

HASIL CEK_Utami, Santoso_politeness, maxims, speech acts.

*by Pratiwi Tri Utami, Dwi Santoso Otto Hasibuan's Politeness Strategy In
Judge*

Submission date: 06-Jul-2022 02:18PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1867223812

File name: 198-329-1-SM.pdf (383.58K)

Word count: 4896

Character count: 25321

OTTO HASIBUAN'S POLITENESS STRATEGY IN JUDGE SESSION OF MIRNA'S CASE

Pratiwi Tri Utami¹, Dwi Santoso²

¹Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

¹Pratiwitriutami1@gmail.com

²Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

²dwiuad@gmail.com

Abstract

This research explores the forms of politeness strategies in utterances of Otto Hasibuan in Judge Session of Mirna's case. The research method of this research uses descriptive qualitative method. The subject of the research is Otto Hasibuan's utterances in Judge Session of Mirna's case. Furthermore, this research uses the Otto Hasibuan's utterances containing politeness strategies. In collecting the data, the researcher uses noting and transcribing technique. Then, the data analyzing of this research are categorizing, data classifying, and data analyzing. The researcher watched the Judge Session, wrote down the script, translated the script, identified the Otto's utterances, classified the script based on the forms of politeness strategies, then analyzed the data. In analyzing the data, it shows that the politeness forms used by Otto Hasibuan have ten typical speech acts: *warning*, *asking* (for permission), *questioning*, *requesting*, *suggesting*, *agreeing*, *informing*, *criticizing*, *respecting*, and *thanking*, which are categorized into five maxims: *tact maxim*, *agreement maxims*, *opinion-reticence maxim*, *approbation maxim*, and *obligation maxim*.

Keywords: politeness, maxims, speech acts.

1. INTRODUCTION

In every conversation meaning is important. There are two studies of meaning in linguistics study, semantics and pragmatics. According to Riemer (2010), a branch of linguistics which studies about sentence meaning which refers to semantics. According to Cruse (2006), He says that pragmatics refers to branch of linguistics which studies of meaning based on the context or tends to the implicit meaning which is uttered by the speaker.

Pragmatics has close relation with politeness. According to Fraser (1990), He writes that politeness is related to social-norm view. The politeness comes from the behavior of society. In one hand, Kasper (1990) writes that linguistics politeness can make the utterances strong in the social relationship. In Indonesia, there are some social norms of politeness. For example, the young people have to be polite toward the adult like their parent, their teachers, or everyone which is older than them. Also, the politeness area in Indonesia can happen in school, office, home, meeting room, and also judge session.

In this research, the researcher analyzes the Judge Session of Mirna's case on August 25th and on August 29th, 2016. This study focuses on the politeness strategy of request which used by Otto Hasibuan, the law advisor of Jessica Kumala Wongso, the defendant of Wayan Mirna Salihin. Mirna was killed by using cyanide. The utterance which is proposed by Otto Hasibuan in the Judge Session of Mirna's case can be analyzed to find out the forms of politeness strategy.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics study is known as the study of meaning in linguistics. Cruse (2006) says that pragmatics is based on the situation or condition around the speaker and the hearer. In addition, Greenbaum & Nelson (2002) state that pragmatics is focused on the use of particular utterances within particular situations which have relation with the situation where the utterances are uttered. The utterances which uttered by the speaker is based on the need of the speaker itself directly or indirectly.

2.2 Speech Acts

Speech act theory is introduced by Austin (1962). He assumes that every utterance has meaning or sense. It has own purposes beyond the sentence. Thus, Speech act is one of the important particular parts of pragmatics to understand what the speaker intend to tell to the addressee; whether it is requesting, asking, greeting, informing, arguing, warning, congratulating, advising, etc. Furthermore, the types of speech acts can be as follows:

2.2.1 The Types of Speech Acts

According to Cruse (2006), He clarifies three types of speech acts. Those three things are the key role of the speech act theory.

1) Locutionary act

According to Riemer (2010:109), the performing of utterance in saying something, such as making a sound or sign with contain a meaning and certain reference and sense refers to locutionary act.

