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Abstract

This research aimstodescribe the politeness strategies in disagreement act used by students of eighth grade in SMP N 1 Ngawen. The type of this research is descriptive qualitative research which the writer uses observation method as the method of collecting data uses DCT scenario. The data of this research are Students of eighth grade in SMP N 1 Ngawen. The data of politeness strategy were analyzed by Brown and Levinson The result of the research shows the politeness strategies in SMP N 1 Ngawen have three type of politeness strategies. The students uses Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness and On-Record Politeness. The positive politeness that used by the students are attending to hearer, Using in group markers, Avoiding disagreement, Joking, Asserting speakers’s knowledge of and concern for hearer’s wants, offering/promising, including S and H in activity, Give (or ask for) reasoning, assuming or asserting reciprocity. The negative politeness that used by students are be direct and appologizing. As to gender, PP was mostly used by female in scenario 2, that is 14 responses, nevertheless PP was mostly used by male in scenario 2, that is 15 responses. Both of female and male mostly used PP 13. NP was mostly used both female in scenario 4, that is 8 responses and male in scenario 7, that is 6 responses. BOR was mostly used by female in scenario 6 and scenario 9, that is 4 responses, nevertheless BOR was mostly used by male in scenario 9, that is 5 responses. Based on findings, familiar relationship had a slight influence for respondents. The respondents used positive politeness mostly in E-C relationship, but respondents in H-U relationship used negative politeness more frequently. Bald on Record mostly used in L-U and the respondents was not used Off Record strategy.
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A. BACKGROUND

Language is the instrument which is formed and feeling, mood, aspiration, will and act (Hjilmslev: 1969), helps human to communicate with others. A successful communication happens when people realized that there are some norms that their languages use and their interpretation toward the action and the utterance of the addressee. The norms are used by people to maintain social relationship with other.
Politeness, as one of social norm, is reflected in their daily communication. Communication is the way to communicate with other people.

When people realize politeness and perform it in human interaction. It is possible for them to maintain their social relationship with other. Yule (1996:60) says that politeness is used in communication “as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face”. When this concept is used, it can prevent miss communication between speaker and hearer.

Sometimes people do not aware to another person face. Then, if speaker does not care the face of addressee, he or she might threaten the face of speaker or hearer then it is called *Face Threatening Act* (FTA). FTA happen in communication and can threaten both positive and negative face. Therefore, to minimize treat happen in communication, politeness strategies are applied to repair these FTA. Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest a number of politeness strategies to repair FTA, do the FTA with positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record politeness, bald on record politeness and do not do FTA. The number of strategies is represented in different situations.

B. Literary review

1. Politeness

The major aim of this section is to review the literature on linguistic politeness as a technical term. A theory of linguistics politeness always takes as its focus the ways in which the members of social group conceptualize politeness as they participate in socio-communicative verbal interaction. There are eight concepts of politeness that will become the subject of discussion of this article. These concepts are proposed by (1) Robin Lakoff, (2) Penelope Brown and Steven Levinson, (3) Geoffrey Leech.

a. Lakoff’s Theory

Lakoff was one of the first linguists to study politeness and gave birth to the notion that politeness is an important aspect of interaction that needs to be studied. Many theorists following Lakoff have focused on either expanding on his maxims or contesting them. Lakoff defines politeness as “system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and
confrontation inherent in all human interchange” (Lakoff, 1990:34). Lakoff’s rules are as follows.

1) Be clear (based on Grice’s Cooperative Principle Maxims)
2) Be polite

These subsets of “Be Polite” have also been referred to as the maxim of formality or distance, the maxim of hesitancy or deference and the maxim of equality or camaraderie. Lakoff suggests that interlocutors must try to find a balance between these three maxims because they cannot all be maximized at the same time. When the balance of these three maxims is thrown off people perceive behavior or speech to be inappropriate or impolite. Lakoff’s theory of politeness considers politeness to be universal.

b. Brown and Levinson

According to Brown and Levinson (in Jaworski, 1999:322) there are two kinds of face, which reflect two different desires present in every interaction.
1) Negative Face
2) Positive Face

There are four types of politeness strategies, described by Brown and Levinson (1999:327), as follows:
1) Bald On-record politeness
2) Off-record
3) Positive Politeness
4) Negative Politeness

c. Leech

Leech’s (in Fauziati, 2009: 210-217) theory approaches politeness from a more pragmatic perspective. He begins by establishing two pragmatic systems: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Pragmalinguistics includes the speakers’ intentions and illocutionary acts. This system accounts for the more linguistics application of politeness. Alternatively, sociopragmatics refers to how the speaker wants to be perceived socially. Leech also introduces two rhetorics for conversation: textual and interpersonal. Interpersonal rhetoric addresses politeness and has three principles.
1) The Politeness Principle
2) The Irony Principle

2. Disagreement

According to Richard (2010), Disagreement is common: even informed, intelligent, and generally reasonable people often come to different conclusions when confronted with what seems to be the same evidence. Philosophical questions about disagreement arise in various areas, notably politics, ethics, aesthetics, and the philosophy of religion. According to the free dictionary, disagreement is a failure or refusal to agree, a disparity; an inconsistency. Furthermore, according to Merriam-Webster, online disagreement is the act of disagreeing or the state of being variance. Disagreement can be defined as the expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker. Yet, in the relevant literature, disagreement is mostly seen as confrontational and should thus be mitigated or avoided. In CA terms, it is a “dispreferred” second. Similarly, in earlier politeness theories, disagreement is seen to verge on impoliteness.

