

The Influence of Social Deixis in Students' Conversation

Oki Savyanandaru¹ ✉, Issy Yuliasri²

¹ SMA N 3 Semarang, Indonesia

² English Language Education Postgraduate Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Received 29 December
2016

Accepted 05 July 2017

Published 01 August
2017

Keywords:

*social deixis, level of
politeness, students'
conversation.*

Abstract

In this study, we focused on the influence of social deixis on maintaining the level of politeness. The subject of this study was about speaking classroom activity of the eleventh year students of SMA N 3 Semarang. We intended to prove that social deixis influences the level of politeness and describe what factors influence it. This type of study was qualitative research since we did not collect the numerical data. The data was collected in the form of sentences. Research Method used in this study was a discourse study. In this study, we used the ethnography of communication approach since this study talked about social relation between people. In this study, the students were asked to use the social deixis and the level of politeness appropriately. Furthermore, there were observations, questionnaire and interview as this research instruments. The findings of the study showed that there were three factors that influenced social deixis on maintaining the level of politeness based on the students' conversation. Those were social rank, social distance and formality.

© 2017 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉Correspondence Address:

Jl. Pemuda No.149, Sekayu, Semarang Tengah, Kota Semarang, 50132

E-mail: nanda.kamajaya@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108

e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

Communication is important in human's life. People naturally will get in touch with others to express their feelings, ideas, and wants. According to Ekowati and Sofwan (2014:2), communication is an activity of negotiating and transferring meaning and simply about understanding between two parties or more. There are five main components of micro linguistics such as phonology, morphology, syntax, semantic and pragmatics. One of the issues in communication that we are interested to study is pragmatics. As stated by Thomas (2013:1) people do not always say what they say. Speakers frequently mean much more than their words actually say. For example, I might say, "I am hungry.", but what I mean is actually, "Give me some food!"

In pragmatics there are deixis, conventional implicature, politeness, speech acts, and conversational structure to study. Deixis, as this study focused on, is a way in which the relationship between language and context is reflected in the structures of languages themselves. Moreover, Levinson (2004) states that Deixis is phenomenon of the language that consists on referring to a piece of reality by using a word whose meaning can only be guessed when both speaker and addressee are sharing the same context.

Deixis, based on Levinson (2004), is classified into five; person, time, place, discourse and social deixis. Here, the writers focused on the study of social deixis. Social deixis, based on Levinson (2004), concerns with the encoding of social distinction that is relative to participants-roles, particularly aspects of the social relationship holding between speaker addressee or speaker and some referent. It is rather to refer to the level of relationship between people than to information. Social deixis, as this study focused on, is interested to study since it is about the distinction between speakers, about level of relationship, about how to use it to greet others. Let's say you work in your brother's company. In the office, it is not appropriate if you greet your brother with name, "Hey John". It is rather

you use, "Good morning, Mr. John". On contrary, at home, it is not appropriate when you use Mr, or Sir to greet him.

Politeness, meanwhile, Lakoff (1973) stated that it is a form of behaviour developed by societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction. While, Brown & Levinson (1987) stated that politeness is when people use politeness as a way of known deception, in order to help preserve each other's face needs (avoid face threatening acts).

Moreover, we related social deixis and politeness. The relation between social deixis and politeness as stated by Holmes (1992: 8-10) is in the form of social distance scale, status scale, formality scale and referential and affective function scale. Social scale which deals with participant relationship and this scale are useful in pointed out that how well we know someone is a significant factor in linguistic selection. For example we call someone with a nickname, Meg, for example, as we are intimate to her. However, people who are distant with her will call her with her surname, Mrs. Billington for example.

Status scale deals with participant relationship and it ends to the relevance of relative status in some linguistic choices. For example is when people prefer calling Sir or Mrs to people who have higher status than them to call his or her name. For example, there is a conversation between a student and a teacher, the student would say, "Good morning, Mr. John." instead of "Good morning, John."

