

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter consists of pragmatics, politeness strategies, and the previous of the study.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning (Thomas, 1995:3). It means that people also consider to whom they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstance. It is because particular context may influence what is said by the speaker. The advantage of the studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumption, their purpose or goals, and the kinds of action that they are performing when they speak.

Brown and Yule (1983: 27) mention that there are four areas of pragmatics: 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. It explains that the speaker and hearer must understand the regulation when they talk to each other.

Leech's (1983: 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. Pragmatics tells us it is 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 or definition is, the language users become the prime point of view of attention in pragmatics (Mey, 1993: 36).

2.2 Politeness Strategies

Politeness is the expression of the speaker's intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003:6). It is considered as the way how to deal with people who have conversation with other people which expression of faces are important to respect during the conversation. Politeness in an interaction can also be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face (Yule, 1996:60). Therefore being polite consists of attempting to save face for another. Face is a mask that changes depending on the audience and the social interaction (Goffman cited in Brown and Levinson, 1987:61). It means that people have different expression to show to different people when they are talking. Face can thus be likened to person's self-esteem (Huang, 2007:116). It means that face can be a reflection for the person himself or herself. By keeping, the expression during conversation can show characters or attitudes. When a person has interaction to another, he or she can keep their utterance or habit politely. Politeness strategies are meant for supporting or enhancing the addressee's positively to avoid uncomfortable feelings during conversation (Watts, 2003:86).

Face consists of two aspects, positive face and negative face. The definition of positive face is the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others (Brown Levinson, 1987:62). It means that positive face

describes a person's desire and need to be liked, appreciated, approved and accepted by others. It is a basic need that every person wants to be accepted or treated as a member of a group. As the example:

A: look at that, wow! He got here by a Lamborghini.

B: Yeah, I see. The conversation shows when a friend comes by super car.

A is amazed, but **B** just acts normal like nothing happens. It seems **B** is not surprised than much as **A** does. It can be said that **B** is not kind of person who is easily impressed with super car. Therefore, **B** has made positive face **A** threatened. The previous event happens between A and B who is neighbors which they do not have a close relation that makes A do not feel respected. Brown Levinson defines Negative face as the wants of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by other (1987:62). It can be understood that negative Face is the need not to be imposed upon or disturbed. When the statement turns into a command, it is also called threatening face which can interrupt someone else's activities for getting bothered by doing favor. An example when someone is reading a newspaper, and suddenly someone else gets him or her to do something else. It makes the person who is reading a newspaper feels threatened because he or she is bothered by a command from someone else to do a favor because A and B do not know each other.

Brown and Levinson (1987:65) argue that a FTA often requires a mitigating statement or some sort of politeness, or the line of communication will break (cited in Makhmudiyah, 2014:13). It means that the importance of decreasing FTA can fix the face and has to use politeness strategies to decrease

that threat. With this understanding, the definition of politeness can be understood in relation to face. Therefore, four possibilities of politeness strategies are needed to minimize FTA. The strategies are bald on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. The other one set is 'off record' strategy.

2.2.1 Bald On record strategy

Actually, someone who wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy H's face usually uses bald on record. However, there are different kinds of bald on record usage in different circumstances, because S can have different motives for his want to do the FTA with maximum efficiency. These fall into two classes: those where the face threat is not minimized, where face is ignored; and those where in doing the FTA baldly on record, S minimized face threats by implication.

Bald on record is usually used by speakers who hold a high relative power over the hearer of a lower one, between intimates or in urgent situation, for example: “*Open the window!*”

Strategy 1: Cases of non-minimization of the face threat (1987:95)

It is used where maximum efficiency is very important and mutually known to both S and H, which no face redresses, is necessary.

For example: *don't burn your hands!*

Strategy 2: Cases of FTA-oriented bald on record usage (1987:98)

The orientation of this strategy is actually the face of the hearer and usually used in welcoming (or post-greetings), farewells and offers.

For example : 1. *Come in!*
2. *Wash your hands!*

2.2.2 Positive Politeness Strategy

Positive politeness strategy shows that your hearer has a desire to be respected (Brown and Levinson, 1978). It means that hearer could possibly have good friendship with the speaker, which both has a trust to make quality time in conversation. Positive politeness is approach that minimizes social distance. It is usually seen in groups of friends, or where people in the given social situation know each other fairly well. It attempts to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendliness and solid interest to the Hearer's need. Related to positive politeness, Brown and Levinson (1987: 101-129) propose fifteen kinds strategies as follows:

Strategy 1: Notice, attend to Hearer (his interest, wants, needs, goods)
(1987:103)

In this strategy, the speaker should notice the condition of the hearer (noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, anything that looks as though hearer would want speaker to notice and approve of it).

