

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

In the end of Chapter 2, the writer draws hypotheses that high-involvement style, which is dominated by fast rate of speech, fast turn-taking, more overlaps and interruptions, consists of more preferred acts that are opted in the interaction between speaker and addressee. The style is signaling interpersonal involvement or close connection; hence it is known as connection-based style, which respecting community or others. However, the employing of this kind of style may lead to the act that the speaker violates the need for freedom of the addressee. While threatening the needs to be independent and to have freedom, it means threatening negative-face want.

On the other hand, high-considerateness style, which is dominated by low rate of speech, slow turn-taking, avoidance of overlaps and interruptions, consists of more dispreferred acts that opted in the interaction. The style gives signals of load of distance or lack of connection; hence it is known as defensive or self-based style, which respecting freedom of addressee. Nevertheless, the employing of such style may lead to the possibility of the speaker to violate the need for community. While threatening the needs to be accepted, liked by others or being in the same side with addressee, it means threatening positive-face want.

The result of analysis which is provided in Table 3.3.3 are counted from the frequencies of features of analysis that both speakers shows through the conversation which can be seen from the transcript (attached). The writer puts many symbols on the transcript according to the theory of transcript conventions form Gail Jefferson (2004), count them and put it altogether in Table 3.3.3.

Based on the result, it is obvious that conversational style which is dominantly employed by both Michelle Obama and Ellen DeGeneres is high-involvement style. The frequency of employing each characteristic in high-involvement style are higher than what it is shown in the frequency of employing high-considerateness style. Ellen is recognized to do 173 times characteristics in high-involvement style, such as fast rate of speech, fast turn-taking, more overlaps, more interruptions and

more backchannel signals. Undoubtedly, with the competences to host a talk show, Ellen as the brilliant comedian and host, has won twenty-five Emmy Awards during period 2004-2014. Nearly similar to Ellen, Michelle is counted to do 168 times characteristics in high-involvement style. Her attributes as the First Lady for 8 years is the biggest influences to make her excellent in controlling the floor of conversation and managing her speech. The total number of characteristics of high-considerateness style that they may employ is far away below the high-involvement. Thus, the writer concludes that both Michelle and Ellen, in this episode of talk show, employ the high-involvement style.

The hypotheses assume if speaker performs high-involvement style, it means that more preferred acts are done in the interaction. It can be viewed in the table of result that the total number of frequency of employing preferred acts are higher than the dispreferred ones. Both Michelle and Ellen perform preferred acts more frequently than dispreferred acts. Even, the preferred acts performed by Michelle are higher than what Ellen does—she does 81 times while Ellen merely does half of it, 44 times. The employment of more preferred acts is the signal for the way both speakers want to show that they agree with each other along the talk show. It is regarded as important because the agreement between the host and the guest star leads to the success of the talk show.

As the consequences of employing high-involvement style and more preferred acts opted in, Michelle and Ellen are signaling interpersonal involvement to each other. They tend to build a closer connection and respect the value of community or others. The more interpersonal features are involved, the closer distance between them. However, as the hypotheses assume formerly, the process of honoring community and connection cause violation to the need for freedom, the need to be independent personally. The violation, then, has impact the negative-face want of each participant in the interaction.

The result shows that the total number of acts that may threaten negative-face want is higher than the acts that may threaten positive-face want. Michelle does 22 acts that threaten negative-face want of Ellen, and only does 15 acts that threaten positive-face want. The similar events occur to Ellen, she does more acts that

threaten Michelle's negative-face want for 30 acts rather than acts that threaten positive face want.

Therefore, the writer sums up that the hypotheses are proven to be evaluated as true based on the careful analysis and research on each detailed case. Regarding to the three objectives of research that are mentioned in Chapter 1, the writer draws conclusion to answer the formulation of the problem that (1) conversational style and preference structure in an interaction have significance and correlation to face want. The interrelationship among these features is established by means of signaling needs to each participant, (2) conversational styles have impact to the face want since the employing of a particular style is signaling either interpersonal involvement or lack of connection. The first one is called connection based-style, and the latest is called self-based style. High-involvement style, which is connection-based, puts high respect to community and it is commonly found in the relationship among families and friends. Each participant in the interaction shares positive politeness altogether so that the conversation runs smoothly and friendly. Everybody shares idea that fulfill the needs to become one group, aimed to solidarity. However, the high-considerateness style, which is self-based (or defensive), conversely puts high respect to the independence of other so it is the proper style to those who are working in a relationship. There are boundaries represented in negative politeness in order to maintain self-face and other's face fairly. Each participant in the interaction will have the same freedom or independence to share its own idea. Unfortunately, since honoring self-face becomes the focus, they tend to loosen the distance so that the conversation will sound awkward; dominated by long pauses between turns, some apologies, and hedges, (3) preferences structures, that are divided into preferred act and dispreferred act, also have impact to the face want. The expression of a preferred represents closeness and quick connection, yet dispreferred represents distance and lack of connection. The employing of preferred is indeed harmless to the positive-face want due to respect to the first part of each pair which mostly show agreement and acceptance, but it does threaten the negative-face because the needs to be independent are lost. On the other hand, dispreferred is regarded harmless to the

negative-face but may threaten positive-face want because the needs to be common in a close connection are lost.

Face-threatening acts, at last, are always in the preference of both conversational styles and preference structures. The acts are generated distinctively from one style to another, from preferred to dispreferred. Eventually, each of the face-threatening act can be minimalized on various strategies so communication becomes mutually beneficial. To be an excellent communicator, it is essential to be sensitive to get signals among the interaction so that one will not disadvantage the other. Through this research, the writer expects that there will be further studies which will open other possibilities of the connection between features of communication in this research with more diverse features.