Formality scale relates to the background or kinds of interaction in evaluating the effect of the social background or kinds of interaction on language choice. e.g.: there will be a difference in addressing someone if we are in formal and informal situation although we know them well. When a person is involved in formal situation, they tend to use higher politeness, while in informal situation people will use lower politeness. For example, you have a conversation with your brother who is your boss in a company. "Good morning, Sir. Would you mind sending me our company sale report last month?" It is an appropriate one than saying,

“John, send me our company sale report last month!” On contrary, an informal situation of having dinner at home with family, you said, “John, give me the spoon, please!” It is an appropriate one. It is not appropriate if you said, “Mr. John, would you mind giving me the spoon, please.”

Thus, in this study, we explained the social deixis used by the students in their conversation, level of politeness used by the students in their conversation, external and internal factors that influence the use of social deixis and level of politeness in students' conversation, and the influence of social deixis on maintaining the level of politeness in students' conversation.

METHODS

This type of study was qualitative research since we did not collect the numerical data. The data was collected in the form of words. Research method used in this study was a discourse study. In this study, the writers used the ethnography of communication approach since this study talked about social relation between people, how to use the social deixis and level of politeness correctly (Sciffrin: 1994). Furthermore, there were observation, questionnaire and interview as this research instrument.

To analyse the conversation, based on the video recording, the researchers constructed a detailed transcription (ideally with no details left out). After doing the transcription, the researchers performed inductive data-driven analysis aiming to find what social deixis the students used based on the theory of Levinson in 2008 that there were two kinds of social deixis, relational and absolute, what kind of politeness on the theory of Brown and Levinson in 1987 that there were two kinds of the level of politeness, high and low level of politeness presented descriptively. Analysing the data also involved the activities of describing what factors influencing the used of social deixis. We also described what level of politeness and what factor influenced students to use a particular

level of politeness. Lastly, to analyze how social deixis influences the level of politeness we used the Janet Holmes's theory, which include the concepts of social rank, social distance, formality level and referential and affective function.

The next step was analyzing students' questionnaire. It was to find what social deixis used by the students, factors influencing it, level of politeness used, and factors influencing it based on students' opinion. The last step was analysing students' interviews as additional data. It revealed what social deixis the students used, why they used it, what level of politeness they used and what factor that influenced their decisions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Social Deixis Used by the Students

There were two kinds of social deixis used by the students, relational social deixis and absolute social deixis. Adane (2014) in his journal stated clearly differentiate relational and absolute social deixis. Age, marriage status, circumcision status and kinship are social deictic factors that can be grouped under relational social deixis. Office related respect (e.g. the chief) and mahaaraano 'people who have socio-cultural respect (a culture-specific term)' are absolute factors.

The students, based on the 32 conversations, appropriately used the social deixis to call others. From the students' conversation of relational deixis in the students conversation were name, pronoun you, and sister, while, the absolute social deixis were your majesty, sir, mam, and Mister.

The relational social deixis appear in the conversation 3 (boss to employee), conversation 4 (boss to employee), conversation 7 (sisters at home), conversation, conversation 8 (sisters at home), conversation 11 (Father and his son), conversation 12 (Mother and her son), conversation 13 (Friends), conversation 14 (Friends), conversation 17 (Master to his servants), conversation 18 (Master to his servant), conversation 19 (Neighbours),

conversation 20 (Neighbours), conversation 22 (A Police officer to a motorcycle rider), conversation 24 (President to her minister), conversation 25 (teacher to her student), conversation 26 (Teacher to her student), and conversation 32 (husband and wife).

Conversation 7 is an example. It was a conversation between sisters at home. Conversation 7 used relational social deixis name, 'Aurora' and 'Vira'. The use of name in this conversation indicated that they were closely related as siblings, thus, we included name as a relational social deixis. and Mister.

Other example of relational social deixis is conversation 32. Conversation 32 was a conversation between a husband and a wife that used relational social deixis. Based on the data analysis in the table 32 appendix 3, both the husband and wife used 'darling' and 'honey' as social deixis. We analysed 'darling' and 'honey' since they were married, they respect each other.

