

Politeness Strategies: Negotiation in Procurement Services of Traditional Entertainments

Eko Joko Trihadmono¹, Djatmika², Sumarlam³ & Joko Nurkamto⁴

Postgraduate Program, University of Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

¹Corresponding email: ekojokoplenghe@gmail.com

²djatkamika@staff.uns.ac.id; ³sumarlam@staff.uns.ac.id; ⁴jokonurkamto@gmail.com

Abstract:

This paper aims to describe kinds of politeness strategies and features of the politeness in Javanese cultural context where Javanese people incur activities in the procurement of Javanese traditional entertainments. The study used qualitative approach assigning 20 research subjects and analyzed 42 corpuses as the sources of data. Data of this study were divided into politeness techniques, politeness strategies, and impoliteness strategies. Results show that of five politeness strategies, one does not appear in the negotiation that is using affective tag to show a certain concern. Four techniques that appear are: to speak indirectly, to lie politely, to use euphemism, and to use modal tags to show uncertainty. Four politeness strategies, including bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record politeness all exist as the medium of interactions. Finally, impoliteness strategies exist in the form of bald on-record impoliteness, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and entertaining impoliteness. In context of Javanese culture, this study shows its novelty that Javanese culture has its own universal cultural values in politeness.

Keywords: *entertainment, impoliteness strategies, negotiation, politeness*

1. Introduction

In this paper, we describe politeness strategies used by Javanese people in negotiation of procurement services of Javanese traditional entertainments. The focus is how Javanese politeness strategies characterize negotiation process and to identify how each strategy is applied in context of pragmatic. Javanese has been acknowledged as a society who appreciates politeness in high respect using a standard language, attitude and norms that are well established so that politeness strategies will appear during the entire conversations they perform.

The politeness is reflected in the procedure of communicating through verbal signs or language procedures. If a language procedure one used is againsts the cultural norms, he will receive a negative value, e.g. being arrogant, indifferent, selfish, etc (Fitrah, 2018; Sukarno, 2015; Poedjosoedarmo, 1979). In pragmatics, politeness is associated with to a particular language and culture that shows respect or deference and friendship or solidarity (Al-Shorman, 2016). Yule (1996) asserts politeness is a social behavior to show awareness for both a socially distant person's face and a socially close person's face. Lakoff (1975:64) maintains politeness is "developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction". This way, politeness is "strategic conflict avoidance", friction, and fight in human interactions (Leech, 1980:19 cited in Watts, et. al, 2005).

Since people interact all the time, politeness is essentially needed in the society to show respect to others, to maintain the relationships that they have built, and to maintain face to create a comfortable interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987) maintain two types of politeness: positive politeness and negative politeness. Positive politeness are characterized by the use of greater direct speech acts, positive relationship, and respect others the objectives of which are to satisfy the speaker's needs. The negative politeness is indicated by the use greater indirect speech acts, decrease requests, and respect others' independence. Negative politeness has an aim to avoid a face-threatening act (FTA).

In Javanese culture, people show politeness to avoid feeling of ashamed (*isin/saru*) by showing proper behavior when they interact with others. The ashamed is greatly connected how Javanese people express politeness (Sukarno, 2015; Fitrah, 2018). Javanese in Surakarta Central Java Indonesia, a person who is *njawani*, performing perfect Javanese attitude is associated with their pledge to perform Javanese traditional entertainment, such as *karawitan*, puppet play, and *campursari* for wedding secemony, circumcsions and other thanksgiving party. From these various interests, an idea will emerge, how to present a lively *karawitan* group in return for affordable services. A skill in negotiation or bargaining at the time of entering into an agreement with an art actor, will benefit someone who responds to the 'service user' of the art. Respondents who are skilled in negotiating will get lively entertainment in affordable prices. Skills in negotiating a respondent to an art actor will produce satisfaction for responders (Boden, 1995; Young, 1991).

Negotiation itself is a process of bargaining by negotiating to give or receive in order to reach a mutual agreement between the respondent and the artist. Negotiations will run if both parties maintain each other's egos and entertainment services standards, so that the impression of rigid negotiations will emerge (Alsharif & Alyousef, 2017). Usually the respondent invites the family or relatives to negotiate smoothly. Sometimes the time to negotiate uses a strategy for various reasons with the main goal being high relief. However, there are those who are shy and don't even want to use the strategy and negotiate in the entertainment agreement nominal agreement. Respondents who are less skilled in negotiating usually invite their siblings or are handed over to an intermediary to negotiate.

Negotiation is an essential part of everyday life. Negotiation typically includes action and knowledge exchanges. The action exchanges request the provision of goods or services, and knowledge exchanges request some information, such as approval of an academic request (González & DeJarnette, 2015). However, cross-cultural negotiation is confusing and hard to achieve, as it implies a full understanding of how other cultures function differently from our own (Cohen, 2001; Zheng, 2015). In addition, negotiation can only be successful if it entails the use of persuasion to influence the beliefs or the actions of others (Boden, 1995; Young, 1991).

Drawing the above background in mind, this study is guided by two research questions below:

- 1) What kinds of politeness are used in the negotiation process of procurement of traditional entertainment to indicate politeness served by Javanese people in Surakarta?
- 2) How do the literal utterances of the politeness strategies indicate politeness strategies served by Javanese people in Surakarta?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Politeness

Politeness is the norms and principles to be polite. According to Lakoff (1973) politeness is a system of interpersonal relations to minimize conflict, to establish levels of mutual comfort, and to show awareness of another person's face. In Brown and Levinson's theory (1987), face means someone's self-image that should be maintained while interacting with others.

Coulmas (2013:85) emphasizes "Politeness is a non-normative theoretical construct designed to compare various standards used in different societies for the assessment of speech behavior". A cultural convention of politeness refers to judgment of people's speech behaviour on the basis of the community's social values. A cultural convention originates from a particular sociocultural system. However, politeness has to indicate that every society operates a normative notion of their own politeness, which is not the same for all interlocutors, situations and cultures.

