnificent, wasn't it! B: Was it?

Suppose both *A* and *B* were the audience of the performance, *B*'s reply to *A* by questioning, implies that *B* didn't agree with *A*'s statement. However, *B* chose to re-question to *A* rather than maybe said *Her performance was not so good as it might have been* (Leech, 1983: 135-6).

#### 2.4.4. Modesty Maxim

As what had been stated by Leech, "modesty maxim is more powerful than it is a rule in English-speaking societies, where it would be customarily more polite to accept a compliment 'graciously' rather than to go on denying it" (1983: 137). The rule of modesty maxim is minimizing praise of *self* and maximizing dispraise of *self* (Leech, 1983: 136), and it can be found in expressive and assertive (Leech, 1983: 132), e.g.:

16) Please accept this small gift as a token of our esteem.

17) Please accept this large gift as a token of our esteem.

From above example, it can be seen that sentence (16) obeys the modesty maxim while sentence (17) is not. No matter how large the gift is, *s* did not exaggerate the amount of the gift, and lessen it instead (Leech, 1983: 136).

#### 2.4.5. Agreement Maxim

In agreement maxim, there is a bias to overstress an agreement with other people and to mitigate disagreement by expressing regret, partial agreement, etc (Leech, 1983: 138). In short, the rule of this maxim is minimizing disagreement between *self* and *other* and maximizing agreement between *self* and *other*. Agreement maxim can be seen through assertive utterances (Leech, 1983: 132). The example is shown below:

18) A: It was an interesting exhibition, wasn't it?

B: No, it was very *uninteresting*.

19) A: English is a difficult language to learn

B: True, but grammar is quite easy.

Showing partial agreement as in (19) looks more polite and it is often preferable to complete disagreement as in (18) (Leech, 1983: 138).

#### 2.4.6. Sympathy Maxim

Leech stated that “Maxim of sympathy explains why congratulations and condolences are courteous speech act, even though condolences express beliefs which are negative with regard to hearer” (Leech, 1983: 138). That is why sympathy maxim minimizes antipathy between *self* and *other* and maximizes sympathy between *self* and *other*. The example below will make the explanation above clearer:

- 20) I’m terribly sorry to hear about your cat.
- 21) I’m delighted to hear about your cat.

When people hear any utterance as above, people could easily predict that (20) shows condolences to express a sympathy of misfortune and on the contrary, (21) shows congratulations to express a sympathy of a fortune (Leech, 1983: 138-9). As agreement maxim, sympathy maxim can also be found in assertive utterances (Leech, 1983: 132).

#### 2.5. Power, Distance, and Rank of Imposition

Based on Brown and Levinson (1987/78: 80), there are three relevant factors that are used by speaker to assess the danger of FTA[2], i.e. Power, Distance, and Rank of Imposition. Those three factors are essential to determine how polite an utterance that is uttered by the speaker to the hearer will be. Power is a value that is labeled not to individual, but to roles or role-sets (Brown and Levinson, 1987/78: 78), while distance or social distance is the closeness between the speaker and the hearer or the way the speaker treats the hearer in particular way (Brown and Levinson, 1987/78: 79). And rank of imposition somehow relates to how ‘urgent’ the intention of the speaker will be (Brown and Levinson, 1987/78: 79).

Here are the examples for power, distance, and also rank of imposition:

- 22) Excuse me sir, would it be alright if I smoke?
- 23) Mind if I smoke?

Both utterances above show the same intention from the speaker, i.e. he intended to smoke. However, the different utterances occur if they are uttered by different people. (22) might be said by an employee to his boss, while (23) might be said by the boss to the employee in the same situation (Brown and Levinson, 1987/78: 80). The example above clearly shows that different power brings different strategy in uttering same intention.

- 24) Excuse me, would you by any chance have the time?
- 25) Got the time, mate?

Utterance (24) might be uttered when the speaker and the hearer were distant, strangers from different parts for example, whether (25) was used when the speaker and the hearer were close or intimate (Brown and Levinson, 1987/78: 80).

26) Look, I'm terribly sorry to bother you but would there be any chance of your lending me just enough money to get a railway ticket to get home? I must have dropped my purse and I just don't know what to do.

27) Hey, got change for a quarter?

Let's imagine that both utterance (26) and (27) above were said by the frustrated traveler to a stranger. However, utterance (26) considers the FTA to be much more serious than (27). It shows that the ranking of imposition in (26) is higher than it is in (27) (Brown and Levinson, 1987/78: 81).

On the other hand, Holmes (1992: 8) stated that social factors influencing the choice of one variety (any set of linguistics forms which patterns according to social factors (Holmes, 1992: 6)) are as follows:

1. Participants : **who** is speaking and **who** are they speaking to?
2. Setting : **where** they are speaking?
3. Topic : **what** is being talked about?
4. Function : **why** they are speaking?