2) Illocutionary act

Illocutionary act is an act which showed by utterer in saying something which suitable with the purpose and situation which has particular effect by uttering something. According to Bach and Harnish (1979) have classified the communicative illocutionary speech acts into four main forms. They are:

a. Constantives

According to Bach and Harnish (1979), constantive speech act is the illocutionary speech act which the speaker shows or performs his intention to the hearer in order to the hearer accept what the speaker belief. Constantivespeech acts can be: *descriptives, informatives, confirmatives, disputatives, responsives, suggestives, etc.*

b. Directives

Directive is an illocutionary act which aimed to make the hearer taking action in a certain way toward the speaker's prospective which can be the reason by the hearer's act (Bach & Harnish, 1979). Directivespeech act can be: *requestives, questions, permissives, advisories, etc.*

c. Commissives

Acommissive illocutionary act which uttered by the speaker is to performs a future actionbecause of a certain occasion. The categorization of commissives speech act: *promises and offers* (Bach & Harnish, 1979).

d. Acknowledgement

According to Bach and Harnish (1979) is an illocutionary speech act which to express the speaker's belief toward the hearer because of some condition to gratify the hearer's intention. Acknowledgment speech acts can be: *apologize, condole, greet, thank, accept, etc.*

3) Perlocutionary act

In his book, Cruse (2006:168) says the effect of the utterance which

produced is on the hearer toward what the speaker said refers to perlocutionary act.

2.3 Politeness Strategy

Fraser (1990) states that the social norms view of politeness are deduced by the public in language use. Regarding politeness strategy, there are so many theorists who have discussed it. Cruse (2006) explains that politeness is one of the ways to decrease the negative effects of the utterance which uttered by the speaker and increasing positive effects to the hearer. Politeness can be oriented in either of the speaker-thought or the hearer-thought. The use of politeness can be caused by the position or authority, benefits, needs, etc. Leech (2014) divides them into ten speech acts types. He calls them as the general strategy of politeness.

2 Table 1. Component Maxims of the General Strategy of Politeness

Maxims (expressed in an imperative mood)	Related pair of maxims	Label for this maxim	Typical speech-event type(s)
(M1) give a high value to O's wants	Generosity, Tact	Generosity	Commissives
(M2) give a low value to S's wants		Tact	Directives
(M3) give a high value to O's qualities	Approbation, Modesty	Approbation	Compliments
(M4) give a low value to S's qualities		Modesty	Self-devaluation
(M5) give a high value to S's obligation t O	Obligation	Obligation (of S to O)	Apologizing, thanking
(M6) give a low value to O's obligation t S		Obligation (of S to O)	Response to thanks and apologies
(M7) give a high value to O's opinion	Opinion	Agreement	Agreeing, disagreeing
(M8) give a low value to S's opinion		Opinion reticence	Giving opinion
(M9) give a high value to O's feelings	Feeling	Sympathy	Congratulating, commiserating
(M10) give a low value to S's feelings		Feeling reticence	Suppressing feeling

(Leech, 2014: 91)

3. METHODS

This research is concluded as qualitative research. The research objects of this study are politeness and requesting strategy. Regarding on the data of this study, it is the judge session of Mirna's case on August 25th and 29th, 2016. The subject of this research is utterances which uttered by Otto Hasibuan in Judge Session of Mirna's case on August 25th and 29th, 2016. The data analyzing techniques of this research are watching the Judge Session of Mirna's case, transcribing, translating, categorizing and classifying the data into the form of politeness strategy. Then, concluding the result of the data analyzing.

4. DISCUSSION

Politeness strategies are usually used in language use in the daily activity. By regarding Leech (2014) and Santoso (2015), the researcher finds the forms of politeness in the utterances which uttered by Otto Hasibuan in Judge Session of Mirna's case. They could be; *warning, requesting, agreeing, informing, respecting, and thanking*. Those speech acts will be presented as follows;

4.1 Warning

Warning is one of the directives speech acts. According to Bach and Harnish (1979), warning is the speech acts which can perform an advice because of a special reason. Thus, warning is kind of speech act uttered by the speaker to the hearer which can cause the hearer aware toward the future effect.

