CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED THORIES

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of the discussions in discourse field which concern with the language as a system, but with how to use language. Leech (1993:8) proposes the pragmatics deals with meaning of utterance in the speaker's point of view. It means that pragmatics is the study of meaning involving the context. Yule (1996: 4) defines pragmatics as a study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the user of the forms. The advantage of the studying language via pragmatic is that one can talk about people intended meanings, their assumption, their purpose or goals, and the kinds of action that they are performing when they speak. So, studying pragmatics means we have to know the relation between language and context since these things are basic to an account of language understanding (Levinson 1997).

In comprehending in utterance meaning, pragmatics explores the language and what the user means. Brown and Yule (1983: 27) mention that there are four areas of pragmatic: those are speaker (I) as the producer of an utterance, the context (here) which an utterance is said, the hearer (you) as the receiver of an utterance, social relationship (this and that) between the speaker and the hearer.

Those are the obvious linguistic elements, which are required for the interpretation of the contextual information. Leech's (1993: 8) suggests a

similar definition of pragmatics. He states that pragmatics deals with meaning of utterance in the speaker's point of view. It means that pragmatics is the study of meaning involving the context. Charles Morris even (in Mey, 1993: 37) so far says that pragmatics is about everything human in the communication process, psychological, biological, and sociological.

Pragmatics tells us it's all right to use language in various, unconventional ways, as long as we know, as language users, what we are doing. Therefore, whatever the outcome o definition is, the language users become the prime point of view of attention in pragmatics (Mey, 1993: 36).

2.2 Politeness Strategy

Politeness is a strategy used in communication. Another definition provided by Yule (1996:60) is "politeness is the means employed to show awareness of another person's face." Similar definition suggested by Brown and Levinson is the concept of 'face'. It is 'public' self-image that every member wants to claim for himself (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61).

It is just like co-operative principles; politeness has also several principles gathered with its three maxims as one. Both politeness and co-operative principles often arouse conflict each other. Lakoff (in Cook, 1989: 32-33) has formulated these maxims as follows:

1. Do not impose

2. Give options

3. Make your receiver feel good

To avoid the feeling to be imposed of the being 'busy addressee, people usually precede such sentence like "excuse me, I'm sorry to brother you" by which we apologize for imposing. In English we often order, request and pleas (directives) in the form of elaborate questions ("would you like to….. could you mind…… may I ask you to…..") which provide the option and refusal. While by adding praise, it could make the hearer feel good, and so as to show his/ her good self-image (cook, 1989: 30).

Due to the face that 'face' represents the self image of person, every member of society who engages social interaction expect the opposite to recognize it. Hence, 'face' can unquestionable be treated as norm or value in society. Secondly, 'face' can be considered as the basic wants that every person desires. In every interaction the participants know about it (Brown and Levinson: 1987: 62).

Face has two aspects negative and positive ones. Brown and Levinson define negative face as "the wants of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by other"(*ibid,* 1987: 62). From the citation, it can be understood that negative face refers to the desire to be free to act as chosen and not to be put upon. Saving one's negative face means not to make the person feel being imposed by the speaker's speech. To deliver his intention, a speaker who wants to achieve his goals and save

the negative face of the hearer can convey it by choosing appropriate ways, one of which is indirectness. When a person, for example, wants to borrow a bicycle pump from his neighbor, he may state "Have you got bicycle pump?" this utterance, albeit in the form of question, is a request. The speaker (S) uses indirect statement in order to lessen his imposition to the hearer (H).

The definition of positive face is "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (ibid, 1987:62). For example, someone who have just bought a new BMW car (one of expensive car) but his friend says to him that it is just BMW car, it is not Rolls Royce. The owner of BMW car (Hearer) feels that his car is not all of the people can buy it. So that, the speaker can damage the hearer positive face. It means that positive face refers to the need to be liked, approved of, respected, or appreciated by others. It is a basic need that every person wants to be accepted or treated as a member of a group. Hence, positive 'face' represents the desire of a person that others will share his want. In a conversations, a speaker will show or emphasize or possibly use a register of the group, to have his goal thought of as desirable. The desire, according to Brown and Levinson, is not only about material things such as a car or bicycle pump, but also non-material things such as values (love, liberty, piety) and actions (joining to the club, going to theatre or studying together).