To be polite is important for an individual to support interpersonal comity to save face (Al-Shorman, 2016). Basically, people interact all the time, so politeness is essential for some reasons: to show respect to others, to maintain the relationships that they have built, and to

maintain face to create a comfortable interaction (Leech, 1983). Brown and Levinson (1987) admit five politeness techniques, namely:

- people can speak indirectly.
- people can lie politely.
- people can use euphemisms.
- people can use modal tags to show that the speakers are uncertain about something.
- people can use affective tags to show that the speakers concern about something.

Politeness models vary from some scholars. Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed model of politeness emphasizing on rationality and face. Face has a positive face, the desire to be accepted or liked by others, and a negative face, the need to be independent and not be imposed on by others. Formerly, Leech (1983) offered four different categories according to the inherent functions of communication acts:

- *the convivial function of politeness*, when illocutionary and social communication aim coincide, as in when interactants are greeting, offering, inviting, etc.;
- *the collaborative function*, where the illocutionary and the social aim are independent of one another, when speakers declare, assert, report, announce, etc.;
- *the competitive function of politeness*, where the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal and speakers, order, ask, demand, beg, etc., and;
- *the conflicting function*, entails a conflict between the illocutionary and the social goal and occurs when speakers threaten, accuse and, in general, express negative feelings and reactions.

In addition, Fraser (1990, cited in Kedveš, 2013) proposed perspective on politeness, as another model, consisting of five aspects:

- *the social-norm view*, which sees politeness as socially appropriate behavior, pleasant towards others,
- *the conversational-contract view*, where politeness is seen within the frames of conversational contract between the interlocutors and suggests its dependency on correct context interpretation;
- *the conversational-maxim view*, which is relevant to Grice's (1975) cooperative principles which assume cooperation between the interlocutors, and;
- *the face-saving view*, which sees politeness as a linguistic behavior with the objective of preserving and/or enhancing one's face.

The application of politeness is in adherence to rules of principles and politeness principles. Lakoff (1973:298) maintains "rules of politeness", in that the use of politeness should refer to three principles: (1) "Don't impose," (2) "Give options," and (3) "Make [alter] feel good—be friendly." Here, speakers orient toward their addressees and take their point of view into account. The rules express certain values attached to cultural norms, as it is considered negative to impose on others (first rule), to leave people without any choice (second rule), or to make

them feel uncomfortable (third rule). Depending on the cultures, different rules will gain precedence (Lakoff, 1973:303).

In addition, Leech (1983) introduces the so-called “politeness principle,” which consists of six politeness maxims: the tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy maxims. Further, Leech (1983:108) associates indirectness with politeness by saying that “indirect illocutions tend to be more polite (a) because they increase the degree of optionality, and (b) because the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its force tends to be.”

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) indirectness and politeness are influential work on politeness, emphasizing to the notions of “face” and “FTA”. Face, originated by Goffman (1955), is defined as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself (Brown & Levinson, 1987:61). Face is divided into positive and negative face. Negative face is “The want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others,” while positive face is “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” (Brown & Levinson, 1987:62; Mohammed & Abbas, 2016).

2.2 Politeness Strategy

Politeness strategy is a technique how to express ideas in the way is considered polite. Politeness strategy is used to lessen the threat to someone’s face or can be called as face saving acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The aim is to save the listener’s face when the interaction is built as the purpose of creating relaxed and comfortable relation among others. Brown and Levinson (1987) propose four politeness strategies:

- bald on-record
- positive politeness
- negative politeness
- off-record strategy

Further, Brown & Levinson (1987) describe that bald on-record strategy is used to minimize threats to the listener’s face, emphasizing speakers to speak effectively and directly, as in emergency, task-oriented, request, and alert situation. This politeness strategy relates to the superior power and the relationship between speakers and listeners. Positive politeness aims to minimize the threat to the listener’s positive face by showing deference, confirming friendly relationship, and showing cooperation. The positive politeness is applied in the situations between those who have close relationships, to make the listener feel comfortable and good when interaction is built (Kreishan, 2018).

Other politeness strategies are negative strategy and off-record strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The negative politeness focuses on the listener’s negative face to show the deference. The speaker barely avoids the imposition of the listeners, by being indirect, avoiding presumption and assumption to the hearer’s beliefs, attempting to decrease compulsion, not interrupting

listener, and incurring the debt. The off-record strategy or indirect strategy aims to avoid direct FTA. Utterances of the speakers are not addressed directly to particular persons because the speakers convey the message indirectly (Al-Shboul & Huwari, 2016).

2.3 Model of Impoliteness Strategies from Culpeper

Culpeper (2001) develops an “Impoliteness model” that is the most notable model called as “Spic-and-Span Model” introduced in his book *Language and Characterization*. The model emphasizes that impoliteness is intended to produce disharmony between interlocutors in social interactions. According to Culpeper (2001:246) the key different between politeness and impoliteness depends on its intention; politeness focuses on speaker’s intention to support face, and impoliteness is to attack face. Understanding the notion of politeness is impossible without comprehending impoliteness phenomenon and, thereby, the analytical framework of impoliteness needs to be improved and receive the due consideration (Mullany and Stockwell, 2010:71). Culpeper (1996:356) proposed impoliteness super strategies as the following:

- (a) Bald on record impoliteness: FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way where face is not irrelevant.
- (b) Positive impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee’s positive face wants.
- (c) Negative impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee’s negative face wants.
- (d) Sarcasm or mock politeness: the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations.
- (e) Withhold politeness: the absence of politeness work where it would be expected

Culpeper (1996:357) suggested both positive and negative impoliteness output strategies as follows:

Positive impoliteness output strategies:

- (a) Ignore, snub the other fail to acknowledge the other’s presence
- (b) Exclude the other from an activity
- (c) Disassociate from the other: for example avoid sitting together
- (d) Be inappropriate identity markers, for example use title
- (e) Use obscure or secretive language
- (f) Seek disagreement, like selecting a sensitive topic
- (g) Make the other feel uncomfortable
- (h) Use taboo words, like swearing
- (i) Call the other name