For example:

1. *Goodness, you cut your hair! (...) by the way, I came to borrow some flour.*
2. *You must be hungry; it's a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch?*

Besides, the speaker should notice the FTA made by hearer, for example a breakdown of body control or any faux pas and indicate that the hearer is not embarrassed by it.

(1987:104)

For example: *What a fantastic garden you have!*

Speaker brings hearer into the middle of the events, which is discussed to intensify the interest of speaker's contribution by making a good story.

I come down the stairs, and what do you think I see? - a huge mess all over place, the phones of the hook and clothes are scattered all over...

Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers (1987:107-111)

1. Address forms. It is to express such in group membership which includes generic names and terms of address, such as honey,

A: Ann went to Paris this week
B: To Paris!

Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement (1987:113-116)

1. **Token disagreement.** The speaker pretends to agree by twisting his/her utterances in order to hide disagreement that is to respond “yes” rather than “no”.

For example:

A: *So they haven't heard a word, huh*
B: *Not a word. Not at all. Except Clara maybe.*

2. Pseudo-agreement. The speaker uses *then* as a conclusory marker, an indication that the speaker is drawing conclusion to a line of reasoning carried out cooperatively with the hearer.

For example:

I'll meet you in front of the theatre just before 8.0, then.

3. White lies. It is where the speaker wants to lie rather than damage hearer positive's face when the speaker should state the opinion.
4. Hedging opinions. The speaker chooses to be vague about his own opinions, so as not to be seen to disagree.

For example: *I really sort of hope.....*

Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert common ground (1987:117-124)

There are several kinds of these strategies:

3. Presupposition manipulation. The speaker presupposes something when he presumes that it is mutually taken for granted.

i) 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.

ii) Presuppose hearer's values are the same as speaker's value. The preference for extremes on value scales is the feature of positive politeness. It claims that speaker and hearer have the same values with respect to the relevant predicate, the same definition of what the scale is.

For example: We can say for offers “*wouldn't you like a drink*” Or
for opinions, *isn't it a beautiful day?*

iii)Presuppose familiarity in S-H relationship. The use of familiar address forms is to presuppose that the addressee is ‘familiar’ and soften the threat of FTAs.

For example: *look, you're pal of mine, so how about...*

iv)Presuppose hearer's knowledge, the use codes , jargon and local terminology) to show that the hearer understands and shares the associations of the code.

Strategy 8: Joke

Brown and Levinson stated Jokes are based on mutual shared background knowledge and values that they redefine the size of FTA. S can put H at ease.

Example: when a speaker wants to borrow his friend's new Cadillac by saying, "*How about lending me this old heap of junk?*" (1867:124). the word "old heap junk" is part of conversation with joke.

Strategy 9: Assert or Presuppose S's Knowledge of and Concern for H's Wants (1987:125).

The first way to show that S and H are cooperators 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 have a 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!*”

Strategy 10: Offer, promise (1987:125).

Speaker claims that whatever hearer wants, speaker will help to get, to show speakers good intentions in satisfying hearer's positive faces wants. Even if the offers or promises are false, they demonstrate speaker's good intentions in satisfying hearer's positive face wants.

For example: *I'll drop by sometimes next week.*

Strategy 11: Be optimistic (1987:126)

Speaker assumes that hearer wants speaker's wants for speaker (or for both) and will help to obtain them. The speaker is confident that the hearer will cooperate with the speaker.

For example: *You'll lend me your lawnmower for the weekend, won't you?*

For example:

I know I must be absolutely stupid but I simply can't understand this book.

(In asking for help)

Mr. President, if I thought you were trying to protect someone I would have walked out.

Strategy 6: Apologies (1987:187)

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.

For example:

I'm sure you must be very busy, but.....,I know this is a bore, but, or I hope this isn't going to bother you too much.

Strategy 7: Impersonalize speaker and hearer (1987:190)

To indicate that speaker does not want to impinge on hearer is by expressing the FTA as if the agent is other than speaker and the addressee is other than the hearer. This causes the speaker to avoid using of the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘You’.