Video excerpt 1. Otto warns the eyewitness

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.28.14-00.28.23

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (Translated)
Otto	1	Saudara tadi sudah disumpah dan	You have been
	2	kalau melanggar sumpah itu bisa	sworn and if you
	3	diancam hukuman penjara. Saya	break that oath, you
	4	ingatkan saja.	will be prisoned. I just want to remind you.
dr. Prima	5	Iya...	Yes, sir.

The video excerpt 1 above line 1-4 shows that Mr. Otto warns dr. Prima toward the oath which has been stated. Semantically, the sentence means that Mr. Otto reminds dr. Prima about the oath, but pragmatically Mr. Otto has a specific purpose in saying the utterances. This sentence forces dr. Prima to tell the truth. The sentence *saudara tadi sudah disumpah* 'You have been sworn' shows the past action, the sentence *kalau melanggar sumpah* 'if you break that oath' shows the warning, and the sentence *bisa diancam hukuman penjara* 'you will be prisoned' shows the future effect. However, this applies the tact maxim in Leech (2014). In that, it tries to minimize the cost to dr. Prima.

4.2 Asking (for permission)

Bach and Harnish (1979) explain that asking is a question speech act which is one of the directives speech acts. Although, literally asking belongs to a question, but in this research, the researcher explains it separately. It is because asking in this research is not just a question which gains for information from the hearer, but it asks for permission from the hearer. It is showed in video excerpt 2 below.

Video excerpt 2. Otto Hasibuan asks for permission from dr. Prima

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.31.25-00.31.40

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Otto	1	Berdasarkan resume medis juga?	Was it based on the medical report
	2		also?
	3		
Dr. Prima	4	Sama, e... berdasarkan resume medis	Of course e... based on the appropriate
	5	yang sesuai.	medical record.
Otto	6	Iya... ada surat yang dikirimkan oleh	Yes... there is a letter sent By e... dr.
	7	e... dr. Sutrisno. Ia e... direktur	Sutrisno. He is
	8	utama Rumah Sakit Abdi Waluyo.	the director of Abdi Waluyo Hospital.
	9	Saya bacakan ya?	May I read it?
10			
Dr. Prima	11	Boleh pak.	Please, sir.

In video excerpt 2 line 10, it is an asking for permission. In that, it shows that Mr. Otto asked for the dr. Prima's permission to read the letter which sent by dr. Sutrisno, the director of the Abdi Waluyo Hospital. The sentence *Saya bacakan ya?* 'May I read it?' can be interpreted as a question in a direct way. In conclusion,

video excerpt 2 line 10 has similarity. It is both of them use direct bald on record strategies. Moreover, this speech act can be categorized as tact maxim.

4.3 Questioning

Questioning is one of the directives speech act (Bach & Harnish, 1979). Martinez (2013) says that questioning deals with an interrogative. An interrogative sentence has two characterizations. It is usually started with 5W+H (WH question; what, when, where, why, who, and how) or auxiliary (yes-no question; is, am, are, was, were, etc.). In addition, questioning also can be a negativeinterrogative sentence (Reiter, 2000).The negative interrogative sentence has two common characterizations. It commonly has a negative phrase and ended by a question tag. Bach and Harnish (1979) describe that question can be a special occasion to make a request. The purpose of question is to gain any information from the hearer.

The questioning in this research can be seen through some words. It can be; *apakah*, *untukapaatauapa* ‘(for) what’, *bagaimanaataugimana* ‘how’, *pernahkah* ‘have (you)’, *dari mana* ‘what does (it mean)’, *benarkah* ‘is it (right)’, *haruskah* ‘must (it)’, *bisakah* ‘can (it)’, etc. The questioning speech act can be found at video excerpt 3.

