

CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

4.1 Conclusion

This research is about an analysis of politeness strategies in making denial used by the defendant in selected videos of Caught in Providence. This research aims to identify the form of denial and the pattern of politeness strategies used by the defendant in Caught in Providence. There are 20 videos that have been analyzed. The result of the research is 30 data found in the selected videos. This research found seven forms of denial. These forms are control-denial, disagree, act-denial, attribute, mitigation, and challenge. From all data findings, the most dominant form used by the defendant is control-denial, with a total of seven forms. It is because the defendant mostly tried to deny control of his/her violation act or deny that the violation occurred because it had accidentally happened.

Furthermore, the writer found all types of politeness strategies in Caught in Providence TV show. The most dominant type used by the defendant is positive politeness with a total of 13 from 30 data. It happens because the defendant does not want to deny directly and seeks to hide disagreement with the Judge in order not to attack the Judge's positive face. This strategy is realized by using the substrategy of avoid disagreement, which is the most dominant used by the defendant. The total use of this substrategy is 12 out of 13 positive politeness. Then, this research also found eight other substrategies: intensify interest to listener, hedge, give deference, nominalize, non-minimization of the face threat, rhetorical question, and be incomplete. Based on the pattern above, the defendant used politeness strategies to

convey their denial utterances without damaging the face and reduce any potential face threat when making a denial.

Last but not least, there are sociological variables that influence the defendant in choosing politeness strategies. These variables are social distance, power, and the rank of imposition. Since the context in the courtroom, social distance and power are held constant and high. It is because the Judge and the defendant are strangers, and the Judge has more power. However, the rank of imposition is small because the Judge requires information and argument to explain the accusation from the defendant.

4.2 Limitation

This research focuses on the use of politeness strategies through speech acts of denials. There are also sociological variables analyzed to determine the choice of strategy for the defendants. However, this study only analyzed denial utterances produced by the defendants. When the defendants were making denial, they attempted to choose a suitable strategy to implement in order to minimize the face threat. Therefore, it will keep the relationship between the parties conducive.

The writer limits this research to the denial utterances uttered by the defendant in Caught in Providence TV show. However, some utterances might be missed to analyze, such as the utterances from the Judge toward the defendant or Inspector. When the Judge made a decision or accusation, it would tend to attack the other's face. There is a difference in the use of language between the Judge and the defendant. That may be due to differences in social status. Therefore, the writer

recommends that future researchers explore speech acts or the use of language spoken by judges.

4.3 Suggestion

In this thesis, the researcher only focuses on speech act denial and politeness strategies in the courtroom. However, the writer found several variations of speech acts in court. In this research, there are several speech acts used by the defendant and the Judge. The defendant, for example, uses justification, excuse, apology, and denial. Meanwhile, the Judge uses a declaration, demand, or decision. In addition, future researchers can analyze these speech acts and also it can use other theories, such as impoliteness strategies. Then, in the Caught in Providence TV show, there are only cases of traffic violations in this study. The next researcher is recommended to use other data sources, for example, in courts in England, Australia, or other countries. This is because there are cultural and linguistic differences between countries. It can also be through internet sources or YouTube, such as the Law & Crime Network channel. There are various kinds of criminal cases that can add insight. Therefore, the writer hopes that future researchers can further examine the use of language and speech acts in the courtroom.