Since face can be damaged or lost, Brown and Levinson introduced the concept of Face-Threatening Acts (FTA) which refers to acts that potentially threaten face or the participants (speaker and/or addressee) of communication. Three kinds of acts that by their nature run opposing to the face wants of the addressee and/ or of the speaker (Brown and Levinson: 1987: 65), so there are two distinctions of FTAs. The first is acts that threaten negative face and those that threaten positive face. Request, order and reminding are some example for the former, while expressions of the latter. The second is acts which threaten the speaker's face and those which threaten the hearer's face. However, sometimes there is an overlap in the identification though there have already been a distinction of FTAs. It is since some FTAs potentially endanger both positive and negative face (Brown and Levinson 1987: 67-68).

In order to avoid the FTAs one can say something indirectly, for example, one can sigh loudly, shake his/ her head, or give other signs. On the other hand, if one wants to hold FTAs, he/ she can do it on record or off record. It is called off record when one says something indirectly, for instance, he/ she says something to himself/ herself loudly enough for others to hear. This is done on purpose so that others who hear it might give response.

When one says something directly to the addressee, it is called on record. The most direct approach is known as bald on record (Yule, 1996:

63). This is actually a direct speech act used to make a suggestion, request, offer, and invitation. This bald on record tends to contain imperative without mitigating devices, such as please, *would you? , would you mind?*. However, to soften this bald on record, mitigating devices should be used.

In the context of maintaining each other's face, S and H will try to avoid the FTAs, or employ a kind of strategies to lessen the threat. To do so, he will allow for the relative weightings of at least three wants; those are the want to communicate the content of FTAs, the want to be efficient or urgent, and he want to maintain H's face to any degree. If they want to be efficient or urgent is not greater than others, S will desire to lessen the threat of his act to H's face (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 68). According to Brown and Levinson, the first decision that has to be made is whether to perform the FTA. There are four possibilities of strategies of 'on record'. They are bald on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. The other one set is 'off record' strategy.

2.2.1 Positive Politeness

The positive politeness is oriented to safety the positive face, positive self-image, of addressee. Doing a Face Threatening Act (FTA) by using this strategy means that S (speaker) considers that he wants. H's (heares) wants (or actions/acquisition, values result them) e.g. by treating H as a member of his group, a friend, or a person whose desires and personality traits are known liked. By doing so, the potential face damage may be minimized. In positive politeness, the area of redress in not restricted to the particular face want

transgressed by the FTA's, but extended to the appreciation of H's desires of the expression of similarity between ego and S's and H's desires (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 101).

The use of intimate language gives a repressive *force to the* linguistic of positive politeness. Moreover, positive politeness is usable to promote or maintain social relationship between S and H since S attempt to get closer to H. this strategy consists of three main strategies involving some sub-strategies.

2.2.1.1 Main strategy 1: Claim Common Ground

The first type of positive politeness is that S claims common ground with H by showing that both of them are in the same group or level and sharing particular desires such as values and goals. Claiming the common ground can be performed in three different ways: S expresses that he admires or is interested in H's desires, S emphasizes that both he and H belong to the same group, therefore both of them share the same desires; finally, S claims come non point of view with H without referring to in-group membership. The first eight sub-strategies of positive politeness belong to this main strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 103).