The second type of social deixis appears in the students' conversation is absolute social deixis. It appears in the conversation 1 (air hostess and passenger), conversation 2 (air hostess and passenger), conversation 3 (employee to boss), conversation 4 (employee to boss), conversation 5 (brothers at the office), conversation 6 (sisters at the office), conversation 9 (colleagues), conversation 10 (colleagues), conversation 15 (people to his king), conversation 16 (people to her queen), conversation 17 (servant to master), conversation 18 (servant to master), conversation 20 (neighbours), conversation 21 (police officer and motorcycle rider), conversation 22 (motorcycle rider to police officer), conversation 23 (president and minister), conversation 24 (president and minister), conversation 25 (student to her teacher), conversation 26 (student to her teacher), conversation 27 (shopkeeper and customer), conversation 28 (shopkeeper and customer), conversation 29 (waitress and customer), conversation 30 (waitress and customer), and conversation 31 (strangers).

The example of conversation that was used absolute social deixis is conversation 15. It

was a conversation between a king and his people. Based on the data analysis that could be seen in the appendix 3 table 15, the students of XI Science 9 in doing the conversation, the people used 'your majesty' as absolute social deixis, while the king did not use any social deixis to his people. We analysed 'your majesty' as an absolute social deixis since it was a title given to someone who had higher status. In order to respect his king, he used 'your majesty'.

Other examples are Conversation 3 and 4. They were conversations between a boss and an employee. Both conversations used absolute social deixis when the employee talked to his/her boss. In conversation 3 practiced by XI Science 9 students, as seen in Appendix 3 Table 3, the employee used 'Sir' as social deixis. Conversation 4, which was practiced by XI Science 8 students, the employee used 'Miss.' as seen in Appendix 3 Table 4. We analysed 'Sir' and 'Miss' in these two conversations because they showed their formal respect. They had lower position at the office.

Level of Politeness Used by the Students

There were two kinds of politeness level used by the students, low and high. As stated in Chapter 2 of *English Grammar Today*, there are some ways to make utterance more polite or less polite, i.e., by using softening words (hedges), vague language, modal expression, changing tenses and verb forms, the use of if, two step questions and the use of name. Furthermore, from esl.about.com, we learned that to be polite or less polite we can use indirect question/command or direct question/command.

From the 32 conversations done by the students, all of them were correct. The students knew really well how to make the request or other utterances high or low politeness.

Another example is conversation 13. Conversation 13 was a conversation between friends. Students A said, "Can I help you?", "What kind of food?", and "Any others? Do you need drink?" is the low level of politeness in offering something, while student B said, "Yes, buy me some food!", "I would like to eat a slice of sandwich", and "Yes, buy me a cup of milk

tea!" are categorized into low level of politeness. We categorised those as low level of politeness since they used direct command.

Other example of a conversation that used low level of politeness is conversation 12. Conversation 12 was a conversation between a mother and her son. The mother said, "Can you buy some chillies?" Also, the mother used direct command, "Buy me some chillies, potatoes, garlic, onion, and here is the money!" We categorized the use of modal 'can' in this utterance as low level of politeness since it is less polite than the use of 'could'. We also analysed that the direct command as low level of politeness.

An example of students' conversation that used high level of politeness is conversation 12, a conversation between a mother and her son. Different with above the son used high level of politeness in requesting something to her mother. He said, "Could you repeat the shopping list?", "I was hoping you to make me a glass of milk, please?" We categorized the first utterance as high level of politeness since he used past modal in present time to request, while the second, the use of verb past in present time indicated that he used more polite request.

Other example of high level of politeness in students' conversation is conversation 29. Conversation 29 was a conversation between a waitress and a restaurant customer. The waitress said, "Excuse me, sir. Where do you want to sit?" "What do you want to eat, sir?" "Do you want a cup of tea?" to the customer. I analysed it as high level of politeness since he softened his words. He didn't say "Want to eat?" or "What drink?"

