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ABSTRACT
This thesis discusses strategies off the record that describes implicatures modesty in a conversation. Off record strategy is one of the five strategies. This strategy is discussed for the use of the language used in the forms of direct. The object of research are strategies off the record that describes implicatures politeness in a famous talk show in America, namely, “Oprah Winfrey Show”. The data were taken using methods refer to refer techniques involved free conversation, where the author was not involved in the dialogue that occurs because the data is taken from the TV show, recording technique with the aid of a recorded tape. Furthermore, the authors use the technique CAAT by way of transcribing talk show back in the form transcription ortografi. This analysis uses methods equivalent pragmatic look at the role of external factors of language, especially the factor of interlocutors on selection strategies used off record. The results showed that the context of the situation and the violations of the maxim of conversation will influence the choice of strategies used off record. However there are some cases when this option do not follow the rules. This is because of other factors that come into play in a conversation such as an intonation. implicatures appear generally in the form of affirmation that is used in polite. In one sentence found two or more strategy off record selected speakers.
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I. INTRODUCTION
To communicate their idea in social interaction, human beings frequently use an indirect expression. Whenever people want to make a request for a specific information or provide as much of that information as possible, they tend to express it indirectly. So, there is a gap between what is literally said and what is conveyed. That kind of communication provides a small part of an account of how people communicate using indirect language (Levinson, 1983: 98). This kind of communication can be said as implicature. According to Grice (qtd from Gazdar, 1979:38), implicature is a proposition that is implied in the utterance of a sentence in a context.
eventhough that proposition is neither a part of nor an entailment of what was actually said. He claimed that there were two types of implicature: conventional and conversational. Conventional implicature arises because of conventional features of the words employed in an utterance. Meanwhile conversational implicature arises because of something implied in the utterance in a certain conversation. This implicature phenomenon is obviously observable in every conversation in which a person implied something in the utterance.

The phenomena of what is literally said and what is conveyed can alsway be seen in daily conversation. This phenomenon can be related to Grice’s theory of implicature. Implicature means an extra message conveyed by speakers indirectly. By ‘extra’ we mean that sometimes there is additional meaning of what the speaker has said (1), sometimes the speaker provides additional information (2), and sometimes he/she conveys something completely different from what he/she said, as seen in the following example.

A: Where’s Bill?
BL: There’s a yellow VW, he may be in Sue’s house.

So, we can say that the theory of conversational implicature is the theory about how people use language in communication. Sometimes in implicating something, people tend to be polite.

In reality, in order to be polite, people usually say something different from what they mean. They are used to say something indirectly, which is aimed at keeping someone’s feeling in the conversation it means that they want to keep their image or face. The concept of face was proposed by Brown and Levinson. It means the notion of being embarassed or humiliated or ‘loosing face’ (Brown and Levinson, 1978: 61). It refers to emotional and social tense of self that someone has (Yule, 1996: 60)

The concept of face is divided into two types, namely: positive face (the desire to be accepted by others and be treated as the same mebers) and negative face (the desire to have freedom and not to be treated by others). Thus, this concept shows the action to be polite to others in order to keep their image. So, politeness can be defined as the means to show the respect to another person’s face.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978: 92), there are five strategies in politeness, they are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off record, and don’t do FTA. From those strategies, the analysis is only focused on off record strategies. It shows the indirect use of language. The interesting thing is how people say something implied in order to be polite to others. The form of these strategies is not discussed by another four strategies.

Having considered these factors, the writer chooses the title “An Analysis Off Record Strategies Reflecting Politeness Implicature in Oprah Winfrey Show”

Related to the phenomena of implicature of politeness, the writer identifies two main problems to be solved in this research, in order to focus the study, as follows:

1. What kind of off record strategies that may reflect the politeness implicature?
2. What is the implicature of the politeness utterances?

This research studies about the strategies of off record strategy. The data are taken from a real popular talk show in America, “Oprah Winfrey Show”. The analysis is specifcically focused on the speech events occuring between Oprah, the host of the talk show and the guests. The writer mainly focuses the research on off record straegies used by the participants. The strategies reflect the implicature of politeness among the participants. There are some sub strategies in off record strategy that cause the occurence of implicature, they are giving hints, giving association clues, presuppose, understate, overstate, using tautologies, using contradictions, being ironic, using metaphors, using rhetorical questions, being ambiguous, being vague, over generalizing, displacing H, being incomplete or using ellipsis

II. METHODS

In conducting this research, the writer uses the systematic methods of linguistic research,
namely: collecting data, analysing data and presenting the result of the analysis.