Negative impoliteness output strategies are classified by Culpeper (1996:3580) include:

- (a) Frighten
- (b) Condescend, scorn or ridicule, emphasize your relative power

- (c) Invade the others space-literally or metaphorically
- (d) Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect
- (e) Put the other's indebtedness on record

2.3.1 Bald on record impoliteness

Bald on record impoliteness is employed when there is much face at risk and when a speaker intends to damage the hearer's face and thus the impolite utterance will be performed directly and clearly (Bousfield, 2008:92). Culpeper (1996) uses concept of face-attack-act (FAA), in opposition to FTA, to identify a deliberate intention on the part of the speaker (Mullany and Stockwell, 2010:71). The difference between Brown and Levinson's bald on-record politeness and Culpeper's bald on-record impoliteness lies in that the former depends particular situations where the risk to face is minimal without any attention to attack the hearer's face, the latter is used when there is much risk to the face and the speaker intends to damage the other's face (Wieczorek, 2013:46).

2.3.2 Positive impoliteness

Positive impoliteness strategy is used to damage the hearer's positive face want. Culpeper (2011) adds 8 sub-strategies to positive impoliteness as cited in Mullany and Stockwell (2010:72) as follows:

- ignoring or snubbing the other
- denying common ground with the hearer
- selecting a sensitive or undesirable topic to talk about
- using inappropriate identity markers
- being disinterested and unsympathetic with the hearer
- looking for disagreements
- using obscure language and inserting secretive words within the discourse
- using taboo words

2.3.3 Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness strategy is designed to attack the hearer's negative want (his desire to be free from imposition) and involves 4 sub-strategies (Mullany and Stockwell, 2010:72):

- scorn (*cemooh*)
- frighten (*menakuti*)
- ridicule (*mengejek*)
- invade (*menyerang*) the hearer's space literally or metaphorically

2.3.4 Sarcasm or mock impoliteness

Sarcasm means the use of one or more sub-strategies which are superficially suitable and accepted but deeply they have the opposite meaning (Bousfield, 2008:95). Sarcasm impoliteness strategies are used to destroy FTA which is clearly insincere.

2.3.5 Withhold politeness

Withhold politeness strategy occurs when the speaker does not perform politeness as expected, such as keeping silent when the speaker is supposed to thank the hearer (Thielemann and Kosta, 2013:239).

2.3.6 Affective impoliteness

Huang (2014:150) maintains affective impoliteness is used by the speaker to expose his anger towards the hearer and this consequently generates a negative emotional atmosphere between the speaker and the hearer. For example:

- You made me crazy!

According to Huang (2014:150) in the above example, the speaker uses such impolite utterance to express the passive effect of the hearer on him and inform him that he is unwanted anymore.

2.3.7 Coercive impoliteness

Coercive impoliteness is a means of getting power via language (Culpeper, 2011:252). For example,

- Shut up or I'll smash your head! (Huang, 2014:150).

This way, the speaker puts an end to the addressee's behavior by warning him not to speak. Such an utterance is more likely to be produced when the speaker has a command over the hearer (Mofidi & Shoushtari, 2012).

2.3.8 Entertaining impoliteness

This kind of impoliteness is generated when the speaker speaks fun at the hearer and utilizes the target's feelings to obtain amusement (Huang, 2014:150).

- Young Estella: with this boy! Why, he is a common laboring boy (Johanson, 1994:25).

2.4 Politeness in Javanese Culture

Politeness in Javanese culture is pivotal to minimize the feeling of ashamed. The way Javanese use politeness strategy is tended to use negative politeness, as when they are showing deference to the addressee and minimize imposition.

Javanese culture sees three basic concepts to show politeness: *tata krama* or etiquette, *andhap-asor* humble and praise others, and *tanggap ing sasmita* responsive culturally to know the indirect message of an utterance. *Tata krama* for Javanese is to indicate that people behave in the good manners to prevent Javanese others against the feeling of shame (Poedjadoedarmo, 1979). Suseno (1997) states that showing a strict formal etiquette will protect and secure Javanese people from the feeling of shame when they perform it properly. In *andhap-asor* Javanese politeness, Javanese people perform as a low profile. *Andhap* means low and *asor* is

humble, demonstrating the politeness of Javanese people apply humble and praise others. Javanese consider that to exalt is impolite. In *tanggap ing sasmita*, prompt response and understanding of indirect expressions, a Javanese must demonstrate his ability to understand immediately meaning of what a speaker is intended to say beyond the contexts expressed within an indirect speech act. The main goal of *tanggap ing sasmita* is the interlocutors are critical to the context particularly the indirect messages being delivered. Javanese people pay attention on listener's feeling and have to avoid expressing their feeling directly (Fitrah, 2018).

Politeness in Javanese is also closed to Javanese speech levels applicable in the Javanese society. Javanese people puts the rules of interactions using Javanese language that emphasizes polite performance, attitude, and word choices into the social level of the speaker and hearer. How the diction and address in Javanese language are used are greatly influenced by the age, social status and formality (Susanto, 2014). The young must put respect to the older and speak using Javanese style that is considered more polite, the style of which is selected dependent on the social relationships.

Geertz (1969) and Poedjosoedarmo (1979) point out Javanese language style has four Javanese speech levels: *ngoko* (low level), *madya* (middle level), *krama* (high level), and *krama inggil* (high level especially used by the royal family). *Ngoko* style is spoken in informal speech used between friends and close relatives to show familiarity, indicating a lower status. *Madya* style, the intermediary form between *ngoko* and *krama*, is spoken by an upper level to a lower age or status to show respect; or addressed to strangers for maintaining relative distance. *Krama* is the most polite to indicate a formal style that show respect addressed to the higher status. The last level of Javanese style is *krama inggil*, which means the highest level of Javanese dictions used in a very formal context. *Krama inggil* is also particularly used in the king palace in the past, but formally it is the Javanese style that is used to communicate between higher level status in an office, society or government office. *Krama inggil* consists of certain number of dictions that describe the highest condition or status used by speaker to address the hearer as he/she is deemed the respected person (Sukarno, 2015; Susanto, 2014).