Factors Influencing the use of Social Deixis and Level of Politeness

Holmes (1992: 8-10) states that there are four factors that influence the social deixis used. There are social distance, status scale, formality and referential and affective function scale. If the students in playing the role understand whom they talked to and the situation of the conversation, they will successfully use certain social deixis.

The social rank appears in the conversation 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 32. In general, they who had lower rank used absolute social deixis, while, they who had higher rank used relational social deixis.

For instance is Conversation 1, a conversation between an air hostess and passenger. The air hostess used social deixis 'Mam' to greet the passenger, while, the passenger didn't use any specific social deixis. It showed the rank between them. The passenger considered higher, so the air hostess in order to respect her, she used social deixis, 'Mam'. The passenger, by not using social deixis indicated she had higher rank. In addition, from the questionnaire, they answered that they used Mam as social deixis since an air hostess must be polite to her passenger. In addition, from the interview the same answer was answered by them, they answered why they used Mam, for the air hostess to greet passenger since she wanted to respect her passenger.

Other example of the social rank factor is in conversation 4. The conversation 4 was between a boss and her employee. The social deixis used by the boss was name, 'Tyas'. Different with the boss, the employee used 'Miss' to call her boss. The used of those social deixis was influenced by the rank between them. The boss, who had higher rank, would be fine if she used name only, while for employee who had lower rank, would be a problem if she used name only to call her boss. Thus, the employee appropriately used 'Miss'. Furthermore, from the questionnaire answered by the students they answered why they used those social deixis was because it was a conversation between boss and his employee. In addition, from the interview, the same answer was answered by them, when the writer asked the social deixis they used, why they used it and the level of politeness they used and the factor influenced it. They answered why the boss used name Tyas, while the employee used miss was because they have different position. The boss had higher position, while the employee had lower position. Thus, it is

impossible for the employee to use name only to her boss.

The second factor the students used certain types of social deixis was social distance. There were two kinds of social distance, intimate and far. They who were intimate used relational social deixis, while, they who were far, used absolute social deixis. The intimate social deixis appears in the Conversation 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, and 19. The far social deixis appears in the conversation 2, 21, 22, 28 and 38.

The example of intimate social distance found in conversation 8. It was a conversation between sisters at home. The social deixis used was 'sister'. They used it because they were intimate and they were at home, so they did not to use Miss Ega for example. Furthermore, from the questionnaire, they answered that they used sister as they were siblings and they were really intimate.

Other example of intimate social distance factor of social deixis is conversation 11. The conversation 11 was between a father and his son. The social deixis used in the conversation was when the son used 'papa'. Seeing the context of the conversation, the reason why the son used 'papa' was he thought he was intimate to his father. Furthermore, from the questionnaire, they answered why they used those social deixis were because of the intimate distance between them.

Meanwhile, an example of far social distance found in conversation 31. It was between strangers. Based on the table 31 in the appendix 3, the social deixis used by Hani was 'Miss'. She used it because she didn't know Lala before. Lala, who also never met Hani before used 'Miss Hani' as social deixis. The social distance between them was far, that was why they used 'Miss'. Furthermore, from the questionnaire, they answered why they used it was because they did not know each other.

Other example of the use of far social distance factor in the students' conversation is conversation 22. The conversation 22 was between a police officer and a motorcycle rider. The social deixis found in the conversation, was the motorcycle rider used 'Sir'. It was because

the police officer was older than him and because he didn't know the police officer. Thus, the social deixis between them was far. Moreover, from the questionnaire, they did not answer clearly why they used them. They just answered that it was a conversation between motorcycle rider and police officer.

The last factor the students used certain social deixis was formality level. In the conversation, there were only formal situation, thus, the students used absolute social deixis. The formal situation appears in the conversation 5, 6, 9, 10 and 30.

For instance, roles played in Conversation 6 were between siblings at the office. The social deixis used was 'Miss Indy'. It was right to use 'Miss Indy' at the office, which is in a formal situation although they were siblings and they were really intimate. Furthermore, the questionnaire data revealed that they used Miss Indy because it was at the office, a formal situation.