Video excerpt 3. Otto Hasibuan asks dr. Primayudo

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.28.24-00.28.52

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (Translated)
Otto	1	Saya ingin menanyakan terhadap saudara	I want to ask you,
	2	apakah saudara mengenal dr.	Do you know
	3	Sutrisno	dr. Sutrisno?
dr. Prima	4	Mengenal.	Yes, I do.
Otto	5	Siapa dia?	Who is he?
dr. Prima	6	A... direkturRumahSakit.	a... The director of the hospital.
Otto	7	Direktur UtamaRumahSakit?	The director of the hospital?
	8		
dr. Prima	9	Iya...	Yes, sir.
Otto	10	Apakah sejak peristiwa tanggal 6 itu,	Since January 6 th 2016,
	11	saudara pernah berhubungan dengan	Have you made any
	12	dokter hmmm... Sutrisno?	contactWith dr.
			Hmmm... Sutrisno?
dr. Prima	13	Gmana pak?	Pardon me, sir?

According to video excerpt 3 above, we can find some questioning forms which use some question marks. The sentence ‘*do you know dr. Sutrisno?*’ line 2-3 is a question because it is started with auxiliary ‘do’. This sentence indicates that Mr. Otto asks dr. Prima whether he knows dr. Sutrisno or not. The next sentence ‘*who is he?*’ line 5 clearly shows a question because it started with a question mark ‘who’.

Also, based on Reiter (2000), the researcher has mentioned that a question can be a negative interrogative sentence. It can be seen at video excerpt 4 below.

Video excerpt 4. Otto Hasibuan asks dr. Primayudo

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.29.32-00.29.44

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (Translated)
Otto	1	Jadi catatan-catatan tentang keadaan	So, the notes about The condition of the patient, did you write it?
	2	pasien ini,	
	3	saudara bukan yang membuat?	
dr. Prima	4	Bukan, resume nyabukan.	No, I did not.
Otto	5	Jadi mengenai jam, mengenai keadaan	So, about the time, about The real condition, You did not write that, did you?
	6	yang sebenarnya bukan tuh... bukan	
	7	saudara yang membuat?	
	8		
dr. Prima	9	Bukan saya yang membuatnya.	No, I did not.

The sample in line 7-8 shows an example of a negative interrogative sentence. The sentence '*You did not write that, did you?*' is a question in negative interrogative form. Reiter (2000) tells that a negative interrogative sentence consists of negative phrase and question tag. The sample in line 7 '*You did not write that*' is the negative phrase and '*did you?*' line 8 indicates the question tag.

In conclusion, questioning can be interrogative and negative interrogative form which use WH-Question and Yes-No Question. Moreover, the question in video excerpt 3 line 2, 3 and 5, and video excerpt 4 line 7-8 which uttered by Otto Hasibuan use the direct strategies in bald on record. Also, questioning is kind of directives speech act which includes in tact maxim (Leech, 2014).

4.4 Requesting

Requesting is one of the requestives speech acts which are the subdivision of directive speech act (Bach & Harnish, 1979). Requesting is the politeness form which can be used by the speaker to ask something from the hearer. The thing can be an action or information.

Video excerpt 5. Otto requests the explanation from Prof. Edward

Date : August 25, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.36.36-00.37.55

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Otto	1	Baik, a... saya panggil ahli aja ya? E...	Well, a... can I call you Mr. expert? E... Mr.Expert can you explain about how is a function of the procedure of criminal in applying the procedure of civil law?
	2	ahli e... bisa ga ahli mencoba	
	3	menceritakan bagaimana peranan	
	4	daripada hukum formil dalam	
	5	rangka menegakkan hukum	
	6	materiil?	
	7		

In line 2-7, it generally indicates a request although it quite similar to question. It has a special occasion which causes the hearer have to do the request. The words *bisagahlmencobamenjelaskan* 'can you explain' indicates the request form. In that Mr. Otto asks Prof. Edward to explain about the function of the procedure of criminal in applying the procedure of civil law. Also, the use of words *bisaga* 'can (you)' show the politeness form because it uses a modal in making a request. Thus, the requesting can be classified into tact maxim.

4.5 Suggesting

Suggesting is categorized into constatives speech acts (Bach & Harnish, 1979). It causes the speaker expresses his intention to the hearer's belief. Bach and Harnish (1979) state that suggesting speech act happens that the speaker gives a suggestion or an advice to the hearer where the speaker has a certain reason for the

hearer to apply or act something. In expressing the suggesting, the speaker does not expect the negative effect toward the speaker's or hearer's face.