Besides, these four scales below also related to the factors above (Holmes, 1992: 8-10):

**a. Social distance scale** which deals with participant relationship and this scale are useful in pointed out that how well we know someone is a significant factor in linguistic selection.

e.g.: We call someone with a nickname, *Meg* for example, as we are intimate to her. However, people who are distant with her will call her with her surname, *Mrs. Billington* for example.

**b. Status scale** which also deals with participant relationship and it ends to the relevance of relative status in some linguistic choices.

e.g.: People will call *Sir* or *Mrs* to people who have higher status than them.

**c. Formality scale** which relates to the background or kinds of interaction in evaluating the effect of the social background or kinds of interaction on language choice.

e.g.: There will be a different in addressing someone if we are in formal and informal situation although we know them well.

**d. Referential and affective function scale** which relates to how information content and affective content also bring effect to express how someone is feeling.

Language preferences express the social relationship between people and topic of discussions, and they reflect how well pople know other person (Holmes, 1992: 12). In addition, verbal communication replicates the context in which language is used, rather than the distinctiveness of the speaker, because the better people know someone, the more casual and relaxed the speech style people will use to address the hearer (Holmes, 1992: 223-4).

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHOD**

#### **3.1. Type of the Research**

The type of this research is descriptive method for the reason that descriptive method describes a situation of interest factually in systematic way (Kuntoro in Jauhari, 2010: 34). Descriptive method is usually used in case study, document analysis, and co-relational research (Jauhari, 2010: 35).

In addition, this research also uses qualitative approach in which the data that are analyzed in this research are texts, in the form of utterances.

A case study in this research is conducted in order to reach a conclusion of this research regarding the use of person deixis in relation to politeness strategy by the sample. As Sulisty Basuki (2006: 113) stated that case study is an intensive study toward event, environment, and particular thing that enables to describe or comprehend something.

#### **3.2. Source of Collecting Data**

Data become the most important part of this research in which they are analyzed to answer the research questions. The objects of this study are person deixis that are uttered by the research object.

The main source of the data is the conversation between the research object and the writer, the research object and their friend, and the research object and their lecturer that was obtained directly by recording and involving in a conversation with them. Therefore, the data are called as primary data as they are directly collected from the research object in the field research (Sutrisno Hadi, 1997:134).

#### **3.3. Method of Collecting Data**

*Metode Simak* is the method that is used to collect the data in this research, as Sudaryanto states that *Metode Simak* is the method of observing the use of language attentively (1993: 133).

In conducting the research, the writer is involved in the research object conversation, so the technique used in this research is *Simak Libat Cakap (SLC)* (Sudaryanto, 1993: 133).

The technique of *Simak Libat Cakap (SLC)* in her research is done by listening and speaking. Recording the conversation and also taking a note are two techniques in listening, while for speaking, the writer was sometimes involved in the conversation with the research objects.

First steps of collecting data in this research were done by listening, recording and note taking. After recording and taking a note, the writer listened to it over and over and also made a pragmatic transcription. Last step was done by selecting utterances which contain person deixis.

### 3.4. Population and Sample

To obtain the data, the writer definitely needs population and sample. Population is the whole number of the research object and sample is the certain part of it (Jauhari, 2010: 41). To narrow the population to sample, the writer uses purposive sampling since the writer only selects utterances containing person deixis and uttered with different speaking partner.

The population of this study is the utterance from the students of English Department Program class 2007, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University Semarang, while the samples are the utterances that contain person deixis and also uttered with different speaking partner (student – lecturer, friend – friend).

### 3.5. Method of Analyzing Data

The method of analyzing data in this research used Sudaryanto's method, namely *Metode Padan* by the kinds of *Metode Padan Referensial* and *Metode Padan Pragmatis* as it defines by Sudaryanto that *Metode Padan* (*Padan* method) is a method where the determinant is exclude, detached from, and not as a part of the related language (1993: 13).

*Metode Padan Referensial* and *Metode Padan Pragmatis* are used because the determinant of this research is reference and also speaking partner (Sudaryanto, 1993: 14-5).

The data are analyzed firstly by determining their kind of person deixis mainly by using Levinson theory and other supporting theories, and then the selected data are identified based on the social aspects by using Holmes theory. After the social aspects have been identified, the selected data are re-distinguished based on their politeness by using Leech theory.

-----

[1] Context is any background knowledge supposed to be shared by speaker and hearer and it has a contribution for the hearer to interpret what the speaker means by a given utterance (Leech, 1983: 13).

[2] Face Threatening Act of (FTA) can be happen when a speaker utters something represents a threat or another individual's expectation concerning self image (Yule, 1996: 61).

-----  
Semarang, July 2011

Ike Endah Rachmawati

Second Member

Dra. Hj. Wiwiek Sundari, M. Hum

NIP. 19590607 199003 2 001

First Member

Drs. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum

NIP. 19671004 199303 1 003