

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the analysis findings of the study. The data are divided into fragments, classified to speech act per utterances, decided the types of speech acts, identified the politeness strategy that is used by two waitress (young waiter and old waiter) to the old man as a customer in the café by listing utterances in short story *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place*. This section presents the analysis of the data in which includes answering and analyzing three main statements of the problems. To answer three statement problems, the researcher uses integration analysis. Thus, to give a better comprehend to read the story is significantly aimed to the reader. The analysis will be presented through this chapter.

4.1 Data Analysis and Findings

The data taken from online short story "A Clean, Well-Lighted Place" by Earnest Hemingway that was written in 1933 that include of types of speech act and politeness utterances. This research analyzes speech acts which have general function (types of speech acts) and politeness utterance. The whole story is going to the same setting which is in a café and the same theme that *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place* (café) is such an escape for the older waiter.

The utterances that will be analyzed are the sentences which are said by two waitresses to the old man. Through the analyzing, it is quite possible the utterances might be indicated politeness maxim theory by Leech. The data will be presented in this chapter.

4.1.1 Flouting Tact Maxim

Dialogue 1:

Young waiter : “what do you want?” (1.1)

The old man : “another brandy” the old man looked at him. (1.2)

Locutionary : “what do you want?” (1.1)

Illocutionary : an act of ordering the hearer to leave the café and go home.

Perlocutionary : the hearer still staid in the café and enjoyed the drink without paying attention to the waiter.

The text above is a conversation between a younger waiter to the old man as a customer (sole patron remaining) at the café. The waiter came over to the customer because the old man called him. Then, he said to the old man, “What do you want?”(1.1) (This is the locutionary act of what the young waiter said). The illocutionary act of sentence (1.1) is not only asking what the old man wants as customers, but also when the man would leave from the café so the young waiter could go home to his wife. However, the man still staid in the café and enjoyed the drink without paying attention to the waiter (This is perlocutionary act of old man responses). There is misunderstanding between speaker and hearer in dialogue 1. It quiet possible that the sentence indicates “directives (request)” because it asks the hearer to do something in utterance “what do you want?”

The speaker (young waiter) said and expressed what the speaker wanted such as ordering something. Afterwards, the sentence (1.1) “what

do you want?” that is said by the speaker (young waiter) also contains “tact maxim” of politeness. Based on theory, tact maxim (Leech, 1983:108) is related by the speaker the cost to addressee by using solidarity and attitude. It possible indicates that this utterance show bad feeling of the waiter (speaker) to the old man (hearer) as an question for ordering something because the tact maxim is not appropriated, which suggests extreme irritation with other behavior (the old man as a customer). It will be better when the speaker used “Can I help you”, “what can I do for you” to the customer.

The speaker used the expression of (1.1) “what do you want?” to ask the old man to leave the restaurant. It is contrary to Leech’s (1983:108) Tact maxim which says that minimizes cost and maximizes benefit to the speaker/ hearer. The speaker might state the expression due to his impatience toward the old man as the restaurant customer who did not want to leave the restaurant soon. So, the speaker (young waiter) used utterance (1.1) to show that he possibly couldn’t stand to the old man who stayed longer at the café. He had to leave the café as soon as possible.

Dialogue 2

Young waiter : “you should have killed yourself last week.” (2.1)

The old man : “a little more”. (2.2)

Locutionary : “You should have killed yourself last week.”

Illocutionary : the act of encouraging the hearer to not come to the café at midnight.

Perlocutionary: the hearer came to the café till overtime and didn’t pay attention any more.

After taking the brandy bottle and another saucer from the counter inside the café and put on the old man's table, he puts down the saucer and poured the glass full of brandy while uttered (2.1) "You should have killed yourself last week". The illocution of utterance (2.1) don't come night too at the café. The speaker always comes home late because of the customer (the old man). From the utterance, it is probably that the speaker wanted to say "if you were suicide yesterday, I never meet you and come home timely". In addition, the waiter can clean up the café on time. One more time, the hearer didn't care the speaker wanted. In fact, he wanted the waiter pouring the brandy little more (the perlocutionary act). There is a misunderstanding between speaker (young waiter) and hearer (the old man). In general function of speech act, (2.1) is a "directive (request)"—the speaker asks someone (hearer) to do something—speech act.