First, in collecting data, the writer applies the observation method. It means the writer observes the use of language by the participants in the conversations. The conversations in that TV Talk Show are collected by applying three techniques, they are: non-participation observation technique, recording technique, and writing technique. The non-participation observation method means the writer observes the use of language by the participants without being involved in the conversations. While recording technique means the writer records the conversation by using tape recorder, and writing techniques means the writer transcribes the conversations that had been recorded by taking a note.

Second, in analysing the data, the writer uses the pragmatic identity method. It means that the data as the object of research are analysed based on the interlocutor/hearer as the factor influencing the linguistic data (Sudaryanto, 1993: 15). The data later on are classified into some groups based on the conversational maxim and the strategies of off record strategies.

In presenting the result of the analysis, the writer uses both formal and informal methods (Sudaryanto, 1993: 145). Formal method means the use of table. Meanwhile, informal method is applied by using natural language.

In this analysis, the writer analyses the data taken from the popular talk show in America that is broadcasted by one of private televisions in Indonesia. The interesting thing in this talk show is all of the participants are the native speakers and the talk show is guided by Oprah Winfrey, an attractive presenter.

Implicate is a very interesting phenomenon in pragmatics. It refers to smoothing implied in the utterances. Many researchers dealing with implicature in relating to politeness strategies. In this chapter, the writer gives some examples on researches related to conversational implicature and off record strategy as one of politeness strategy.

Related to the notion of conversational implicature and politeness strategy, many researchers have carried some researchers about that. Some of them are Alexandria Kallia, Michael Haugh, and Karen Grainger. Alexandria Kallia, in her paper titled Linguistic Politeness: The Implicature Approach, has analysed politeness as a Gricean Implicature. The topic that she discussed was about politeness as the expected thing to do and politeness as unexpected thing to do and she used Gricean approach of implicature. In order to analyse politeness as an implicature, she used the maxims of politeness, which supplements Grice’s cooperative principle. These maxims can be observed or flouted and so give rise to different kinds of implicature. She also said that politeness can be a strategy employed in order to achieve smooth interaction, can convey indirect messages to the addressee i.e. implicature of politeness. In her finding, she said that the implicature approach has some advantages. It gives us the means to distinguish between politeness as a message intentionally conveyed by the speaker (the expression of a positive attitude towards the hearer) and politeness as an inference drawn by the hearer (the belief that the speaker is not being sincere, etc). Strategic and communicative uses of politeness can be seen as implicature. The difference is that implicature conveyed by the expected (appropriate) strategies (i.e. generated through observance of the maxim of politeness) are standard and constitute background messages. The implicature approach captures a variety of messages: messages favourable for the speaker (‘I mean well’), favourable to the hearer (‘I empathise you’), messages regarding the social competence of the speaker (‘I’m following the rules’), ironic uses polite forms, etc. This, the same utterance can have different implicatures depending on the context in which it occurs and the same utterance can be in instance of politic behaviour (it is expected and therefore pass unnoticed) and polite behaviour (unexpected and therefore marked) in different situations.

Alexandra’s analysis is different from the writer’s analysis. The writer talks about linguistic politeness by using implicature approach. She uses both maxim of conversational and politeness maxim in order to
know the utterance which is expected or unexpected. Meanwhile in her thesis, the writer does not use any politeness maxim; she analyzes one of politeness strategies, this is off record strategy.

Michael Haugh in his paper titled Anticipated Versus Inferred Politeness described the distinction between anticipated and inferred politeness. He claimed that politeness is anticipated if the speaker expects certain behaviour to occur. On the other hand, if we are not expecting certain behaviour to occur which nevertheless does occur, and this behaviour give rise to politeness, then this politeness must be inferred. Politeness is inferred (by means of an implicature) when the expression used by the speaker is not conventionalised for some use.

Haugh studied about the politeness utterance that can be anticipated and politeness utterance that can be inferred. According to Haugh, politeness utterance that is inferred is categorized into implicature. Meanwhile, in her thesis, the writer analyses the use of politeness implicature in politeness strategy, it is off record strategy. Many researchers argued that politeness is generally inferred as an implicature, as it usually expected by interactants. This kind of politeness is termed ‘anticipated politeness’ by Fraser (qtd from Haugh’s Journal), in order to contrast it with Brown and Levinson’s view on politeness as inferred. While a number of researchers argued that politeness is only anticipated but others assumed that although politeness is primarily anticipated, it may also be inferred in the form of an implicature.

