#### **CHAPTER II**

#### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter consists of many important aspects concerning the theoretical framework and the related studies.

## 2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is communication clearly depends on not only recognizing the meaning of words in an utterance, but recognizing what speakers mean by their utterances. In many ways, pragmatics is the study of 'invisible' meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it isn't actually said or written. Therefore, speakers (or writers) must be able to depend on a lot of shared assumptions and expectations when they try to communicate. Yule (2006:112)

Charles Morris's in Jacob L. Mey (1993:4) states definition of pragmatics as the study of the relation of signs to interpreters (1938:6). It means that we necessary to pay attention to the context that are surrounding the happening of the conversation in order that know of the meaning in the context. Therefore Mey (1993:6) states that pragmatics is studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society. Thus, pragmatics includes the relevant context, situation and condition, Instead of the meaning of usage. So, in communication we have to know the context of communication in order that easier in communication.

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.

Meanwhile, Yule (1996:3) states that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. According to him, pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or a writer). And interpreted by a listener (or a reader) so, it involves the interpretation what people mean in the particular context and how the context influences what is said.

Based on the definition above, it can be said that pragmatics is the study of meaning contained the utterance in context. Therefore, in pragmatic view, to appreciate and to interpret the meaning of a statement or an utterance, one must consider the relation between language and context in which the situation is uttered.

Context is an important aspect in interpreting the meaning of an utterance.

According to Yule, context is for interpreting words or sentences. The relevant context is our mental representation of those aspects of what is physically out there that we use arriving at an interpretation (2006:114)

From the statement above, it can be concluded that speech context of linguistics research is a context in all physical aspect or social background related with the speech, time, place, social environment, political condition, etc. Thus, context is a set of propositions describing the beliefs, knowledge, and commitments

and so forth of the participants in a discourse to in order to understand the meaning of an utterance.

## **2.2 Face**

Brown and Lenvinson (1987:95) states that politeness strategies are strategies that are used formulate messages in order to save the hearer's face. Face refers to the self-image which the speaker or hearer would like to see maintained in the interaction. Face is something that is emotionally invested and that can be lost maintained and must be constantly attended to interaction (Brown and Lenvinson 1987: 110) states that every individual has two types of face positive and negative. They define positive face as the individual's desire that her/his wants be appreciated in social interaction or the need to have positive image accepted by other. For example if your student shows you his article which he thinks well of and expects your compliments, But yours response is "what a terrible work" which fails to meet her desire then her positive face is offended. Negative face as the individual's desire for freedom of action or from imposition, other words it is the need for autonomy. For example if you make your student reluctant to follow your instruction for the sake of your relative authority. This offends his negative face.

## 2.3 FTA (Face Threatening Acts)

FTA is the acts that infringe on hearer's need to maintain their esteem, and their need to be respected (Brown and Levinson, 1987:72). FTA is described as when

the speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image (Yule, 1996:91).

Brown and Levinson, (1987:1987:82) stated that in human communication, either spoken or written, people tend to maintain one another's face continuously. People need to do saving face to keep the conversation well; therefore face is the most part of our body which is used to show the expression, appearance, and identity among others. Face refers to the self-image that everyone wants to claim them. Face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in an interaction (Brown and Levinson, 1987:110). Then Yule, (1996:155) also stated that face is a mask that constantly changes depending on the audience and the social interaction. Face is divided into two different categories, which are positive face and negative face. Positive face is the desire of being seen as a good human being, and negative face is the desire to remain autonomous. A person's positive face is the need to be accepted, even liked, by others, to be treated as a member of the same group, and to know that his or her wants are shared by others. A person's negative face is the need to be independent, to have freedom of action, and not to be imposed on by others. In simple terms, negative face is the need to be independent and positive face is the need to be connected.

# 2.4 Politeness Strategy

Politeness is a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by human interaction by minimizing, potential conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange (Yule, 1996:104). In communication, politeness can be defined as showing awareness of and consideration for another person's face. Face means public self-image of person. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that every person has and expects everyone else to recognize (Yule 2006:119).

Politeness is a strategy used in communication. Another definition provided by Yule (1996:104) 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). For avoiding the face threatening acts of the hearer, it is better for the speaker to know about politeness strategies. Politeness strategies are strategies used to minimize or avoid the FTA (Face Threatening Act) that the speaker means (Brown and Levinson, 1987). There are four kinds of politeness strategies. They are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record. However, the writer will focus on positive politeness strategies because what the writer going to analyze the implementation of positive politeness strategies.

## a. Bald on record

Bald on record strategy do not attempt to monimize the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is most often utilized by the speaker who closely know their audience. With the bald on record strategy there is a direct possibility that the audience will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy. For example, a bald on record strategy might be to tell your sister to clean the dishes "Do the dishes. It's your turn".