This sentence is used to get the hearer to do something and expressed the speaker wanted by command. The sentence (2.1) "you should have killed yourself last week" that is said by the young waiter (speaker) to the old man (hearer) contains "tact maxim on politeness.

The speaker used the expression "you should have killed yourself last week" to encourage the hearer to not come to the café at midnight. The speaker speaks to other people whom they did not know very well by sentence that describes the speaker (young waiter) was annoyed to the hearer (the old man). The utterance is in opposition to Leech's Tact maxim on politeness theory. He argues that tact maxim minimizes cost and maximizes benefit to the speaker/ hearer. If the utterance doesn't agree

with theory, it is possible that the utterance which is said by the speaker (young waiter) seems to convince and emphasize the hearer (the old man) about the speaker's wanted.

Dialogue 3

The old man : "Another brandy" (3.1)

Young waiter : "Finished". "No more tonight. Close now." (3.2)

The old man : "Another." (3.3)

Young waiter : "No. Finished." (3.4)

Analysis utterances (3.1) and (3.3)

Locutionary : "Another brandy."

Illocutionary : speech act of ordering more brandy and stay long time at café.

Pelocutionary : the hearer does not give what the speaker want.

The old man asked more drink. He will stay longer at the café. He really does not care what the waiter says and what time the café will be closed. He just wants to stay, enjoy the drinks and atmosphere at night (illocutionary act). In spite of the waiter said that "Finished". "No more tonight. Close now." (3.2), he still wants to more drink "Another."(3.3). in this dialogue there is misunderstanding between the speaker (young waiter) and hearer (the old man). The hearer—young waiter—didn't give what the old man want. In the dialogue, there is a misunderstanding between speaker and hearer again. These utterances include "directive (request)" as types of speech act. The speaker is used the sentence to get someone to do something for him.

The utterances (3.1) "Another brandy" and (3.3) "Another", the speaker orders something to the young waiter. He said the same utterance

till twice, because the first request didn't respond as appropriate as the speaker wanted. The sentence in the dialogue implies "tact maxim".

The expression (3.1) and (3.3) is contrary to politeness theory of tact maxim. The tact maxim should minimize cost and maximize benefit to other. The speaker might state the expression because he just wanted to drink and stayed long time at the café. In the sentences, the tact maxim is broken by maximize cost and minimize benefit to other.

Analysis utterances (3.2) and (3.4)

Locutionary : "No more tonight. Close now". "Finished".

Illocutionary : an act of requesting to the hearer to go from the café.

Perlocutionary: the hearer does not pay attention.

The young waiter couldn't be patient to face the old man. The waiter does that because the time of opening café is over and he had to go from the café. Many times the waiter tries to be patient the customer, but he ignores all of what the waiter said (perlocutionary act of 3.2). Therefore, the waiter does not want to pour another brandy to the old man's glass. The old man should go from the place. The time is over and the café must be close. There is a misunderstanding between young waiter and the old man in the dialogue. The hearer does not pay attention and asked brandy. In sentence (3.4) "Finished", the hearer stands up, slowly counts the saucers, take coin from his pocket and pay for the drinks, leaving peseta tip. Finally, the old man leaves the café (perlocutionary act). The waiter watches him go down the street, a very old man walking unsteadily but with dignity.

The utterances are “directive (request)”. The speaker asks to the old man to stop drinking and leave the café as soon as possible. The café will be close because the time is over. He has to clean the table before going home. The sentences describe tact maxim of politeness theory.