Unlike the requesting and instructing, the decision of performing the requesting depends on the hearer. The suggesting speech act can be shown by using a modal such as; *shall, should, can*, etc. Whereas, the requesting tends to the hearer has to do the speaker's wants. Also, instructing is quite similar with requesting, but it usually uses the (im)polite form or less polite than requesting (Leech, 2014).

Video excerpt 6. Otto Hasibuan gives suggestion to the Judge

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.02.56-00.03.12

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Hakim	1	Bagaimana penasehathukum?	Is there any question for the law advisor?
	2		
Otto	3	Yang mulia, bagaimana pun	Your honor, however
	4	statusnya statusnya adalah saksi,	they are the
	5	saya pikir sebahusnya diperiksa	Witnesses, I think that
	6	satu persatu yang mulia.	(we) shall investigate them one by one,
	7		your honor.
Hakim	8	Iya. Karena keberatan ya, akhirnya	Yes, since the law advisor mind of it, so
	9	kita periksa satu persatu aja ya?	we investigate them one by one, is it
	10		okay?

The suggesting can be clearly seen in video excerpt 6 line 5-7. In that, it shows Mr. Otto suggests to the Judge to investigate the eyewitnesses in a different time. The sentence which shows the suggesting is *sayapikirsebahusnya* 'I think that (we) shall' specifically, the word *sebahusnya* 'shall'. It is because as the explanation above that suggesting can be seen by modal. Leech (2014) by using a modal, a suggestion will become more polite in order that it can save the hearer's face toward the utterances which uttered. In conclusion, by regarding it Leech (2014) categorized suggesting speech act into tact maxim.

4.6 Agreeing

Leech (2014) categorizes agreeing on speech act into a subdivision of agreement maxim. Agreeing can be indicated by the speaker shows that he/she agree or believe in what the hearer belief. Agreeing speech can be seen from the speaker by saying 'yes', 'I agree', 'O.K.', even nodding also.

Video excerpt 7. Otto agrees to Prof. Edward's opinion

Date : August 25, 2016

Excerpt video : 01.38.01-01.38.17

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Prof. Edward (Expert)	1	Tidak sah dan tidak serta merta sah,	It illegal and it cannot be legal, why?
	2	mengapa demikian? yang pertama	First
	3	tadi harus ada suatu kepastian dari	it has to be an
	4	ahli IT bahwa menyatakan "oh, ini...	assurance from the IT expert that says
	5	asli ni" kalau masih timbul keraguan,	"oh,
	6	lalu kemudian dibandingkan dengan	this is authentic" if
	7	sumber tempat...	there is any doubt,
	8		then it has to be
	9		compared
	10		with the ...
	11		
Otto	12	Iya	Yes (nodding)

Agreeing in video excerpt 7 can be seen in line 12 and 35. In applying agreeing in line 12, Mr. Otto shows it by saying *iya* 'yes' and nodding. In line 12 indicates that Mr. Otto grants agreeing Prof. Edward's opinion.

4.7 Informing

In applying informing speech act, the speaker informs or delivers his/her belief to the hearers. Informing is categorized into constative speech act (Bach & Harnish, 1979). The informing speech act can be found in a Judge Session especially in Judge Session of Mirna's case.

Video excerpt 8. Otto informs dr. Prima

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.35.58-00.36.35

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Otto	1	Iya... ada surat yang dikirimkan	Yes... there is a letter sent By e... dr.
	2	oleh e... dr. Sutrisno. Ia e... direktur	Sutrisno. He is
	3	utama Rumah Sakit Abdi Waluyo.	the director of Abdi Waluyo Hospital.
	4	Saya bacakan ya?	May I read it?
	5		
dr. Prima	6	Boleh pak.	Please, sir.

