CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1. Conclusion

In this research, the writer analyzes variation of address term and the social factor of address term in Percy Jackson and The Olympians: Lightning Thief novel. The writer has found 51 data that applied address term proposed by Wardhaugh's theory which applied by 9 characters including main character from the novel. Furthermore, they address in the form of First Name (FN), Last Name (LN), Title plus Last Name (TLN), combination of First name and Last Name (FN + LN), Pet Name (PN), Kinship (K), Title only (T) and Mockery (M).

The writer concludes that the dominant type of address term is mockery (M) with 15 data which are commonly referred to Percy Jackson character. In the second rank is pet name with 14 data is associated with Percy Jackson character. The third highest frequency is Name terms which include First name (FN), Last Name (LN), Title + Last name (TLN) and a combination of First Name and Last Name (FN+LN). The fourth is Title only (T) which found 7 data. The fifth is kinship found only 4 data.

To start with, First Name (FN) is mostly influenced by intimacy between the addresser and addressee which means both of them have a close relationship. Then, Last name (LN) is a form of address influenced by distance between the addresser and addressee which means both of them have a low solidarity relationship. Also, a

55

person addressed by their title and their last name (TLN) used to shows distance relationship or inferiority. Thus, the most influencing factors in the use TLN are Distance and different scale. Also, a combination of First Name and Last Name (FN + LN) or it can also be said a full name term where someone addressed by their full name. FN+LN mostly influenced by distance between the addresser. There are 7 data of Title (T) term which are commonly affected by distance and formal situation between the addresser and addressee which means the solidarity of the participants is low and this type is likely more formal than Title plus Last Name (TLN). Furthermore, there are 14 data of Pet Name (PN) which commonly influenced by intimacy between the addresser and addressee which means both of them have a close relationship such as friend – friend, and parents – child relationship of participants. The last but not the least, there are 4 data of Kinship (K) which are mostly influenced by intimacy between the addresser and addressee that have family relation. Finally, Mockery term commonly influenced by social distance between participants which means both of them have a low solidarity relationship.

Following the conclusion, it is described that there are 4social factors influenced the occurrence of address terms. However, each of them have different strength to give impact in the choice of address term. There are two social factors that mostly influenced the address terms in the study, they are distance and intimacy.

First, distance as social scale of participant. It is the most influential factors of occurrence of various address terms where this describe low solidarity between the addresser and the addressee. Distance mostly occur on participants who has different

social scale such as superior to subordinate or vice versa. It can be seen in type of address term of Title (T), Title plus Last Name (TLN), Last name (LN), combination of First name plus Last Name (FN+LN), and Mockery (M). God – Demigod, Student – teacher, stranger people, Senior – new comer, and enemy to enemy.

Second, Intimacy as social scale of participants, the second most influential factor of various address term that occurs on the close relationship between participants such as friend – friend, parent – children, and between stranger person with intention to show closeness to the addressee. It can be seen on First Name (FN), Pet Name (PN), Kinship (K), and also Mockery (M) where the participants have close relationship but use mockery term to joke among friends.

5.2. Suggestion

After conducting the research, the writer recognizes that this study has several flaws in limitation data and analyze of data that should be covered by the next writer. The writer hopes this research could be useful knowledge and could help the next researcher in conduct research of address terms of sociolinguistics. Additionally, this research is far from perfect because it is based on the writer's interpretation and description, which reflect only a superficial understanding of the topic. As a response, the writer provides suggestions for the next writer. In this research, writer found obstacle in using Wardhaugh's theory for analyzing the type of address terms. The author suggests that future researchers use the address term theory from Dunklings (1990), Braun (1988), or Chaika (1982) as a theoretical base of address term.

Because, as claimed by the writer, their theory is more comprehensive than Wardhaugh's theory in this study.

Many researchers did analysis in variation of address term. The writer believes that next study could do a research with new variation of address term in deeper understanding as language always develop. The next researcher could use the latest theory of address term and its factors to have a better understanding the data and to be able doing analysis.