Other example of the formality social deixis factor is Conversation 9, which was between colleagues in an official meeting. The social deixis used were 'Miss Ramona' and 'Mam'. Instead of using name, they used 'Miss Ramoza', and student B when calling student A, she used 'Mam' because they were in a formal meeting. In formal setting, it was correct to use 'Miss Ramoza', than Ramoza. Furthermore, the same answer was answered by these students in the questionnaire.

Based on Brown and Levinson (1987: 80), there are three relevant factors that are used by speaker to assess the danger of Face Threatening Acts, i.e. Power, Distance, and Rank of Imposition. Those three factors are essential to determine how polite an utterance that is uttered by the speaker to the hearer will be. Thus, as the use of social deixis, there were three factors that influenced the students to use certain level of politeness, social rank, social distance and formality. In the conversations, the students in playing the role understood whom they talked to and the situation of the conversation, thus they successfully used level of politeness in requesting something, high or low.

The social rank appears in the conversation 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 32. In general, they who had lower rank used high level of politeness, while, they who had higher rank used low level of politeness.

The examples were found in Conversation 17. It was a conversation among a master and two of his servants. It talked about the master who asked his servants to cook him food and to bring him drink also to wash his car. The servants did what their master asked. Shown in Table 17 in Appendix 3 is the level of politeness they used. Since the master had higher rank, he impolitely asked his servants to do something. The master used direct command, "Hello servants, come here." "I wanna eat something. Please, cook me some 'Ilyasgoreng'." "I wanna some beer." and "Wash my car, please! Whereas, the servants used higher politeness in asking what the master wanted, "What can I do for you sir?" "What do you want to drink?" "Do you need something else?" From the questionnaire answered by the students, they answered that the master used lower politeness since the master had higher rank than his servants. Whereas, the servants used higher level of politeness since they had lower position. The same answer also answered by them from the interview, the master used lower level of politeness in requesting since he had higher position. In contrast, they answered the servants used higher level of politeness in offering something to their master because of their lower position.

Other example of the use of politeness that is influenced by social rank is in conversation 16. Conversation 16 was between Queen and one of her people. The students of XI Science 8 did the conversation well. It talked about a woman who asked permission to her queen to commemorate Indonesia's Independence Day. The Queen agreed and she also asked the time and place of the commemoration. Table 16 in Appendix 3 also showed different level of politeness used by them. The woman used higher level of politeness since she had lower position. She used, "Could I

come in?" "Could I have your permission?" However, the queen used lower level of politeness as she used direct question, "Where is the place?" "When the contest will be held?" Those sentences showed that the queen had higher rank than her people. Furthermore, from the questionnaire given to students, since it was conversation between people and queen, so the people should use higher level of politeness when requesting something to her queen.

The second factors the students used certain kinds of politeness was social distance. There are two kinds of social distance in the conversation, intimate social distance and far social distance. They, who were intimate, used low level of politeness in requesting something, while they who were far used high level of politeness in requesting. The intimate social distance appears in the conversation 7 and 8 (sisters at home), conversation 11 (son to his father), conversation 13 and 14 (friends), and conversation 19 (neighbours). The far social distance appears in Conversation 2 (passenger to air hostess), Conversation 21 (police officer and motorcycle rider), conversation 28 (customer to shopkeeper) and 31 (strangers).

We take Conversation 19 as an example. It was a conversation between neighbours. It talked about what they would to do on that day. They used lower level of politeness since although they were neighbours, they were really intimate and in the same age. The sentences, "What about cycling?" and "What about swimming?" in giving suggestion indicated less polite. Besides, requesting, "Lend me your swimsuit, please?" and "Do you want it?" showed that both of them used lower level of politeness. Furthermore, the same reason was given by these students as revealed by the questionnaire data. They answered that they used lower level of politeness since they were really close and at the same age.