Strategy 1: Notice, attend to H's interest, wants, needs, goals

This strategy generally suggests S giving attend on to some aspects of H's conditions like noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, or anything which seems as if H would want S to notice and

endorse it. It is an example, *"Goodness, you cut, your hair! By the way, I come to borrow some flour.*

Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)

This strategy is quite similar to the previous strategy. However, S's intention or sympathy to H is indicated own exaggerating intonation, stress, and other aspects prosodic, as well as with intensifying modifiers. The example is *"what a fantastic garden you have!"* The other feature that can be used to indicate S's sympathy is the using of exaggerative or emphatic words, such as *for sure, really, exactly, and absolutely,* for example, *Now absolutely marvelous* (ibid, 1987: 104-106).

Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H

S may communicate the share of his wants to H by intensifying the interest of S's own contribution to the conversations by creating a good story. The use of 'vivid present' is a common feature of positive politeness conversation for it pulls H's right into the middle of the events being conversed, metaphorically at any rate, thus increasing their intrinsic interest to him, for example, *I come down the stairs, and what do you think I see? - a huge mess all over the place, the phone's off the hook and clothes are scattered all over…….*

Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers

It suggests that claiming implicitly the common ground with H, S

can use in-group membership identity marker. The forms of it are in-group usages of address, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis. The address forms included generic names and terms like *mac, mate, buddy, pal, honey, dear, cutie,* and *guys* are the common address forms *(ibid, 1987:* 107)

Strategy 5: Seek agreement

Seeking agreement of H is one of the characteristics of claiming common ground. S can achieve this condition by raising 'safe topics'. In this way, S is allowed to stress his agreement with H and satisfy H's want to be `right', or to be corroborated in his opinion. Small talk about weather, sickness, or politics, and current local issues are some examples of 'safe topics'. When S, for example, wants to borrow something from H, he might open the conversation by stating *today is very hot, isn't it... By the way I want to borrow your hammer. You don't use it, do you?* Another topic that can be chosen as 'safe topic" is H's possession like *isn't your new car a beautiful color?* The more S knows about H (e.g. home, children), the more safe topics that S can pursue with H(Brown and Levinson*, 1987: 112).*

Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

In order to satisfy H's positive face, S should avoid disagreement with H. One of the strategies to achieve such circumstance is by

pretending that S agrees with H's statement. This strategy is called *'taken agreement'*.

This strategy is commonly used in request when someone wants to refuse one's request he lies or pretends that there are reasons why he cannot fulfill the request. In this situations, both S and H possibly realize that the reason is not true, but S has saved H's positive face but not refusing the request baldly, for example in response to a request to borrow a radio *"oh, I can't. The battery is dead". (*Brown and Levinson, 1987:116)

Strategy 7.**Presuppose/raise/assert common ground**

In this case, Brown and Levinson use the word presuppose loosely, that is the speaker presupposes something when he presumes that it is mutually taken for granted. Firstly, as may presuppose knowledge of H's wants and attitudes. In doing so, as can use negative questions, which presume 'yes' as an answer, to indicate that he knows H's wants, and therefore partially redress the imposition of FTA, for example, we can say for offers *wouldn't you like a drink?* Or for opinions, *isn't it a beautiful day?* Secondly, to redress the imposition of FTAs, S may presuppose familiarity in S-H relationship. The use of familiar address forms like *darling, honey, mate, Mac, or buddy* indicate that the addressee is familiar and therefore soften the threat of FTA, for example *look, you're pal of mine, so how about...* (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 122-123)

Strategy 8: Joke

Alternative strategy to share common ground (background or values) is by creating a joke. Brown and Levinson state that joke is a basic technique of positive politeness. It is since by making a joke, S can put H at ease, e.g. in responding to a faux pass of H's and minimizes an FTA of requesting as well as in *how about lending me this old heap of junk?* (H's new Cadillac)' (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 124).

2.2.1.2 Main strategy II: Convey that S and H are cooperator

The second major of positive politeness is that S conveys that both he and H are cooperators in a relevant activity. By creating such condition S can redress H's positive face wants. This cooperative condition can be obtained by several ways: S indicate his knowledge and sensitivity of H's wants (strategy 9). S claims some kinds of reflexivity between his and H's wants – either that S wants H's for H or by a point of view flip that H wants S's want for S (strategy 10, 11, 12 and 13), and the last, S indicate that he believes that they (S and H) are in some ways tied into a condition of reciprocally mutual helping (strategy 14) (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 125).