3. Previous Study

There are some studies that have correlation in politeness approach. The first study is a study disagreement strategies produced by career women and housewives in Sidoharjo by Oktavia, Liza (2009). In this study, the writer analyzes how career women and housewives express their disagreement. The writer wants to see the differences and the similarities of strategies they used in expressing disagreement. In conducting this research, the writer used descriptive approach in order to gain a more holistic picture of the way career women and housewives express disagreement to their husband. Using a discourse completion test, which consisted of five situations, collected the data. The writer asks ten respondents (five career women and five housewives) to respond to the situations and record their answers. The data were then analyzed by classifying the respondents into the eight disagreement strategies proposed by Garcia. The findings of the study show that career women mostly used confrontational strategies and housewives mostly used non-confrontational. Career women and housewives are different in using disagreement strategies like challenge, refusing to cooperate, order, strong denial, giving reasons and expression of willingness to cooperate. They also have the similarity in using disagreement strategies like criticism of a third party and down toned suggestion.
The second study is a study of disagreement strategies used by male and female students of the English Department of Petra Christian University toward their male and female teachers was conducted by Margaretha Mayke (2009). In this study the writer interested to find out how gender and solidarity influence male and female students’ disagreement strategies, mainly whether they are confrontational or no confrontational, toward their male and female teachers. The data of this study are 25 male and 25 female students of the English Department of Petra Christian University. The writer used a discourse completion test that is questionnaire to collect the data. She made four role-play situations in order to help the respondent in expressing their disagreement easily. Then, the data are categorized based on Garcia’s (1989) classification of disagreement strategies, concerning confrontational and no confrontational, and put them in tables. In this study, she analyzed the data with a statistics analysis in order to get significant results. From the statistics, she found that the male students have no significant differences of disagreement strategies toward their male and female teachers. On the other hand, it shows there is significant differences of confrontational and no confrontational used by the female students toward their male and female teachers. The female students tended to use confrontational strategy toward their male teachers; mostly they used “challenge.” It may be because they felt uncomfortable when talking to male teachers. By using “challenge, they just demanded response or even just an answer from the male teachers as their interlocutors, as soon as possible. On the contrary, they tended to use no confrontational strategy, especially “giving reason,” when the interlocutors are female teachers. Perhaps they felt more comfortable in the same-sex interaction than in cross-sex interaction.

The third study is the stylistic devices in the disagreement used by the superiors and the subordinates of several bank employees in Surabaya were conducted by Rasmi, Evalina (2009). In this study, the writer used written role-plays, which consisted of two situations involving people who had a higher status (superiors) to the lower one (subordinates) and those who had a lower status (subordinates) to the higher one (superiors). The questionnaires were given to 32 respondents consisting of 16 Javanese and 16 Chinese Indonesians and each of the ethnic groups required eight males and eight females. This is a qualitative and quantitative study, in which the writer herself becomes the instrument in collecting the data and she presents the findings in the form of tables. In analyzing it, the writer
applied Garcia’s theory (1989) on Stylistic Devices in expressing disagreements. From the analysis, the writer found out that all respondents of Javanese and Chinese Indonesian regardless of their gender and status use more non-confrontational devices like `suggestion? And `giving reason’. In the Javanese and Chinese Indonesian respondents, the writer found out that the Javanese subordinates use more confrontational devices like `direct challenge? than the Chinese Indonesian subordinates. It is frequently used when Javanese subordinates disagree with the Javanese superiors. Finally, the writer found out that in the male and female respondents, the male subordinates use more confrontational devices like `direct challenge? Than the female subordinates. It is frequently used when the male subordinates disagree with the male superiors. From the findings above, the writer concluded that in disagreement situation involving subordinates to their superiors, whether they are Javanese or Chinese Indonesian; and male or female, they use more confrontational devices. On the other hand, in disagreement situation involving superiors to their subordinates, there are no differences among the respondents of Javanese or Chinese Indonesian; and male or female.

Based on the research above, there are some similarities and differences between the previous study and this study. The similarities with the first, second and third study are analyzing the disagreement strategies. The difference is the writer use analized by classifying the respondent proposed by Brown and Levinson and the subject use the students of eighth grade SMP N 1 Ngawen meanwhile the first previous study use analyzed by classifying the respondents into the eight disagreement strategies proposed by Gracia and the subject use career women and housewives in Sidoharjo. The difference in the second study use analyzed by classifying the respondents into the eight disagreement strategies proposed by Gracia and the subject use 25 male and 25 female and the third use analyzed by classifying the respondents into the eight disagreement strategies proposed by Gracia and the subject use the superiors and the subordinates of several bank employees in Surabaya.