Other example of level of politeness as influenced by intimate social distance was found in Conversation 14. It was between friends. Student A felt so thirsty, however, as he was doing something he asked his friend, B to make him a cup of tea. Since there was no tea

left, student B only gave mineral water. The students of XI Science 8 played the role really well. Table 14 in Appendix 3 shows the level of politeness they used. They used a lower level of politeness. "Can you buy make me a cup of tea?" "Can you bring me another drink; bring me another drink, please?" "yes, bring me, please." Those are the examples that they used lower level of politeness in requesting something. They used less polite request since they were friends. As the used of social deixis name, they used lower level of politeness since the social distance between them is really intimate. Besides, from the questionnaire they answered also gave answer that they used less polite request since they were close and they were in the same age.

An example of the use of the level of politeness influenced by far social distance in students' conversation is found in Conversation 21. It was between police officer and motorcycle rider that was done by students of XI Science 9 talked about the police officer who did the regular traffic operation. The police officer asked the motorcycle rider to show him his driver license. In the conversation, the motorcycle rider also requested the police officer to lend him his phone. The level of politeness used by both, as displayed in Appendix 3 Table 21, was high. They used a very polite request. The police officer when asking driver licence said, "Could you show me your licence card now?" While, the motorcycle rider said, "Could I borrow your phone, sir? They used very high polite request, as the reason of the social deixis used, because they did not know each other. They were not intimate. Also, the questionnaire data showed that they used higher level of politeness because they never met before. In other words, they talked to stranger.

Other example of the use of the level of politeness influenced by far social distance was found in Conversation 28, which was a conversation between a waitress and a restaurant customer. The customer inconsistently used level of politeness. When asking the shopkeeper to give him body soap, he used low level of politeness, "I'm looking for body soap. Give me

one" Also when he said, "I need one box of this." However, he used high level of politeness in saying, "Can you give suggestion about the best noodle in this market, sir?" and "How much money I will spend for these stuffs, sir?" The customer used high level of politeness because of the far social distance between them, he didn't know the shopkeeper before. In addition, the questionnaire data also showed the same; the shopkeeper must be polite to his customer.

The last factor that influenced the use of certain level of politeness was formality. The conversations were in formal situations. In these situations, the students playing the role used high level of politeness. The formality factor appears in the Conversation 5 and 6 (siblings at the office), Conversation 9 and 10 (colleagues) and Conversation 30 (waitress and customer).

Take Conversation 30 as an example. It was a conversation between waitress and restaurant customer. The setting of this conversation was formal or high class restaurant. The customer politely asked the menu, the chef's choice and the bill. Shown in Table 30 in Appendix 3, the level of politeness used by these students was high or very polite. The restaurant customer said, "Yes, could I have the menu, please?", "I was hoping you could give me chef choice, please!" and "Could I have my bill, please?" These indicated that she wanted to show that she was a noble woman and must use higher level of politeness in a formal situation as in the restaurant. Besides, the waitress also used higher level of politeness since she had lower position or rank than the customer. She said, "Good afternoon, Ma'am. Do you think I might able to help you?" "Of course. Would you mind to wait a minute, Ma'am?" Furthermore, the questionnaire data showed that the students used higher level of politeness since this was a conversation between waitress and restaurant customer in which the waitress should respect to her customer. Also, the interview data showed that the students used higher politeness in offering and requesting something because of the situation. They were in a fancy or formal restaurant.

Other example of the use of level of politeness influenced by formality level is found in Conversation 9. Conversation 9 was conversation between colleagues in an official meeting. The students of XI Science 9 students played the role really well. They discussed about the next plan for their restaurant. Student A asked student B about what food would be served in the restaurant. Also student A asked student B to find cheaper pumpkin. In the meeting, student B asked student A about furniture that would be placed in the restaurant. Shown in Table 9 in Appendix 3 is the use of higher level of politeness in asking thing or requesting. They said: "Might I borrow your report?" "Could you tell me the result of the survey?" "Could you find the cheaper one?" Those sentences considered higher than "Borrow me your report!" "Tell me the result of the survey!" or "Find the cheaper one!" It was a conversation between colleagues in a formal meeting, thus, they must use higher level of politeness in requesting something. In addition, from the questionnaire answered by them also strengthen the reason. They knew that they acted as colleagues and they were in an official meeting, hence, they used higher level of politeness.