The speaker used the utterances (3.2) “No more tonight. Close now” and (3.4) “Finished” ask the hearer to stop drinking and leave the café. It is in opposition to politeness theory that is tact maxim. According to Leech, tact maxim minimizes cost and maximizes benefit to other. In these sentences, the tact maxim is broken again because the speaker (young waiter) minimizes benefit and maximizes cost to hearer (the old man). If the old man stays longer at the café, absolutely he will by much brandy that will give many benefits to the café (maximizes benefit to other). When the old man leaves the café, he will stop to buy drink (minimizes cost).

4.1.2 Using Tact Maxim

Dialogue 4

Old waiter : “why didn’t you let him stay and drink? It is not half-past two.” (4.1)

Young waiter : “I want to go home to bed.” (4.2)

Analysis utterance (4.1)

Locutionary : “why didn’t you let him stay and drink? It is not half-past two.”

Illocutionary : speech act of suggesting the young waiter to let customer stayed.

Perlocutionary : the hearer cleaned up the café and still wanted back home.

After the old man (as the last patron) leaving the café, the old waiter is disappointed because the patron had left the café. The time is enough to wait the old man finish his drink. But, he had gone. The young and old waiters were putting up the shutter. It means that the café will be close and it is time to go home. The old waiter is different with young waiter. The old waiter is unhurried to go home because he does not have someone who is waiting at home. He wants to stay longer and waits on customer at the café, shares everything with his partner. He does not to go home as his partner.

The sentence (4.1) “why didn’t you let him stay and drink? It is not half-past two” is “directive (request)”. The speaker the speaker expresses the aim by suggestion to hearer. The speaker suggests the hearer to let the customer stayed and drank at the café. The sentence—based on politeness theory—is tact maxim. The speaker minimizes cost and maximizes the benefit to other.

By using the utterance (4.1), the speaker suggests the hearer to wait the old man till finish his drink. The sentence agrees with tact maxim politeness theory. The speaker minimizes the cost and maximizes the benefit by suggesting his partner (young waiter) to let the café’s customer stayed longer at the café. When the customer stayed longer, he will buy the menu at the café as many as he wants. It is called maximizing benefit to other based on politeness theory. If the customer (the old man) is back

home, the café will close and no income till the café open in next day (minimizes the cost).

4.1.3 Flouting Generosity Maxim

Dialogue 5

The old man : “another brandy” the old man looked at him. (5.1)

Young waiter : “you’ll be drunk.” (5.2)

The old man looked at him. The waiter went away

Analysis utterance (5.2)

Locutionary : “you’ll be drunk.”

Illocutionary : speech act of reminding the hearer to stop drinking.

Perlocutionary: the old man denied and continued the drink.

This utterance was expressed by the waiter to warn the hearer to stop drinking. If the hearer (the old man) understands what the speaker (young waiter) says, the aim of the speaker—to ask him (the old man) to go home and meet his wife (young waiter) —will be done. But it didn’t happen; the man still enjoyed and denied what young waiter said. The hearer just looked at the speaker without saying something. Misunderstanding happens in the dialogue. It possibly happens because of two reasons. First, the hearer doesn’t hear what the speaker says because he is a deaf man. Second, he may hear the speaker saying, but the hearer doesn’t care about it. He just wants his order on hand quickly. The waiter understood the old man’s word. That is why the waiter went away. He did possibly because he takes the order or doesn’t want to serve and talk to the old man any longer. The utterance (5.2) includes the general function of

speech act. It is “directive (request)”. The speaker (young waiter) asks to the old man to stop drinking (something to do).

The utterance (5.2) “you’ll be drunk” is said by young waiter (speaker) to the man (hearer). The speaker said and expressed what he wanted, although the hearer didn’t response as well as the speaker wanted. Furthermore, utterance (5.2) contains”generosity maxim” of politeness.