Strategy 9: assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants

The first way to show that S and H are cooperator is by declaring or implying knowledge of H's wants and willingness.

Implying knowledge of H's wants and willingness allow S to put a pressure on H to cooperate with him, e.g. to receive the speaker's request. Negative questions sometimes function to achieve such situation, for example for request or offer, *look, I know you can't bear parties, but this one will really be good-do come! (Ibid, 1987: 125).*

Strategy 10: Offer, promise

Another way to satisfy H's positive politeness is by stressing that whatever H wants, S wants for him and will help to obtain. S may state offers and promises to create such condition with a purpose S's good intentions in redressing H's positive face wants even if they are false. For example, *I'll drop by sometimes next week (ibid, 1987: 125).*

Strategy 11: Be optimistic

The cooperative strategy can be performed by assuming that H wants what S wants for himself (or for both of them) and H will help S to obtain it. On contrary of strategy 10, this strategy suggests S being presumptuous that H will cooperate with him for their mutual shared interest. Being presumptuous or optimistic allows S to put pressure on H to cooperate with him, for example *look I'm sure you won't mind if I borrow your typewriter* or *you'll lend me your lawnmower for the weekend, I hope.* These optimistic expressions of FTA appear to be successful by reducing the size of face threat – implying that the cooperation between S and H will only take a small thing to be granted

by using certain expressions like a little, a bit, for a second, etc. – or sometimes softening the presumptuousness with a taken tag like in *I'm borrowing your scissors for a second – OK?* Or *I just drop by for a minute to invite you all for tea tomorrow - you will com, won't you?* (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 126-127).

Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity

Including both S and H in the activity is another way to perform cooperative strategy. By using word 'we' (inclusive form), so it is commonly used to make H involved in S's action thereby redress FTA. Some common examples are *let's have a cookie, then (i.e. me), give us a break* and *I will do it for our benefit.* This strategy is often used to soften request where S pretend Is as if H wanted the requested think to, and offers where S pretend as if S were as eager as H to have the action, for example *"We (inclusive) want your salt, We (inclusive) will shut the door ma'am. The wind's coming in"*(Brown and Levinson, 1987 127-128).

Strategy 13: give (or ask for) reasons

This is still related to strategy 12. Including H and S's action can be done by giving reasons in respect of why S wants what he wants. Giving reason or asking for is a way of implying 'A can help you' or 'you can help me', and assuming cooperation, a way of showing what help is needed. This fact directs to pressure to go off record, to

investigate and see H whether or not he is cooperative. If he seems to be, the context is probably enough to push the off- record reason into on record request or offer. Hence, indirect suggestions which lead to demand rather than give reason are a conventionalized positive politeness forms.

This strategy generally use the word 'why not' in performing the FTA, like *why not lend me your cottage for the weekend?* And *why don't we go to the seashore.* It implies that if S has good reasons why H should not or cannot cooperate. The strategy can also be used to criticize H's past action why he did or did not do something without any good reason, e.g. *Why didn't you do the dishes (ibid, 1987: 128),*

Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

This strategy suggests that giving evidence of reciprocal rights or obligation obtaining between S and H can be used to claim or urge the existence of cooperation between S and H. it means that S may 'I'll do X for you if you do Y for me or 'I did X for you last week. For example: *I'll give you the bonus if you can sell a mechine.* In this way, S may soften his FTA by negating the dept aspect (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 129).

2.2.1.3 Main strategy III: Fulfill H's want for some X

The last positive politeness strategy is that S decides to redress H's positive face directly by granting some of H's wants. It indicates that

S wants what H wants for H. This strategy can be done by giving H gift like real thing (goods) or abstract thing (like sympathy) *(ibid,* 1987: 129).