2.4.1 Address in Javanese

To address other people in Javanese should maintain the level of politeness and put respect to the addressee. Jensen (1988) states the forms of address in Indonesia, especially in Javanese culture, sometimes concern with politeness level to show the social relationships between the speakers and the listeners. See excerpt (1) to show the different of address in three levels of status in Javanese context.

- (1a) Apa **kowe** wes garap PR? (Did you finish your homework?)
- (1b) Napa **sampeyan** sampun maca buku niku? (Excuse me, have you read the book?)
- (1c) Menapa **panjenengan** sampun ngunjuk? (Would you please inform me, did you have a drink?)

Drawing the excerpt (1a), (1b) and (1c) a Javanese will soon identify the words of address to show the level of status as marked in bold, namely: *kowe*, you (low level), *sampeyan*, you (middle level), and *panjenengan*, you (high level). This way, *kowe* is used to address someone in the same level and show the close relationships, indicating no intention for the speaker to show respect to the listener. The word *sampeyan* is used to address strangers to maintain relative distance. Finally, *panjenengan* is used to address someone who is older than the speaker and who has higher social status. The higher level address *sampeyan* (*madya*) and *panjenengan* (*krama*) implies that the listener is an elder that should receive respect in Javanese culture context. A younger speaker who addresses an elder using *kowe* will be considered as being impolite.

2.4.2 Higher Level of Language Style

Other obvious politeness in Javanese interaction is indicated by the higher level of language style that is *krama*. Basically, a higher level of language style must present when a younger talks to an elder or lay people to the official as exemplified in the excerpt (2) as quoted from Sukarno (2015).

- (2a) *Apa kowe wes **mangan**? (ngoko)* (Already have a meal?)
- (2b) *Napa sampeyan sampun **nedho**? (madya)* (Did you already have eaten?)
- (2c) *Menapa panjenengan sampun **dhahar**? (krama)* (May I know Sir, did you already have eaten?)

Excerpt (2a), (2b) and (2c) indicate how a word *mangan* (to eat) is applied to three different context using different level of the addressee. The word *mangan*, to eat in (2a) is *ngoko* level and is used to address a lower level of interlocutor, e.g. an elder to a younger. To address using middle level person, the word *mangan* is not allowed and is replaced into *nedo*. In the *krama* style, *mangan* and *nedo* are considered of being rude and impolite and the appropriate diction must be *dhahar*. The contexts indicate that politeness in Javanese is affected by the social relationships, relative status and degree of friendliness. *Krama* level is used to express politeness as it is considered the most polite and the highest level of Javanese language style.

2.4.3 Politeness Using Lie and Indirectness

Typical expression in Javanese that is considered polite is to lay and state in an indirect statement. To lay in a certain expression that means to refuse has a similar meaning with an indirect expression to show a politeness (Poedjosoedarmo, 1979; Sukarno, 2015). To say too open when we meet a new person or as being a guest is *saru*, ashamed. In other case, to refuse an offer is also considered polite. See excerpt (3a) and (3b) as for the examples illustrating a guest and a host.

- (3a) Host : *Kula damelaken unjukan nggih.* (Let me serve you drink?)
- (3b) Guest : *Mboten sah repot-repot Bu. Pun sampun Bu.* (No, don't make you busy. No need the drink, Mom.)

Excerpt (3a) describes that a host offers a guest to serve drink as a courtesy in Javanese culture to receive a guest. The guest (3b) however refuses the offer to avoid a shame manner using a refusal statement, because to say frankly that he/she receives the offer is considered impolite in Javanese culture. Similar manner is indicated in the context when a Javanese receives praise as seen in excerpt (4).

(4) A: Your dress is beautiful.

B: No. It is just cheap.

The context of (4) is A who wears a new dress meet B. When A received praise from B, A feels ashamed and she refuses the admiration by saying “No. It is just cheap”. This manner is the way Javanese people express using refusal to show politeness. To say frankly: “Of course. My dress is new and expensive” is considered arrogant and obviously indicates impolite. Other Javanese politeness expressed using indirect expression is exemplified in excerpt (5).

(5) A: I can accompany you to your house.

B: No thanks. I will buy cakes in a mini market and my son will fetch me.

The context of (5) is a person met other his friend on the way home. A offers B to accompany him by riding his motorcycle. Unfortunately, B refused using an indirect answer that is actually a lay. “I will buy cakes in a mini market and my son will fetch me” is not a true statement that he will do. It is a politeness strategy in Javanese culture that implies that the person will feel ashamed if he receives the offer directly. Commonly, if the friend offering to accompany asked again, the friend will receive the offer.

3. Research Methododology

3.1 Design and Setting

This study used qualitative approach and applied a case study as the research design. Qualitatively, this study explored its data in the forms of words, phrases and sentences obtained from utterances the research subjects performed their expression when negotiating in the procurement process (Santosa, 2017). In addition, the case study design allowed the researchers to make a reserach in a small scale subject, area and topic emphasizing the in-depth analysis of the case (Vu, 2017). This study took place in Surakarta, Sragen, Sukoharjo and Karanganyar, where most of the society served Javanese traditional entertainments for their general parties, such as wedding or thanksgiving events. Traditionally, this area is named as **Subosukowonosraten** an abbreviation Surakarta, Boyolali, Sukoharjo, Wonogiri, Sragen and Klaten. This study was conducted in six moths starting from January to July 2018.