The speaker still respects the old man as restaurant customer. But, he (speaker/ young waiter) didn’t want to let himself angry in front of the old man because of what the old man (hearer) did. So he left to avoid his being impatience. From the utterance, this speech act is contrary with Leech’s theory of generosity of maxim. He says that it minimizes benefit and maximizes cost the expression of belief that expresses or implies to self. But, in this utterance, the speaker gives the benefit to other but not imply any cost to self apart from the verbal effort to giving the advice itself.

4.1.4 Flouting Approbation Maxim

Dialogue 4

Old waiter : “why didn’t you let him stay and drink? It is not half-past two.” (4.1)

Young waiter : “I want to go home to bed.” (4.2)

Analysis utterance (4.2)

Locutionary : “I want to go home to bed.”

Illocutionary : an act of expressing his feeling that he is happy; he will meet his wife quickly.

Perlocutionary : the café will be close.

Different with his partner, the old waiter, young waiter is in hurry to go home. He is happy because the patron had gone from the café. It means that he could back home after cleaning up the table and all of stuff at the café. The faster he cleaned cafe, the sooner he could come home and see his wife. There is someone—his wife—who is waiting him at home. After cleaning up, the café will be closed (this is a perlocutionary act) and going home to take a rest and meet his wife (illocutionary act). The utterance includes “expressive”. He shows psychological states by expressing his feeling. This is about the speaker (young waiter) experience (feeling).

The utterance (4.2) “I want to go home to bed” indicates “approbation maxim” of politeness theory. Approbation maxim is closed to politeness of avoiding disagreement.

The speaker used the utterance (4.2) to show his feeling that he is happy because the old man had gone from the café. The sentence is contrary “approbation maxim” of politeness maxim. It means that approbation maxim minimizes the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximizes the expression of beliefs which express approval of other. The utterance doesn’t go with the theory of the maxim. The speaker maximizes dispraise by letting the old man (the café’s customer) left and closed the café. Furthermore, the speaker minimizes approval by going home as quick as he could.

4.1.5 Using Approbation Maxim

Dialogue 6

- Young Waiter : “I wish he would go home. I never get to bed before three o’clock. What kind of hour is that to go bed?” (6.1)
Old waiter : “he stays up because he likes it.” (6.2)
Young Waiter : “he’s lonely. I’m not lonely. I have a wife waiting in bed for me.” (6.3)

Analysis utterance (6.1)

Locutionary : “I wish he would go home. I never get to bed before three o’clock. What kind of hour is that to go bed?”

Illocutionary : an act of warning the hearer that he wants to go home, close the café and take a rest with his wife.

Perlocutionary : he still stays up at the café.

The speaker might want to hurry back home. He never sleeps before three o’clock. On speaker’s (young waiter) view, three o’clock is not time to start sleeping. His wife is waiting for him. He wants to take a rest and take down tired with his wife as soon as possible (the illocutionary acts). But he couldn’t. The waiter stayed at the café because the customer (the old man is the only one patron) wouldn’t go home, enjoyed the drink and scenery around the café at midnight (perlocutionary act). By the utterance, the speaker states what the speaker feels. The speaker expresses psychological states. It is called “expressive’ on types of speech act by Searle (1985:24). In this case the speaker expresses the feeling that he dislikes the condition. The sentence involve illocutionary functions classified as ‘expressive’, it is complaining sentence by using his feeling.

Sentence (6.1) “I wish he would go home. I never get to bed before three o’clock. What kind of hour is that to go bed?” that is said by young waiter (speaker) to the old waiter (his partner at the café as a hearer) goes with “approbation maxim”.

The speaker used the expression (6.1) “I wish he would go home. I never get to bed before three o’clock. What kind of hour is that to go bed?” to warn the hearer that he wants to go home, close the café and take a rest with his wife. Based on the theory, “approbation maxim” states that minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of believes which express approval of other (Leech, 1983:120). The utterance illustrates the illocutionary function of complaining, in which the speaker maximize dispraise and minimize approval of addressee. Yet the utterance doesn’t minimize the goal of belief when he reminds the old man to leave the café as soon as possible, the sentence that is used by the speaker (young waiter) is contrary to the theory.