Strategy 15: Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, understanding, cooperation)

Lastly, to satisfy H's face S may grant H what H wants e.g. by giving gifts to H, not only tangible gift which indicates that S knows H's wants and wants them to be fulfilled, but also human relations wants like the wants to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, listened to and so on *(ibid,* 1987:129).

2.2.2 Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is oriented to satisfy H's negative face, his basic want to be free and unimpeded. It means that the speaker recocnizes and respects the addressee's freedom of action and will not (or will only minimally) impede it. The characteristics of negative politeness are self-effacement; formality and restraint, with attention to very limited aspects of H's self image, focusing on H's want to be unimpeded. In this strategy, the FTA is equipped with apologies for transgressing, with linguistic and non linguistic deference, with hedges on illocutionary force of the act, with impersinalizing mechanism that make S and H distant from the act, and other alleviating mechanism that make H feel there is no force on his response (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 70).

2.2.2.1 Be direct

This strategy is derived from the ascpect of negative politeness that specifies on record delivery of the FTA, whereas, other strategies are derived from the aspec od redressing H's negative face. According to R. Lakoff (in Brown and Levinson, 1987: 130), coming rapidly to the point to minimize the imposition and avoiding the further imposition of prolixity and obscurity is the most important feature of politeness. Therefore, when someone chooses this strategy to convoy his message e.g. request, he will face the dilemma between the desire to deliver the FTA on record as bald on record usage and the desire to save H's face negative face. However, Brown and Levinson disagree with this statement. They argue that even thought the desire to go on record provides a pressure to deliver the FTA directly, it is a desire that never convey it baldly. Hence, it can be stated that choosing negative politeness strategy appears a natural tension between two wants, namely the want to go on record (be direct) and the want to go off record (indirect) to avoid imposing or transgressing. To overcome this problem, Brown and Levinson suggest that speaker employs conventional indirectness (1987: 130).

Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

Conventional indirect speech act is unambiguious sentence or phrases (by virtue of conventionalization) which contextually have different meaning from its internal meaning. In many contexts there are many sentences which are conventionally understood differently from its

literal meaning e.g. questions are used to make request or assertion, imperatives to make offers, asserstion to command. This strategy encodes the clash of desires. The desire of going on record and the desire of going off record and partially allow the speaker to achieve both. For example when someone says "can you pass the salt?" it is understandable as a request for salt (not asking about the addressee's potential abilities) (*ibid,* 1987: 132-133).

2.2.2.2 Do not persume/ assume

To satisfy H's negative face S should carefully avoid presuming or assuming what H desires or believes in FTA, or H's personal interest such as his want, interest or what is worthy of his attention, in other word, S would keep ritual distance from H (*ibid,* 1987: 144)

Strategy 2: Question, hedge

The second strategy which is derived from the desire not to persume and the desire not to coerce H, is using hedge. Hedge is a particle word, or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of as predicate or noun phrase in set. It involves particle like *really, sincerely, certainly,* as in *"he really did run that way"* or *"I tell you he certainly run that way"* (ibid, 1987: 145)

2.2.2.3 Do not Coerce II

Another way to satisfy H's negative face is avoiding coercing him especially when FTA involves predicating act of H such as requesting help to offering something which needs H's acceptance. This condition can be created by explicitly giving H the option not to do the expected act. By assuming that H is not likely to do the act, there by this makes easy for H to open out. The second way to avoid coercing H is by minimizing the threat of coercion by clarifying the P (Power), D (Distance), and R (ranking of imposition) values (*ibid,* 1987: 172)

Strategy 3: Be pessimistic

His strategy suggests that H is not likely to do his expected act. It means that S should be pessimistic about H's response. There are three important realizations of this strategy, namely the use of negative (with a tag), the use of subjunctive, and the use of remote-possibility markers. Some examples can be given as follows: (*ibid,* 1987:173-175)

1. *You could not by any chance pass the salt, could you? – (the use of negative tag)*

2. *Could you do me a favor?-(the use of subjunctive)*

3. *Perhabs you'd care to help me. -(the use of remote possibility markers)*

Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition, Rx

Another strategy to avoid coercing H is minimizing the imposition on H by inserting some expression like *just, a drop, a tiny little bit* and *a bit in his remarks.* These expression function to delimit the extent of FTA. Some examples of the use of such expressions are *'I just ask you if I can borrow a tiny bit of paper', 'could I have a taste (chi, slice) of that cake?',* and *'just a second.'(chi. A few minutes) (ibid,* 1987: 177).