The data in video excerpt 8 line 1-3 shows the informing speech act. Mr. Otto informs dr. Prima that dr. Sutrisno, the director of Abdi Waluyo Hospital sends a letter to Indonesian Police Force. The purpose of Mr. Otto by informing it to dr. Prima is to help dr. Prima in answering the question which is given by Mr. Otto Hasibuan as the pre-condition. Thus, according to Leech (2014) in performing informing speech act, Mr. Otto applies maxim of opinion-reticence where the speaker shows low value to his opinion.

4.8 Criticizing

Criticizing speech is not clearly mentioned by Bach and Harnish (1979). Although, based on its nature, criticizing can be categorized into disputative speech act subdivision of constatives speech act. It is because criticizing has a similar characteristic with the principle of disputative speech act which the speaker performs unbelieving towards the hearer's intention because of a certain reason. The use of criticizing speech act by Mr. Otto Hasibuan can be seen in video excerpt 9 below.

Video excerpt 9. Otto Hasibuan criticizes dr. Ardiyanto

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.35.58-00.36.35

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Otto	1	Baik, karena saya mau tanya kalau	Well, because I want to ask you if
	2	umpamanya di.... tadi itu saudara	for
	3	periksa itu nya apa pasiennya, nah	example.... when you
	4	kemudian tadi saudara mengatakan ada	checked the
	5	e... apa e... infus gitu ya, tolong ingat-	patient, then you said
	6	ingat dulu karena	that there e... what
	7	disini ngga ada tindakan infus dibuat	e... you gave an infusion, please
	8	gitu, mungkin coba saudara lupa	remember because in here (pointing
	9	atau....	the letter) you did not mention it,
	10		please maybe you
	11		forgot it
	12		or....
	13		
Dr. ardiyanto	14	Ada pemasangan infus pak.	I did it, sir.

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Otto	15	Tapi, kenapa ga ada disini di resume medis ini? saudara tadi bilang semuanya yang ada sama nggak mungkin beda.	But, why don't (you) mention in this medical record? But you said that it is similar, there is no difference.
	16		
	17		
	18		
Dr. ardiyanto	19	Ya....	Perhaps..... (thinking)
Otto	21	Disini nggaada.	(You) did not mention it here.
	22		
Dr. ardiyanto	23	ya... mungkin waktu pembuatan saya terlewat untuk memasukannya...	a... perhaps when I wrote the medical record, (I) missed to write it....
	24		
	25		
	26		
Otto	27	Hah, jadi tadi katanya ngga bisa ditambah-tambah ngga dikurangi.	What, but you said that it cannot be added or ellipsed.
	28		
	29		
Dr. ardiyanto	30	Iya pak, memang betul.	Yes, sir. That's right.

The use of criticizing speech act by Mr. Otto Hasibuan can be seen in line 15-19, 21-22, and 27-29. In the sentences *tapikenapagaadadisini* 'but, why don't (you) mention it here' and *hah, jaditadikatanya* 'what, but you said', the word *tapi* 'but' in line 15 and 27 shows the contrary that Mr. Otto criticizes dr. Ardiyanto's statements. Mr. Otto Hasibuan does not believe to what dr. Ardiyanto's said because there is no synchronization between dr. Ardiyanto's statement with the medical record. Concerning to criticizing speech act, it can be classified into maxim of agreement (Leech, 2014), because it has closed meaning to disagreement. Although, it does not use any politeness strategy to increase the hearer's positive face, but it uses baldly on record strategy.

4.9 Respecting

Bach and Harnish (1979) do not mention respecting speech act clearly. But, it can be categorized into acknowledgment speech act, in that the speaker performs his/her feeling in appreciating the hearer. The use of respecting speech act by Mr. Otto Hasibuan can be analyzed by words *yang mulia* 'your honor', *saya* 'I', *saudara* 'you', *ahli* 'expert', *saudarasaksi* 'Mr. Witness', etc.