For example: “*take this out*” is more polite than “*you take this out!*”

Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule (1987: 206)

In order to minimize the FTA, the speaker states the FTA as general social rule, regulation or obligation so that by doing this, the speaker knows that I is not his own intention to do the FTA instead the circumstances are the one that forces him to do it.

For example:

Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the rain (not 'you will please refrain from flushing toilets on the rain')

Strategies 9: Nominalize (1987:208)

The speaker changes the verb or adjective in a sentence into noun in order to be more polit. It also wants to show degree of formality.

For example:

'I am surprised at your failure to replay' instead of 'I am surprised that you failed to replay'.

Strategy 10: Go On-record as incurring a debt or as not indebting Hearer
(1987: 210)

Subject can directly state his debt toward hearer when he asks hearer for help.

For example: *I'd be eternally grateful if you would... (request)*

It wouldn't be any trouble: I have to go right by there anyway.
(offers)

2.2.4 Off Record Strategies

Off record is an indirect politeness strategy in which the speaker says something that can be interpreted in more than one. It means that if a speaker wants to do an FTA, but wants to avoid the responsibility for doing it, he can do it off record and leave it up to addressee to decide how to interpret it. In other words, we can say that off record is an indirect way of saying something that may cause a face damaging interpretation. Usually the form of the utterance is in declarative sentence, for instance, “this room is very hot”. By using this strategy the speaker wants the hearer to assume and give response, “I’ll open the window”. This response means that the hearer is being cooperative and that the speaker has

shown himself or herself as not being forceful. According Brown and Levinson, off record consists of 15 strategies as stated below:

Strategy 1: Give Hints (1987:213)

S says something that is not explicitly relevant; he lets H to search for an interpretation on the possible relevance.

For example: “*this soup’s a bit bland*” (c.i Pass the salt)

Strategy 2: Give Association Clues (1987: 215)

S mentioning something associated with the act required of H, either by precedent in S-H's experiences or by mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience.

For example: “*Oh God, I have got a headache again*” (it may be used to convey a request to borrow *H*’s swimming suit, if *S* and *H* mutually know they both have an association between *S* having a headache and *S* wanting to borrow *H*’s swimsuit in order to swim off his headache)

Strategy 3: Presuppose (1987:217)

S makes H to search for the presupposed former event by implicating something.

For example:

I washed the car again today (he presupposes that he has done it before (e.g. last week) and therefore may implicate a criticism).

Strategy 4: Understate (1987: 217)

S saying less than what is required. In the case of criticism, S avoids the lower points of the scale, and in the case of compliments or admission, S avoids the upper points.

For example:

A: what do you think of Harry?

B: nothing wrong with him (e.g I don't think he's very good)

Strategy 5: Overstate (1987: 219)

S says more than is necessary, by exaggerating or choosing a point on a scale that is higher than what is required.

For example: *I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer.*
(It could convey an apology not getting in touch)

Strategy 6: Use Tautologies (1987: 220)

S encourages H to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance by using tautologies.

For example: *War is war* (it may be an excuse).

Strategy 7: Use Contradictions (1987:221)

S stresses that she/he cannot tell the truth, thus S stating two things that contradict to each other so H can look the interpretation form two contradicting propositions.

For example: *A: are you upset about that?*

B: well, I am and I'm not.

Strategy 8: Be ironic (1987:221)

S indirectly conveys his intended meaning by saying the opposite of what he meant.

For example: *John's a real genius (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row)*

Strategy 9: Use Metaphors (1987:222)

S uses a metaphor and leaves it to H interpret his intended meaning.

For example: *Harry's a real fish* (c.i He drinks/swims/is slimy/is coldblooded like a fish).

Strategy 10: Use Rhetorical Questions (1987:223)

S wants H to give him the indicated information by asking question with no intention of obtaining an answer.

For example: *How many times do I have to tell you..?* (c.i Too many)

Strategy 11: Be Ambiguous (1987:225)

S being ambiguous when communicates with H and lets H to guess what he/she means.

For example: *John's a pretty sharp cookie* (it could be a Compliment or insult)

Strategy 12: Be vague (1987:226)

S may go off record with FTA by being vague about who the object of FTA is, or what the offence is.

For example: *perhaps someone did something naughty* (vague understanding)

Strategy 13: Over-Generalize (1987:226)

S utters sentence that may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record.