3.2 Subject

This study assigned 20 subjects for the observation involving in average 5 subjects in each site. The subjects were a person who conducted entertaintment events and invited Javanese

traditional entertainments in the party. As the subjects were recruited based on the availability of the person to have the Javanese traditional entertainment show, they were selected using purposive sampling (Spradley, 1980). The subjects were persons who had a negotiation with the Javanese traditional entertainment management. Normally, customers came to the management of Javanese traditional group and made a negotiation to have a deal for the show. For the purposes of this study, the researchers came to the management house when a customer conducted a negotiation with the management. Time and place a customer made a negotiation was dependent much on if there was a customer wanted to have a show and invited a certain group to perform. With this view in mind, the selection of the subject was based on the availability of the customer where the researchers were available to access.

3.3 Data and Sources of Data

The primary data of this study were records of negotiation dialogues between customers and management of Javanese traditional entertainments. Secondary data were records on interviews between the researchers, customers and management. Therecords were transcribed verbatim to see the features of politeness strategies in the entire contexts and sites. Therefore, data of this study were utterances that contained politeness strategies in terms of words, phrases and sentences. The utterances were classified into politeness techniques, politeness strategies and impoliteness strategies (Vu, 2017).

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

This study collected 42 corpuses containing politeness strategies data, showing 10 courpuses from three sites and 12 courpus from one site. Data were obtained from observing the negotiation conversations between a customer and the management in each area. Upon completion of the negotiation, the researchers conducted an interview with the customer and the management taking format as a discussion meeting. The researchers used recorder to record the entire negotiation and the interview. In addition, field notes were also employed to jot down relevant information and evidences that compliments the records (Vu, 2017).

Procedures to collect data were made possible in three steps. First, the researchers made contact to both the customer and managment of the head of Javanese traditional entertainment group. The contact was aimed to confirm schedule of meeting for negotiation and the researchers asked a permit to join in the meeting. Second, the researcher arrived at the home of the management and explained to join in the negotiation process. In this regard, the researchers served a record and field notes. Third, upon the completion of the negotiation the researchers initiated a discussion to discuss the general aspects of the procurement of Javanese traditional entertainment. During the whole process of negotiation and discussion, the researchers wrote the polotiness strategies in the field notes to identify the most crucial points and recorded the whole utterences the participants produced.

Operationally, data were collected using three techniques: observation, interview and documents. Observation was used to collect data from the sites interactions eliciting utterances

from the conversations between customers and management of Javanese traditional entertainments to see how politeness strategies appeared (Alsharif & Alyousef, 2017). A video-camera was used in the observation process in each site. Observation took place four times in each site, providing 12 records. In addition, interview was conducted in terms of semi-structured interview to search an in-depth interview with customers and managements. The interview was recorded through the video-camera to identify the verbatim utterances containing politeness strategies. Each interviewee was interviewed fully in Javanese ranging in 15 minutes. Data obtained from the video-camera were transcribed verbatim to pose the pragmatic evidences in terms of sentences and conversation corpuses. Complimentary to the observation, field notes were prepared to help the researcher located the focus of the study and highlight points in the identification of pragmatic evidences. Documents including schedule, name of musicians, individual data, records on the performance, were collected to support the results of the records.

With this in mind, primary data on pragmatic in general and politeness strategies were identified from the corpus obtained from the video-camera transcripts and field notes. In addition, transcripts of interview data were used for the method triangulation. The secondary data obtained from documents were used complimentary. We applied a passive participatory observation technique, field-note taking, interviewing, and video recording to get rich data and to guard against bias. (Table 1).

Adler and Adler (1984) define non-participatory observation as the act of observing a phenomenon by using instruments and recordings for scientific purposes. Observation aimed to gather impressions from the surrounding environment related to the object under study. Ideally, the observer is not supposed to manipulate nor stimulate the subject. As a result, we did not to interact verbally with the participants while observing the meeting sessions. Rather, we made the field notes for the purposes to: (1) portrait of the subjects, (2) describe physical setting, (3) account of particular events, (4) depict the activities (Mirhosseini, Mardanshahi & Downlatabadi, 2017).

Table 1. Data collecting techniques and tools

Sources	Techniques	Tools
Observation	a. Non-participant observation b. Active discussion	a. the researcher b. a laptop
Documents	a. Asking for research assistant to ask for some documents required b. Attending targeted sites	a. research assistant b. a laptop
Video recording	a. Recording using a video camera on verbal interaction b. Transcribing the recorded oral data	a. research assistants b. a video camera
Interview	a. Play-back interviews b. Transcribing the data	a. the researcher b. I phone

		c. Samsung Galaxy tablet d. PC e. Interview guide
--	--	---

3.5 Data Analysis Techniques

To analyze the data this study applied The Development Research Sequence techniques proposed by Spradley (1980). The sequence was focused on four concurrent analysis that emphasized on domain analysis, taxonomy analysis, and thematic analysis. This analysis model is considered appropriate and easy to conduct because the data were at random and mixed in various characteristics (Santosa, 2017). Using theories of Spradley (1980) we classified data into three dimensions: politeness techniques, politeness strategies, and impoliteness strategies.

Specifically, to analyze the politeness strategies, theory of politeness strategy from Brown & Levinson (1987) on five politeness techniques and Face Threatening Acts as demonstrated in four types of Politeness Strategies. In the attempts to express politeness, Brown & Levinson's (1987) theory was used as the tool of analysis. To examine the impoliteness strategies that aim to Face Threatening Attack, this study adapted theory of Culpeper (1996; 2011) on impoliteness strategies.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The Use of Politeness

Results of analysis indicate that the use of politeness of this study is classified into three categories: techniques of politeness, politeness strategies and impoliteness strategies. Total utterances identified from the corpus from the four sites are 42 as appearing in table 2.

Table 2. Politeness Techniques

No	Kinds of politeness techniques	F N=42	%
1	Speak indirectly	12	28.6
2	Lie politely	2	4.8
3	Use euphemisms	3	7.1
4	Use modal tags to show that the speakers are uncertain about something	2	4.8
5	Use affective tags to show that the speakers concern about something	0	0
		29	45.3

As table 2 suggests of 5 politeness techniques "affective tags to show the speaker concern about something" does not present. Evidently, the result of analysis shows that "to speak indirectly" receives 28.6% as the highest frequency to use. To lie politely is used 4.8%, to use euphemism 7.1% and to use tags to show uncertainty 4.8%.