Video excerpt 10. Otto asks dr. Prima

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.47.23-00.48.23

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Hakim	1	Ada tambahan penuntut umum?	Is there any question, Mr. Prosecutor?
	2	Cukup, penasehat hukum sudah cukup?	Enough, (how about) law advisor, enough?
	3		
Otto	4	Ada yang mulia.	Yes, there is your honor.
Hakim	5	silahkan.	Please.
Otto	6	E... kepada ahli ya, eh ke pada saksi ya.	e... Mr. Expert, sorry Mr. Witness, (I mean). You told that when you
	7	Tadi saudara mengatakan melihat	looked
	8	(jeda) korban itu pucat, tapi dalam	(silent) the patient was pale but in the
	9	resume apa laporannya di resume	medical report written that the
	10	medisin disebut kantung ada kebiru-	patient's lips
	11	biru itu gimana itu? Sidik	was blue, what do that mean? The lips
	12	bibir kebiruannya itu?	were
	13		looked blue?
	14		
	15		

The respecting speech act which used by Mr. Otto Hasibuan can be found in line 4, 7, and 8. The words *yang mulia* 'you honor' in line 4 is used by Mr. Otto to respect the Judge as the chief of the Judge Session. It is more polite than use word *anda* 'you' or *kamu* 'you'. Then, the words (*saudara*) *saksi* 'mr. Witness' and *saudara* 'you' are used for respecting dr. Prima as the witness of Mirna's case. In using (*saudara*) *saksi* 'mr. Witness' and *saudara* 'you' are more polite than *kamu* 'you'. Thus, in applying respecting speech act, it may suggest applying the Leech (2014) maxim of approbation. In that, the speaker put the high value towards the hearer's qualities.

4.10 Thanking

According to Bach and Harnish (1979), thanking speech act is be categorized into acknowledgment. In that, the speaker thanks to the hearer when the hearer doing or has done something which beneficial for the speaker. The purpose of thanking speech act is to grant and appreciate the hearer's belief. It is usually showed by word *terimakasih* 'thank you or thanks'. This kind of speech act can be found in the many situations and places. There are many thanking speech acts which can be found in Mr. Otto's utterances. They can be seen in video excerpt below.

Video excerpt 11. Otto thanks to dr. Prima

Date : August 29, 2016

Excerpt video : 00.50.00-00.50.05

Speaker	Line	Indonesian (original)	English (translated)
Otto	9	Eh, 18.30 ya?	I mean, 18.30 right?
Dr. Prima	10	Iya, 18.30 (mengangguk)	Yes, 18.30 (nodding)
Otto	11	Baik, terimakasih.	Oke, Thank you.
Dr. Prima	12	Terimakasih.	Thank you.

Thankingspeech act can be seen in video excerpt 11. It indicates that Mr. Otto Hasibuan thanks to dr. Prima for his description about the death of the victim, and also in line 12 shows that the hearer reply it by saying *terimakasih* 'thank you' too. So that, thanking speech act can be used to save the positive face of the hearer (dr. Prima) and also the positive face of the speaker (Mr. Otto).It applies the obligation maxim of Leech (2014).

5. CONCLUSION

In the analysis of the forms of politeness strategies in Otto Hasibuan utterances of Judge Session of Mirna's case, the researcher finds ten forms of politeness speech act which are categorized in five label of maxims, they are:

- Tact maxim: *warning, asking* (for permission), *questioning, requesting* and *suggesting*.
- Agreement maxim: *agreeing* and *criticizing*.
- Opinion-reticence maxim: *informing*.
- Approbation maxim: *respecting*.
- Obligation maxim: *thanking*.

6. REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspective on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 219–236.
- Greenbaum, Sidney, & Nelson, G. (2002). *An introduction to english grammar* (2nd ed.). Great Britain: Longman.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: current research issues. *University of Hawaii Working Paper in ESL*, 9(1), 1–33.
- Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness. The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341386.001.0001>
- Riemer, N. (2010). *Introducing semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reiter, R. M. (2000). *Linguistics politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Santoso, D. (2015). *Linguistic politeness strategies in Javanese political discourse*. Bundoora: La Trobe University.

HASIL CEK_Utami, Santoso_politeness, maxims, speech acts.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

4%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

Submitted to Hellenic Open University

Student Paper

2%

2

pdfs.semanticscholar.org

Internet Source

2%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 2%