Then, H decides whether the general rule applies to him.

For example: *The lawn has got to be mown.*

S uses off record to address the FTA to someone whom it wouldn't threaten and hope that the real target will see that the FTA is aimed at him.

a secretary in an office asks another but with negative politeness to pass the stapler, in circumstances where a professor is much nearer to the stapler than the other secretary. His face is not threatened and he can choose to do it himself as a bonus ‘free gift’.

S purposely does not finish his utterance and leaves a FTA half-undone, thus “leaves” is the implication of ‘hanging in the air’, just as with rhetorical question.

2.3 Factors Influencing the Choice of Politeness Strategies

1. The 'social distance' (D) of S and H.
2. The relative 'power' (P) of S and H.
3. The absolute 'ranking' (R) of imposition in the particular culture.

Social distance refers to the relationship between the participants. In this case, the way people talk to a friend is different from when we are talking to strangers. For example, when someone with a group of friends, he or she can say to them, “Go get me that glass!” or “shut up!” it is because we are closer and have intimate relationship with our friends. Nevertheless, he or she cannot say the same

thing to a stranger, especially the one he or she just met because it will be considered rude. Thus, he or she might say “could you take that glass for me?” or “I do not mean to interrupt you but I cannot hear the speaker in the front of the room.” It would be better to use this utterance since the relationship with the stranger is not close and there is a gap or high social distance between the speaker and stranger. The social distance between speakers has a tremendous impact on how they speak to each other.

Power refers to the power relationship between two participants. People will typically find themselves in three types of power relationships. In the first, they would have equal power with the person they are talking to example a friend or colleague. Second, they would either have more power, example: as a boss or instructor. Third is less power, example employee or student than the person they were talking too. This factor is usually applied asks his/her employee to staff/secretary, For example: the employer can directly asks his/her employee to open the door by saying, "Open the door!" the boss can do this because he has a high relative power and secretary is the lower one. However, the secretary cannot say the same thing since it will be considered as being impolite.

The third factor that Brown and Levinson believe is important in order to understand the different politeness strategies people used is how big the social infraction is. Rank of imposition can happen in the case when someone really needs money so he/she borrows it from his friend. In order not to threaten his/her interlocutor's face, he/she might say, "I was wondering if you could lend me \$2000". The speaker uses this utterance to show that actually he/she does not

mean to impose on his interlocutor by borrowing some money. It is because to borrow money from other people has a high rank of imposition so the speaker uses apologizing expression (I am terribly embarrassed to have to admit that I need money right now) to minimize the threat.

2.4 Previous Studies

The previous study about Politeness Strategies those are quite helpful for this research. Almost 28 years (1987-2015) 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, the thesis entitled “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 used ‘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 produced by Kathleen when speaking to Joe? 2. What are the politeness strategies by Joe when speaking to Kathleen? 3. Which politeness strategies are mostly used by Kathleen and Joe? In her study, she concluded that in this study both Kathleen and Joe applied four kinds of politeness strategies which are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record. However, there are some differences between this study and Ilena Wongso’s study. Ilena Wongso made a movie as the data, which generally always uses script

The second is The Politeness Strategies Used By The Host of Empat Mata Talk Show to His Female Guests Star as the title by Duwi Purwita Sari student of English Departement of Airlangga University of Surabaya 2008. This study applied politeness strategies in interaction between Host named Tukul Arwana and guests star named Mulan Kwok, Bunga Citra Lestari, Pinkan Mambo, Tenny and Parmi was conducted to examine the types of Politeness Strategies employed by Host and the guest stars. There are two research's questions, there are: 1. How are the politeness strategies used by the host of Empat mata? 2. How is position of woman in Empat mata talk show, related to woman's position in media?. However, this talk show has any difference with the talk show used by the writer. The talk show which is used by the writer is purely using English language so the resulted data are more natural and valid, and it is not the translated talk show used by Duwi Purwita S.

[illegible]

focused to negative and positive politeness. She also analyzes it globally. It means they did not put the theory completely as the writers did.

Based on the previous study above, the writer uses different topic of object. The writer analyzes the conversation among the character in Jimmy Kimmel talk show especially Selena Gomez episode. In this research, the writer uses descriptive-qualitative method to analyze her research. The writer chooses that previous study to her references because it has some things that are relevant with her research.