4.1.6 Flouting Agreement Maxim

Dialogue 6

Young Waiter : “I wish he would go home. I never get to bed before three o’clock. What kind of hour is that to go bed?” (6.1)
Old waiter : “he stays up because he likes it.” (6.2)
Young Waiter : “he’s lonely. I’m not lonely. I have a wife waiting in bed for me.” (6.3)

Analysis utterance (6.2)

Locutionary : “he stays up because he likes it.”

Illocutionary : the act of encouraging letting the customer enjoyed the drink in the cafe

Perlocutionary : the hearer (young waiter) still wanted back home whatever the partner talk about.

The old waiter respects to the customer. He will wait and open the café till the old man finish to drink. It is in opposition to the young waiter that wants to go home to meet his wife and close the café as usual (illocutionary act). The old waiter stayed whatever the partner said. He still did his duty in the café while listening the partner who was in rush. "Representative" (assertive) is shown in the utterance. The speaker expresses their belief that content the utterance is true. The speaker conveys a belief by predicting the condition of the old man. It can be seen in utterance (6.2) "he stays up because he likes it".

The sentence is a disagreement between young and old waiter to the customer (the old man). The agreement does not happen between himself and the other waiter. The utterance contains "agreement maxim of politeness". This utterance is contradiction to the theory.

The old waiter disagrees with the young waiter. It can de shown in the utterance (6.2) "he stays up because he likes it." The speaker (old waiter) lets the old man (café customer) to stay till he finished his drink. According to theory, the old waiter utterances' is not appropriate and contrary with it. "Agreement maxim" of politeness minimizes disagreement and maximizes agreement between speaker and hearer. The speaker (the old waiter) contravenes the theory. Agreement maxim was

broken to be disagreement. In this utterance, the old waiter maximizes disagreement and minimizes agreement.

Analysis utterance (6.3)

Locutionary : “he’s lonely. I’m not lonely. I have a wife waiting in bed for me.”

Illocutionary : speech act of giving reasons that he still wanted to go home; someone who is loved was waiting him home.

Perlocutionary: still stays up at the café.

The young waiter was going to back home. He was not the old man. It did not matter when the old man spent all his time at the café because he was alone, but the young waiter couldn’t do it. He had a wife and waited him (illocutionary act). Although the young waiter explained as much as he could, he couldn’t leave the old waiter (partner) at the café and clean it lonely. Young waiter also couldn’t leave the old man that didn’t finish the drink yet in the café. That was why they still stayed up at the café. They had to wait till the customer finished the drink. Cleaned up the café; turned off the light, so they could go home. Type of speech act in this utterance is representative (assertive). The speaker tells what they know about himself and the old man in utterance (6.3).

The young waiter disagrees with the old waiter. He says an attitude his belief by reason. It is shown in utterance (6.3) “he’s lonely. I’m not lonely. I have a wife waiting in bed for me”. This utterance is called agreement maxim though the agreement maxim was broken to be disagreement.

The speaker used the utterance (6.3) to give a reason why he wanted to back home quickly. There is different opinion (disagreement) between young waiter and old waiter. The utterance is in contradiction to agreement maxim of politeness theory. Agreement maxim was broken to be disagreement. The speaker ought to minimize disagreement and maximize agreement to hearer. In this utterance, the speaker does in other way. Young waiter maximizes disagreement and minimizes the agreement.

Politeness maxim subconsciously happens in daily activity. People uses maxim, might show the good feeling by her/ her utterances to the hearer. But, sometimes, flouting maxim occurs in daily conversation. It happens if the speaker want to convince, ring true and emphasize what the speaker wanted. Occasionally, the flouting maxim is acceptable by several people. It can be shown by the responses of the hearer. The speaker flouting might state the expression due to his impatience toward the speaker. Then, the speaker flouts the maxim to show that he possibly couldn't stand to the hearer do.