This evidence can be clarified that Javanese culture represents the applicability of politeness techniques as suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987). It confirms the study by Sukarno (2015) stating that Javanese perform to indirect strategies to express their want and coriousity in negotiation.

The central features of politeness strategies appearing in Table 3 indicate how four politeness strategies from Brown and Levinson (1987) are analyzed in this study.

Table 3. Politeness strategies

No	Kinds of politeness strategies	F N=42	%
1	bald on-record politeness: to minimize threats to the listener's face, to speak effectively and directly	14	33.3
2	positive politeness: to minimize the threat to the listener's face, showing deference, confirming friendly relationship, and showing cooperation	10	23.8
3	negative politeness: to minimize listener's negative face, avoiding imposition of the listeners, being indirect, attempting to decrease compulsion, not interrupting listener.	12	28.6
4	Off-record strategy: to avoid direct face threatening acts, utterances are not addressed directly	6	14.3
		42	100

Respectively, as indicagted in table 3, politeness strageies are achieved as follows: (1) bald on-record politeness 33.3%, (2) positive politeness 23.8%, (3) negative politeness 28.6%, and (4) off-record strategy 14.3%. Basically, the ultimate goal of using politeness strategies is to make negotiation runs smoothly, cooperative, friendly, and avoid to making a speaker or a hearer's face is not threatred thereby he/she does not feel of being ashamed.

In Javanese context, this finding is supported by the study of Sukarno (2015) and Fitriah (2018). In response to other offers or claims, Javanese people emphasize to put harmony for the communication. This way, principles to perform as andhap asor are well developed. In addition, Coulmas (2013) states that indirectness strategy is used to minimize the acts, which can threaten the addressee's face and reduce the speaker's face at risk seems true. In Javanese culture, some acts such as to give order and advise, to show one's dislike of the addressee, to express criticism and show disagreement are very sensitive, and becomes more extreme if a younger people do to the elders. Javanese norm believes younger people are not expected to give orders, advice and express criticism. If, an advice should appear, indirect language must be used. An implicit manner saying something else should be addressed until the addressee can understand what the speakers really want him to do (Smith-Hefner, 1989).

Table 4. Impoliteness strategies

No	Kinds of impoliteness strategies	F N=42	%
1	Bald on record impoliteness (to damage the hearer's face and thus the impolite utterance will be performed directly and clearly, e.g. emergency, task.	2	4.8
2	positive impoliteness (to damage the hearer's positive face want, e.g. ignoring others, denying common ground with the hearer, selecting a sensitive or undesirable topic to talk about, using inappropriate identity markers, being disinterested and unsympathetic with the hearer, looking for disagreements, using obscure language and inserting secretive words within the discourse, using taboo words	4	9.5
3	negative impoliteness (to attack the hearer's negative want, e.g. scorn (<i>cemooh</i>), frighten (<i>menakuti</i>), ridicule (<i>mengejek</i>), invade (<i>menyerang</i>) the hearer's space literally or metaphorically	2	4.8
4	sarcasm or mock impoliteness (showing artificial truth	0	0
5	withhold impoliteness (keeping silent when speaker to thank)	0	0
6	affective impoliteness (to expose anger towards the hearer, a negative emotional atmosphere between the speaker and the hearer.	0	0
7	coercive impoliteness (using power of language)	0	0
8	entertaining impoliteness (to make a fun)	6	14.3
		14	28.6

Pertaining to impoliteness strategies, table 4 indicates that entertaining impoliteness achieves 14%, and respectively positive politeness has 9.5%, bald on-record impoliteness and negative impoliteness 4.8% each. Entertaining impoliteness is a way to show disagreement and refusal using a joke or entertainment statement. As to explicitly refuse is not allowed, making a joke is considered safe and easy to declare. In Javanese convention this is named as “*sembrono parikeno*” careless statement but accurate to describe the target (Sukarno, 2015; Fitrah, 2018).

This finding surprisingly indicates that of 8 types of impoliteness strategies stated by Culper (2011), Javanese in this study use only 4, most probable because the other four strategies are too rude and in the opposite of the tradition in serving Javanese traditional entertainments. Above all, impoliteness in negotiation has its typical strategies to apply, depending on the skill a person has and the cultural context where the negotiation takes place (Alsharif & Alyousef, 2017).

4.2 Features of Impoliteness Strategies

Features of politeness that indicate politeness techniques, politeness strategies and impoliteness strategies are described in this section. Extracts of the features are obtained from the transcripts of the entire records the researchers have identified.

4.2.1 Politeness Techniques

Politeness techniques in this section means the way interlocutors maintain interaction to show respect to others, to maintain the relationships that they have built, and to maintain face to create a comfortable interaction (Leech, 1983). Using criteria from Brown and Levinson (1987), this study reveals four techniques of politeness, namely: to speak indirectly, to lie politely, to use euphemisms, and to use modal tags to show uncertainty. Excerpt (1) indicates the interaction between Management (M) the head of Javanese traditional entertainment group and a Customer (C) when M welcomed a customer for negotiation. Negotiation took place in the C's house. The context is when C arrived the traditional music in M's house has been playing.

(1) M: *Monggo dipun pidangetaken rekaman CD ne Mas.*

C: *Matur suwun Pak. Wah gayeng tenan, koyo neng suwargo. Durung nanggap wae wis kesengsem.*

M: I can play the record. Please enjoy.

C: Thank you Sir. Wonderful. It is so amazing like in the eden. The music does not yet perform, but I truly fall in love.

Excerpt (1) suggests that C expresses his impression using an euphemism "eden" to praise the M. This is to show an admiration as he expects that by praising the music, M will provide him a smooth and easy negotiation.

(2) M: *Meniko penyanyi sing paling ayu lan paling terkenal teng ngriki. Ngersakne?*

C: *Wah saget perang kalih mbok wedok mangke.*

M: This singer is one the most beautiful and most popular here. Want her?