C. Research Method

This study is descriptive method of which purposes to describe the politeness strategy in disagreement act used by the students of SMP N 1 Ngawen. Politeness strategy theory used by Brown and Levinson theory. The data of this research used DCT scenario.
D. Finding and Discussion

1) Type of Politeness

In this study, the writer found that the students of SMP N 1 Ngawen in eight grade mostly used positive politeness strategies in their disagreement act, that is 174 responses out of 270 responses (64.44%). The most common used of Positive politeness is giving (or asking for) a reason. This strategy was used in 79 responses out of 270 responses (29.25%). Second high frequency is PP 4, and and third high frequency is PP 6 and PP 12 with the same frequency. The other strategy which had low frequency are PP 8, PP 10, PP 9, PP 1 and PP 14. Each of them had frequency under 3.00%.

The example use of them were as follows:

a. Response: I think the painting exhibition can held once in three moon, so not disturb our study. (18B/male/dis/PP) (PP 1) (a response to scenario 2, see appendix)
b. Response: Yes My Lovely Father, but I think Prambanan is very crowded. (03A/female/dis/PP) (PP 4) (a response to scenario 1, see appendix)

c. Response: May be yes, but it depend on user. (06H/female/dis/PP) (PP 6) (a response to scenario 7, see appendix)

d. Response: How about every day (laugh) (21B/male/dis/PP) (PP 8) (a response to scenario 2, see appendix)

e. Response: Yes, i think mommy like if we give hand made and greeting. (20C/male/dis/PP) (PP 9) (a response to scenario 3, see appendix)

f. Response: Yes dad, but I’m not like Prambanan. How about beach? (20A/male/dis/PP) (PP 10) (a response to scenario 1, see appendix)

g. Response:yes, but if we will always to want open our facebook and make our lazy to study. (15H/female dis/PP) (PP 12) (a response to scenario 8, see appendix)

h. Response: I disagree, because learning with listening music make me can’t concentration. (a response to scenario 5, see appendix)

i. Response: I disagree because I think take holiday in Prambanan is boring (26A/male/dis/PP) (PP 13) (a response to scenario 1, see appendix)

The second high frequency was negative politeness strategies, 70 responses out of 270 responses (25, 92 %). Negative politeness strategy that was mostly used was apology (15, 92%) and the other strategy was conventionally indirect (10.00%).
The use of them were as follows:

a. I’m sorry dad, Prambanan is very dirty. (04A/female/dis/NP) (NP 6)
b. I’m very forgive me dad, i know Prambanan is interesting for many people but i’m not like this place. (17A/male/dis/NP) (NP 6)
c. Forgive me, but I think badcover is very expensive. (9C/female/dis/NP) (NP 6)
d. I think it excessive. (8C/female/dis/NP) (NP 1)
e. It will spend our time. (15B/female/dis/NP) (NP 1)

The third common strategy is Bald on-Record politeness strategy. Bald on Record strategy just used 26 responses. For example:

a. I dislike hiking (30G/male/dis/BOR)
b. I don’t like Spongebob. (16I/male/dis/BOR)

2) Politeness according gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.66%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Scenario 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Scenario 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Scenario 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Scenario 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h. Scenario 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Scenario 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding to the use of Politeness Strategy based on gender differences, Positive politeness was used by males more often than by females in every situation.

By contrast, the females was mostly using negative politeness strategy more often used by female than male respondents. Bald on record mostly used by female than male respondents. And offrecord was not used by all.

3) Politeness according familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Politeness</th>
<th>Negative Politeness</th>
<th>Bald On-Record Politeness</th>
<th>Offrecord Politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-close</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-familiar</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-unfamiliar</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-close</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-familiar</td>
<td>76.67%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal-Unfamiliar</td>
<td>Lower-close</td>
<td>Lower-familiar</td>
<td>Lower-Unfamiliar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 1</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 2</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 3</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding to the use of Politeness Strategy based on familiarity differences, High frequency in Positive politeness was used by Equal-close respondents. Whereas high frequency in Negative politeness strategy more often than male respondents and high frequency in Bald on record mostly used by female than male respondents. And offrecord was not used by all.

E. Discussion

Brown and Levinson (1978) proposed four highest-level strategies named super strategies including bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. This study found the domination of positive politeness in the use of respondents. It happened because may intend to camouflage their face threatening behavior. When performing positive politeness strategy, the respondents mostly used PP 13, asking (or giving) reason. They mostly used PP 13 because it might be that when they study about disagreement the teacher often provided examples of strategy PP 13 and many examples on the textbook used PP 13 too. Besides it might be that they had to respond DCT scenarios spontaneously thus PP 13 could be the easiest strategy. Whereas Off Record was not used by respondents because the respondents might be did not understand how to use Off Record strategy or it might their teacher rarely taught them about Off Record Strategy.

F. Conclusion

The using of politeness strategy in this comic is dominated by Positive Politeness because the respondents may intend to camouflage their face threatening behavior. Although uses positive politeness, the respondents also uses negative politeness and bald on record politeness strategy. Whereas Off Record was not used by respondents because the respondents might be did not understand how to use Off Record strategy.
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