How Social Deixis Influence the Level of Politeness

When the students in playing the role understand whom they talked to and the situation of the conversation, they will successfully use certain social deixis and the level of politeness. As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987: 80), there are three relevant factors that are used by speaker to assess the danger of Face Threatening Acts, i.e. Power, Distance, and Rank of Imposition. Those three factors are essential to determine how polite an utterance that is uttered by the speaker to the hearer will be. Furthermore, Holmes (1992: 8-10) states that there are 4 factors influencing the use of social deixis : social distance, status scale, formality and referential, and affective function scale. If the students in playing the role understand whom they talked to and the

situation of the conversation, they will successfully use certain social deixis.

Seeing from those two arguments, there are similar factors of using social deixis and level of politeness. Those are social status, social distance, and rank of imposition/ formality level. How social deixis influences level of politeness is when there is a similar reason of using social deixis and level of politeness. An example is the use of social deixis Sir in a formal meeting. One can't say "Sir, give us our financial report!" It is unusual if he used Sir in order to respect him but level of politeness is low. It would be correct if one say, "Sir, would you give us our financial report?" Further explanation is presented below.

In the 32 conversations, most of the students appropriately used certain social deixis and what level of politeness they used. Of the 32 conversations, 30 were correct. They appropriately used social deixis and level of politeness. A similar reason of the use of both indicated the influence of social deixis to maintain level of politeness. Nevertheless, 2 conversations were wrong. It is Conversation 24, which is between president and minister. The president used a name to call his minister but used high level of politeness in requesting something. The interview data showed that they incorrectly used it because they were nervous during the conversation. Furthermore, in Conversation 28, which is between shopkeeper and customer, the customer inconsistently used level of politeness. When he did not use any social deixis, he used low level of politeness in requesting body soap, but when he used social deixis Sir to the shopkeeper he used high level of politeness in requesting instant noodle and asking how much he had to pay.

Thus, in general, the students played the role really well. Although they did many mistakes, like grammar and vocabulary, they appropriately used certain social deixis to call others. Furthermore, they could use the level of politeness. They knew when they had to use higher level of politeness or when they had to use lower level of politeness. They also knew

that certain social deixis influenced the level of politeness they used.

CONCLUSION

From the 32 conversations, two kinds of social deixis were used by the students: relational social deixis and absolute social deixis. The examples of relational deixis in the students conversation were name, pronoun you, and sister, while, the absolute social deixis were your majesty, sir, mam, and Mister. The use of the social deixis in the students' conversations was influenced by three factors: social rank, social distance, and formality level. They, who had a higher rank used relational social deixis, while they who had a lower rank used absolute social deixis. For social distance, they who were intimate used relational social deixis, while they who were not close used absolute social deixis. Lastly, the students' conversations were in formal situation, thus, they used absolute social deixis.

Also, there were two kinds of politeness level used by the students, low and high. The use of the level of politeness by students was influenced by social rank, social distance and formality level. They who had a higher rank used low level of politeness while they who had a lower rank used high level of politeness. They who were intimate used low level of politeness

while they who were not intimate or not close used high level of politeness. Lastly, the conversations were in formal situations. In these situations, the students used high level of politeness. Social deixis influenced the level of politeness because there was a similar reason of using social deixis and the level of politeness.

REFERENCES

- Adane, Dereje. 2014. Social Deixis in Hadiyya. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. 2 (5): 301-304.
- Brown, P. & S.C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in Language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ekowati, A. and Ahmad Sofwan. 2014. The Use of Pragmatics Deixis in Conversation Texts in "Pathway to English." *Lembaran Ilmu Kependidikan, [S.l.]*. 43 (2): 71-78.
- Holmes, Janet. 1992. *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Lakoff, R.T. 1973. *The Logic of Politeness; or Minding your p's and q's*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Levinson, S.C. 2004. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Ed. Horn, L.R and Ward, G. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2008. *Pragmatics*. 19th edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Thomas, Jenny. 2013. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routled.