C: I don't think so. My wife may quarrel with me.

The context of excerpt (2) is C offers the most beautiful singer in his group and he indicates that the singer will be possible to book to perform. C has shown his interest but replies in indirect politeness and lies politely, he refused the offer. The rationale is if C agrees to book the beautiful singer, his wife will be jealous and they will quarrel.

This finding confirms that politeness techniques appear in this negotiation process in this study. As Alsharif and Alyousef (2017) maintain, using euphemism is mostly used politeness techniques in negotiation. Javanese also uses euphemism as a politeness technique. However, the way Javanese refuse an offer is emphasized more to use indirect technique as negotiation may differs across culture (Al-Shboul & Huwari, 2016). In addition, this study reveals that using affective tags to show a concern do not appear in this study. The most reasonable argument is because Javanese people avoid to use direct expression that they deem to destroy the face of the hearer (Fitrah, 2018; Poedjosoedarmo, 1979).

4.2.2 Politeness Strategies

Strategies to show politeness in the negotiation in this study is based on four types of strategies from Brown & Levinson (1987), emphasizing on bald on-record politeness, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record politeness. Each of the strategy aims to minimize face threatening using positive manners and utterance, thereby cooperation and harmony in the entire interaction are maintained. Utterances showing politeness strategies are exemplified in the following extracts.

(3) A: *Saya pingin sekali Pak. Kalau diundang ke Gunung Kidul berapa biayanya Pak?*

B: *Lengkap dengan gamelan, sinden dan kendaraannya juga?*

A: *Untuk seperti itu, saya berikan 7 juta saja. Transpotnya saja mahal lo Mas.*

B: *Wah, mahal ya Pak. Saya kira tiga juta.*

A: I do want. If we invite to Gunung Kidul, how much does it cost, Sir?

B: Do you rent a complete facilities including instrumental tools, singer, and transportation?

A: Well. I offer you Rp 7 millions. You know the transport is expensive.

B: What an expensive cost. I think it costs Rp 3 millions.

Quote (3) indicates bald on-record politeness whereby interlocutors describe their ideas clearly and effectively. Cooperation was made because both of them are open to express their wants. The context of quote (3) is a negotiation of cost for a perform of Javanese traditional music in Gunung Kidul that takes its distance around 80 km from the house of the M. M offers a certain cost, and considering the cost is too high, C expects to reduce. Politeness is indicated in that both interlocutors maintain their conversation in a way to achieve harmony and friendship. The way the interaction takes place indicates on-record politeness, and the language choices to maintain harmony and cooperation are the positive politeness.

Excerpt (4) below is an example of negative politeness strategy, showing that an interlocutor has lower level than the other. However, negative politeness strategy is used to bargain by the customer and the manager uses persuasion to response the queries in context of positive politeness strategy.

(4) A: *Walah, mbok jangan segitu to Pak. Saya ini sebenarnya orang yang kurang punya, tapi saya sangat ingin mengundang Setyo Laras.*

B: *Saya jamin dah. Tidak mengecewakan.*

A: *Biaya Rp 5 millions*

B: *Saya jamin pasti asyik dan puas. Setyo Laras itu tok cer.*

A: Please reduce the cost. Frankly, I am not actually a rich person. I invite your group because I love Setyo Laras, your group.

B: Sure. I fully guarantee. You are satisfied.

A: Is it Rp 5,5 millions

B: I guarantee. Enjoyful and satisfied. Setyo Laras is so great.

Excerpt (4) is a conversation that presents negative politeness and positive politeness in one session. The negative politeness is indicated by A who performs as the lower level than B. By saying that "I am not a rich man but do expect to have the show", the speaker expects that his offer is accepted by A. To respond the offer, B performs a good persuasion that affectively encourages A's motivation. Replies concerning the reduction of the offer are not given by B, rather he persuades positively his sympathetic manner by saying "I guarantee you will be satisfied". As indicated by Brown & Levinson (1987) and Culpeper (2011) the success of applying politeness strategies indicates the power of language. More power contributes command of the language and the manipulation of politeness are the key success in the interactions.

Excerpt (5) is an example of negative impoliteness to scorn, indicating an impoliteness strategy used by B to respond A's queries. In this context, B as the manager scorns A to destroy A's face.

(5) A: *Istri dan anak saya menginginkan karawitan dari Mojogedang ini. Sekarang itu harganya berapa Mas?*

B: *Kalau Bapak tanya harga memang tinggi! Tetapi kalau tidak tanya harga hanya seadanya saja ya bisa. Karena tanya harga, jawaban saya ya jumlah angkanya. Rp 9 juta.*

A: *Wah, mbok jangan terlalu mahal.*

B: *Tidak mahal Mas. Sampeyan sudah saya kasih murah dan komplit. Teman-teman sini saya beri harha Rp 11 juta. Terserah sampeyan saja bagaimana.*

A: *My wife and son want to invite Karawitan from Mojogedang your group. Please inform me how much does it cost now?*

B: *So you asked the cost. I replied it is high. If you did not aske the cost, I can arrange in the acceptable rate. Because you asked the rate, my answer is the nukber of cost, that is Rp 9 millions.*

B: *What an expensive rate. No reduction?*

C: *It is not expensive. I already give you the lower and full services. Please confirm, customers here paid Rp 11 millions for the same service. So, it is you what to decide.*

The obvious evidence from excerpt (5) is that Costumer has shown his identity using negative politeness in order to bargain his offer to achive a lower cost to have a show of the *Karawitan*. The response from the Manager, however, is not as it is expected because the Manager uses negative impoliteness. This way, the offer to reduce the rate has been replied in the form of "scorn" using negative statement.

