ABSTRACT

Sembiring, Puan Suri Mira Annisa. Politeness Strategies in Javanese. AThesis. English Applied Linguistics Study Program. Postgraduate School. State University of Medan. 2009.

This research was conducted to discover the politeness strategies of Javanese peoples. The subject was taken 8 Javanese speakers who lived in Tembung-Bandar Klippa, Medan consisting of 4 females and 4 males. The age was 30-50 years old. They come from various professions: lecturer, trader and house wife. The instruments of collecting data were interview and record adopted by Bogdan & Biklen (1982). The researcher observed the subject closely and interviewed them. Then responses were classified a verified with reference to the criteria of politeness strategies as determined by Brown & Levinson (1987); cover the bald on record strategy, positive strategy, negative strategy and off- record strategy. The finding show that there were four types of politeness strategies used by Javanese speakers in different of types of illocutionary acts: in representatives were positive strategy (68.75%),bald on record strategy (31.25%), negative strategy (0%), off- record strategy (0%). Politeness strategies in directives were positive strategy (71.87%), bald on record strategy (20.32%), off- record strategy (4.68%) and the lowest score was negative politeness strategy (4.68%). Politeness strategies in commisives were positive strategy (67.86%), bald on record strategy (16.07%), negative strategies (16.07%), off- record strategy (0%). Politeness strategies in expressives were positive strategy (75%), bald on record strategy (25%) and negative strategy (0%) and off- record strategy (0%). Politeness strategies in declaratives were positive strategy (75%), Bald on record strategy (12.5%) negative strategy (12.5%), off- record strategy (0%). Positive politeness strategy was dominant types used by Javanese speakers in daily life. The representatives (68.75%), directives (71.87%), commisives (67.86%) and the lowest were expressives (75%) and declaratives (75%). The use of the dominant type was due to the fact that the speakers in interaction try to get closer to the hearer. They use the group identity marker in addressing someone so there is no distance relationship between the speaker and the hearer. They also gave the reasons when they speak in order to satisfy the hearer.