### III. RESULT

After analysing the data, it shows that there are several valuation of conversational maxim occur in the show. The result of table 1 shows the form of violation of conversational maxim, off record strategy, and implicature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data No.</th>
<th>Violation of Conversational Maxim</th>
<th>Off Record Strategy</th>
<th>The Implicature of Polite Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quantity Maxim</td>
<td>Understate Strategy</td>
<td>Understatement of admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quantity Maxim and Manner Maxim</td>
<td>Tautology strategy and be vague strategy</td>
<td>Indirect refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quality maxim and Relevance maxim</td>
<td>Contradict strategy and give associations clues</td>
<td>The assertion statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quality maxim</td>
<td>Rhetorical question</td>
<td>The assertion request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Manner maxim</td>
<td>Being vague</td>
<td>The assertion request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quantity and Relevance maxim</td>
<td>Tautology strategy and Presupposes</td>
<td>The assertion statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Manner maxim</td>
<td>Ellipsis strategy</td>
<td>The assertion request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quality maxim</td>
<td>Rhetorical question</td>
<td>The indirect confession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quality maxim</td>
<td>Contradict strategy</td>
<td>The hesitancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Relevance maxim</td>
<td>Presuppose</td>
<td>Hints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Manner maxim</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>Agreement and hints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Quality maxim and Relevance maxim</td>
<td>Metaphorical substitution and giving clues association</td>
<td>The conflict and suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Quantity maxim</td>
<td>Overstate strategy</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Manner maxim and Relevance maxim</td>
<td>Ellipsis strategy and rhetorical question strategy</td>
<td>The assertion request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Relevance maxim</td>
<td>Hints</td>
<td>Criticisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Quality maxim and Manner maxim</td>
<td>Metaphorical substitution and displaces the hearer</td>
<td>Avoid the guilt’s feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Quality maxim</td>
<td>Contradict strategy</td>
<td>Criticisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Quality maxim and Manner maxim</td>
<td>Ironic strategy and Ellipses</td>
<td>Hints and Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Relevance maxim and Quantity maxim</td>
<td>Presuppose strategy and Tautology strategy</td>
<td>Someone who has big responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Manner maxim</td>
<td>Ellipsis strategy</td>
<td>The assertion of promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Manner maxim</td>
<td>Being vague</td>
<td>Uncertain promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Relevance maxim</td>
<td>Hints strategy</td>
<td>Criticisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. DISCUSSION

This research is focused on off record strategy as one of the politeness strategy that is proposed by Brown and Levinson. In this off record strategy, the utterances are essentially indirect. To construct an off record utterance, one says something that is actually different from what one means. In addition, there is also sub strategies in this off record strategy, which may reflect the conversational implicature and politeness.

In the analysis later on, the writer does not arrange the date based on the violation of maxim, but on the sequence of the talk show. This kind of analysis is done in order to make the context of situation clearer.

V. CONCLUSION

Having analyzed the data, the writer concludes that the interlocutors do not only try to communicate their feeling and idea, but also to maintain their relationship with others. This is done by applying some politeness strategies, one of them is off record strategy.

There are fourteen possible strategies of off record strategy, namely: giving hints, giving association clues, presuppose, understate, overstate, using tautologies, using contradictions, being ironic, using rhetorical question, being ambiguous, being vague, over-generalizing, displacing H, being incomplete or using ellipsis. Each of the utterance in those strategies shows the violation of conversational maxim which may reflect the conversational implicature. This phenomenon is observed in the real talk show “Oprah Winfrey Show”.

The writer finds out some cases of the strategies of off record, they are: giving hints (2 cases), giving association clues (2 cases), presuppose (3 cases), understate (1 case), overstate (1 case), tautologies (3 cases), using contradictions (3 cases), being ironic (1 case), metaphors (2 cases), rhetorical questions (3 cases), being ambiguous (1 case), being vague (3 cases), displacing H (1 case), being incomplete or using ellipsis (4 cases). All of the utterances show the politeness implicature.

From the analysis, the writer finds out that one utterance may reflect two or more strategies of off record strategy. This happens because the utterance is affected by the different context of situation. The implicature of each utterance is each strategy may have similar meaning. In addition, the implicature occurs mostly in the form of the assertion. The intonation in this case also affects the meaning of the utterance.

To sum up, the findings in this research are closely related to the previous research on the discussion above. The implicature in the polite utterance maybe different in the different situations and someone is more polite when his or her language is more indirect.
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