5. Conclusion and Implication

This study outlines politeness strategies and features of politeness in context of Javanese community to procure Javanese traditional entertainments. In summary, politeness strategies to use by Javanese community in Subosukowonosraten apply three major concerns: politeness techniques, politeness strategies and impoliteness strategies. Embedded in Javanese culture, each strategy is attributed by using Javanese culture that put harmony and agreement in any aspect of negotiation where indirect politeness and to lie politely are the most choices. Impoliteness strategy does occur in a certain settings where politeness strategy has to appear. This study however shows its limitation that more in-depth analysis pertaining to the reasons of politeness selection need more explorations. This implies that evidences between politeness strategies and impoliteness strategies are not balanced. Future research is suggested to explore the impoliteness strategies on Javanese cultural basis are developed more thoroughly.

References

- Adler, P.A & Adler, P. (1984). Observation Techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 377-392). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Alsharif, Abdullah Amerah & Alyousef, Suleiman Hesham. (2017). Negotiation and Impoliteness Strategies in Saudi and Australian Postgraduate Students' Email. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 8(4), 333-351. DOI: 10.24093/awej/vol8no4.23
- Al-Shboul, Y., & Huwari, I.F. (2016). A Comparative Study of Jordanian Arabic and American English Refusal Strategy. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 4(3), 50-62.
- Al-Shorman, A.R. (2016). Saudi and Jordanian Undergraduates' Complaining Strategies: A Comparative Intralanguage Educational Linguistic Study. *Arabian World English Journal*, 7(1), 203-228.
- Boden, D. (1995). Agendas and arrangements: Everyday Negotiations in Meetings. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace* (pp. 83-99). Tarrytown, NY: Elsevier.
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam, AMS: John Benjamins B. V.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, R. (2001). Living and Teaching Across Cultures. *International Studies Perspectives*, 2(2), 151-160. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1528-3577.00046>
- Coulmas, F. (2013). *Sociolinguistic: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2001). *Language and Characterisation: People in Plays and Other Texts*. New York, NY: Pearson

- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, B. (1990). The Domain of Pragmatics, In J. Richards and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 29-59). New York: Longman.
- Fitrah, Hidayat. D. N. (2018). Politeness: Cultural Dimensions of Linguistic Choice. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 5(1), 26-34. doi:10.15408/ijee.v5i1.
- Geertz, C. (1969). *The Religion of Java*. New York: The Free Press Glancoe.
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. *Psychiatry*, 18(3), 213-231.
- González, G., & DeJarnette, A. F. (2015). Teachers' and Students' Negotiation Moves when Teachers Scaffold Group work. *Cognition and Instruction*, 33(1), 1-45. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2014.987058>
- Grice, H.P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation" in P. Cole & Morgan (eds). *Syntax and Semantic Speech Acts*. New York: Academy Press.
- Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics*. (2 ed.). Oxford, OXF: Oxford University Press.
- Johanson, R. (1994). *Charles Dickens' Great Expectations: A Dramatization*. Woodstock: The Dramatic Publishing Company.
- Jensen, K.M. (1988). *Forms of Address in Indonesian*. LT. L. 81-82, 113-137.
- Kedveš, A. (2013). Face Threatening Acts and Politeness Strategies in Summer School Applications Calls. *Jezikoslovlje*, 14(2), 431-444.
- Kreishan, Lana. (2018). Politeness and Speech acts of Refusal and Complaint among Jordanian Undergraduate Students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*. 7(4), 68-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.4p.68>
- Lakoff. (1973). *The Logic of Politeness*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Lakoff. (1975). *An Analyzes of gender differences in the use of impoliteness strategies*. Retrieved from; <https://prezi.com/emtfk4hrnead/an-analysis-of-gender-differences-in-the-use-of-impoliteness/>
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *The Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford, OXF: Oxford University Press.
- Mirhosseini, Monir; Mardanshahi, Maryam & Downatabadi, Hamidreza. (2017). Impoliteness Strategies Based on Culpeper's Model: An analysis of gender differences between two characters in the movie Mother. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(3), 221-238.
- Mofidi, M., & Shoushtari, Z. G. (2012). A Comparative Study of the Complaint Strategies among Iranian EFL and ESL Students-The Study of the Effect of Length of Residence and the Amount of Contact. *English Lan- guage Teaching*, 5(11), 118.
- Mohammed, Nassrullah Hiba & Abbas, Fadhil Nawal. (2016). Impoliteness in Literary Discourse: A Pragmatic Study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 5(2), 76-89. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.2p.76
- Mullany, L. & Stockwell, P. (2010). *Introducing English Language: A Resource Book for Students*. Nottingham, NTT: Routledge.

- Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1979). *Tingkat Tutur Bahasa Jawa (The Speech Levels of Javanese)*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa DEPDIKBUD (Centre for Language Development and Maintenance of The Department of Education and Culture).
- Santosa, Riyadi. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Smith-Hefner, J. N. (1989). A Social History of Language Change in Highland East Java. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 48(2), 256-273.
- Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant Observations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sukarno. (2015). Politeness Strategies in Responding to Compliments in Javanese. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 4(2), 91-101.
- Susanto, D. (2014), The Pragmatic Meanings of Address Terms *Sampeyan* and *Anda*” *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1). pp. 140-155.
- Suseno, Franz-Magnis. (1997). *Javanese Ethics and World View*. The Javanese Idea of Good Life. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Thielemann, N. & Kosta, P. (Eds.). (2013). *Approaches to Slavic Interaction*. Amsterdam, AMS: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vu, Ngoc Minh. (2017). *Teaching pragmatic in English as a Foreign Language at a Vietnamese university: Teachers’ perceptions, curricular content, and classroom practices*. Unpublished Ph.D’ Dissertation. Sydney: Faculty of Educational and Social Work, University of Sydney.
- Watts, R., Ide, S. & Ehlich, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Politeness in Language Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. (2 ed.). Berlin, BL: Walter de Gruyter.
- Wieczorek, A. E. (2013). *Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse*. Newcastle, NEWC: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Young, H. P. (1991). *Negotiation Analysis*. Ann Arbor, MI, USA: University of Michigan Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zheng, S. (2015). A Study of Politeness Strategies in Persuasive English Business Letters from the Perspective of Londo's AIDA Formula. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(7), 1467-1475. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0507.20>