Strategy 5: give deference

This strategy suggests that S considers H being in higer social status than him. There are two ways to actualize this one; one in which S humbles and *lowers* himself and the other in which S raises H's position or threats H as superior. (*ibid,* 1987: 178)

2.2.2.4 Commubicate S's want to not impinge on H

The other strategy to satisfy H's negative face is by indicating that S recognize H's negative face demands and takes them into account in his decision to communicate the FTA. This strategy produced two kinds of sub strategies namely apologizing (strategy 6) and conveying implicatly S's reluctance for being imposing on H, the latter can be carried out by dissociating S and H from the infringement. The dissociation can be obtained by various ways; those are by making it unclear who the agent of the FTA is, by being fuzzy about who H is

(strategy 7), by phrasing the FTA as general principle (strategy 8), and by de-streesing the act of imposing by nominalizing the expression of the FTA (strategy 9) (*ibid,* 1987: 187-190)

Strategy 6: Apologize

The next strategy to show that S does not mean to impinge H is apologizing. By apologizing for doing FTA, S indicates his reluctance to impose on H's negative face. Some expressions that can be used are *I'm sure you must be very busy, but......,I know this is a bore, but, or I hope this isn't going to brother you too much. (ibid,* 1987: 187).

Strategy 7: impersonalize S and H

The seventh strategy is to indicate that S does not want to impinge on H's negative face is to phrase the FTA as though the agent were other than S, or at least possibly not S alone, and the addressee were other than H, or only inclusive of H. This strategy result an avoidance of the pronoun 'I' and 'you' is another technique to save H's negative face. For example S may use performatives such as in *it is so* instead of *I tell you that it is so and do this for me* instead of *I ask you to do this for me.*

Strategy 8: State the FTA as general rule

Another way to distance S and H from the impingement in FTA is by conveying that S does not intend to impinge, but is merely forced to by circumtances, general rule, or obligation. The example is *international*

regulations require that the fuselage be sprayed with DDT, the commite request the president... and *the late comers cannot be seated till the next interval* (ibid, 1987: 206-207)

Strategy 9: Nominalize

It suggests that S can minimize the threat of his FTA and save H's negative face by nominalizing the subject, the verb phrase and even the complement of his utterance. For example: *I am surprised at your failure to replay* instead of *I am surprised that you failed to replay*.   Hence, the sentences become more formal as the speaker nominalizes the subject, predicate, or complement. It is because intuitively the more nouny expression, the more removed the speaker or/and the addressee is from doing, feeling for being something *(ibid,* 1987: 208).

2.2.2.5 Redress other wants of H's

The last higher-order strategy of negative politeness is offering partial compensation for the face threat or damage in FTAby satisfying or redressing other wants of H's. Nevertheless, the wants which are compensated are very limited for negative politeness focus on a narrow band of H's wants. Or a narrow face of person. However from the core of negative politeness namely satisfying, H's desire for territorial integrity and self determination other want can be derived such as a higher power. There are two strategies naturally emerged; those are giving deference

(strategy 5) and going on record as incurring a debt (strategy 10) *(ibid,* 1987: 209).

Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H

This suggest S may redress his FTA by ecplicitly conveying his indebtedness to H or disclaiming any indebtedness of H. These are the example in request. S may state *I'd be eternally grateful if you would...* or I'll never be able to replay you if you....; or for offer he may say *I could easily do it for you or it for you or it wouldn't be any trouble; I have to go right by there anyway (ibid,* 1987: 210)

3.3 Previous Studies

The previous study about Politeness Strategies that are quite helpful for this research. Almost 27 years (1987-2014) the theory of Brown and Levinson has been used and applied in many linguistic study and research, especially the study of politeness and any other studies related to linguistic politeness. The writer will show the similar focus in the study. First, "*Politeness Strategies In The Interaction Between Santriwati and Ustadz/Ustadzah In Pesantren Zainul Hasan"* as the title by Wardatun Nadzifah student of English department of Airlangga University of Surabaya 2012. This study on Politeness Strategies used in the interaction between santriwati and ustadz/ ustadzah in Pesantren Zainul Hasan was conducted to examine the types of Politeness Strategies employed by both santriwati and ustadz/ ustadzah. Further, a case study qualitative approach by doing observation based on the politeness strategies

theory based on the theory proposed by Brown and Levinson. There are two research's questions, there are: 1.What kind of Politeness strategies are used in the interaction between santriwati and ustadz/ ustadzah in Pesantren Zainul Hasan? 2. What factors motivated santriwati and ustadz/ ustadzah of Pesantren Zainul Hasan to employ politeness strategies in their interactions?

Second, the thesis titled "*Politeness Strategies used by Joe and Kathleen in You've Got Mail*" by Ilena Wongso student of English department of Petra Christian University 2005. She uses 'You've Got Mail' as the source to investigate the politeness strategies based on Brown and Levinson theory that are used in the movie. The film is a romantic comedy set in the age of e-mail based around the remake of the 1940 film. There are several questions about politeness expression as follows: 1. What are the politeness strategies producted by Kathleen when speaking to Joe? 2. What are the politeness strategies by Joe when speaking to Kathlen? 3. Which politeness strategies are mostly used by Kathleen and Joe?

Third, the thesis titled "The Politeness Strategies used by Sebastian in the film Cruel Intention" by Anne Darsono Hadi student of English department of Petra Christian University 2000. In her study, she intends to find out the politeness strategies used by Sebastian when conversing with Kathryn and Annete, the factors for the choice of each strategy and analyze the influence of Sebastian's relationship with Kathryn and Annette to the choice strategy. The problem of the research is whether Sebastian, the main male character in the film Cruel Intentions, uses different politeness strategies or not when

conversing with two main female characters in the film; Kathryn and Annete and which strategy is used the most to each character. This problem then, leads to what factors and reasons that affect the usage of each strategy and how Sebastian's relationship with Kathtyn and Annete influences his usage of politeness strategies.

Based on the previous study above, this research has similar study. Politeness strategies but the writer only focuses on Positive and Negative Politeness strategies in the same theory that used in this research but has different topic of object. The writer analyzes the conversation among the characters in *Despicable Me 2* movie. In this research, the writer uses Qualitative method to analyze her research. The writer chooses that previous study to her references because it has some things that relevant with her research.

Table 2.5 previous studies

No	Researcher	Title	Technique of data	Data	Result
1.	Wardatun Nadzifah	*Politeness Strategies In The Interaction Between Santriwati and Ustadz/Ustadzah In Pesantren Zainul Hasan*	Recording and transcribing the data	The conversation among santriwati and ustad/ustadzah by using Indonesia language	Mostly used positive politeness and bald off record
2.	Ilena Wongso	*Politeness Strategies used by Joe and Kathleen in You've Got Mail*	Watching the movie and read the scripts that she got from internet	Western movie which were the main characters, Kathleen and Joe and other characters are excluded	The main characters used four kinds of Politeness strategies. Mostly Joe used

					positive politeness to Kathleen.
3.	Anne Darsono Hadi	*The Politeness Strategies used by Sebastian in the film Cruel Intention*	Watching the movie and used film's transcription	Western movie which were the main character, Sebastian	The main character, Sebastian applies more Positive Politeness to female characters.