Specially, Brown and Levinson (1987) explained that an FTA will be done in this way only if the speaker does not fear retribution from the addressee, for example in circumstance where:

- a) Speaker and listener both tacitly agree that the relevance of face demand may be suspended in the interest of urgency or efficiency.
- b) The danger to listener's face is very small, as in offers, request, suggestions that are clearly in listener's interest and do not require great sacrifice of speaker.
- c) Speaker is vastly superior in power to Hearer, or can enlist audience support to destroy Hearer's face without losing his own.

# **b.** Positive politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:70) positive politeness is oriented toward the positive face of the hearer, the positive self-image that he claims for himself and his perennial desire that his wants (or the action/acquisition/values/

resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable (1987:101). Positive politeness utterances are not only used by the participants who have known each other fairly well, but also used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy to imply common ground or to sharing of wants to limited extent between strangers. For the same reason, positive politeness techniques are usable not only for FTA redress, but in general as a kind of social accelerator for the speaker in using them indicates that he wants to 'come closer' to the hearer.

Positive politeness strategy involves fifteen strategies, namely: notice, attend to the hearer (his interest, wants, needs, goods); exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with the hearer); intensify interest to the hearer; use in-group identity markers; seek agreement; avoid disagreement; presuppose / raise / assert common ground; joke; assert or presuppose the speaker's knowledge and concern for the hearer's wants; offer / promise; be optimistic; include both the speaker and the hearer in the activity; give (or ask for) reasons; assume or assert reciprocity; and give gifts to the hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation). According to Brown and Levinson positive politeness consist of fifteen strategies, they are:

## 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 ingroup 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).

# 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 après sure 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 thereat – 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 come, 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 T'll do X for you if you do Y for me or T did X for you last week. For example: *I'll give you the bonus if you can sell a machine*. In this way, S may soften his FTA by negating the depth aspect (Brown and Levinson, 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).

## c. 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 recognizes 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 impersonalizing 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).

#### a. Be direct

This strategy is derived from the aspect of negative politeness that specifies on record delivery of the FTA, whereas, other strategies are derived from the aspect do 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 unambiguous 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, assertion 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)

## b. Do not presume / assum

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 presume 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)

## c. 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. Perhaps 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 higher 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)

# d. Communication S's want to not impinge on H

The other strategy to satisfy H's negative face is by indicating that S recognizes 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 implicitly 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 that 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-stressing 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 circumstances, general rule, or obligation. The example is *international regulations* require that the fuselage be sprayed with DDT, the committee request the president... and the late comers cannot be seated till the next interval (ibid, 1987: 206-207)

## **Strategy 9: Nominative**

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).

## e. 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 FTA by 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 suggests S may redress his FTA by explicitly 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)* 

# d. Off Record

This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposed. Even if the speaker decides to say something, the speaker does not actually have to ask for anything. Yule, 1996 stated that the types of statements are not directly addresses to the other. According to Brown and Levinson, 1987 a communicative act is done off-record if it is done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act. Therefore if a speaker wants to do an FTA, and chooses to do it indirectly, he must give the hearer some hints and hope that the hearer picks up on them and thereby interprets what the speaker really means (intends) to say.

# 2.5 Factors Influencing the Use of Positive Politeness Strategy

The employment of politeness strategy is influenced by several factors. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:71) there are two factors that influence the speaker to employ positive politeness strategy. The factors are payoff and circumstances.

## 1. Payoff

The speaker employs the positive politeness strategy because they can get any advantages. The speaker can minimize the FTA by assuring the hearer that he likes the hearer and wants to fulfill the hearer's wants. Thus, the hearer positive face is not threatened by the speaker because it can be seen for their mutual shares. For example: "Let's get on for dinner." (Brown and Levinson, 1987:114) The example above shows that the speaker minimizes the FTA (request) to the hearer by including the speaker himself equally as the participant.

## 2. Relevant Circumstances

The seriousness of an FTA is also influenced by the circumstances, sociological variables, and thus to a determination of the level of politeness. According to Brown and Levinson in Rahardi (2005:68) there are three dimensions to determine the level of politeness. Among them are relative power (P), social distance (D) and size of imposition (R).

#### a. Relative Power

Power (P) is the general point is that we tend to use a greater degree of politeness with people who have some power or authority over us than to those who do not. It is based on the asymmetric relation between the speaker and the hearer. These types of power are most found in obviously hierarchical settings, such as courts, the military, workplace. For example, you would probably be more polite about conveying to your employer because she or he always arrives late, than in conveying to your brother. This is because your employer can influence your career in a positive way (reward power) or negative way (coercive way).

## **b.** Social Distance

Social distance (D) can be seen as the composite of psychologically real factors (status, age, sex, degree of intimacy, etc) which together determine the overall degree of respectfulness within a given speech situation. It based on the symmetric relation between the speaker and the hearer. For example, you feel close to someone

or you know him well because he is similar in terms of age or sex, then you will get closer to him and the distance rating will get smaller. As a result you will not employ polite utterance when you ask him to do something. On the contrary, you will employ polite utterance when you interact with person whom you have not known well, such as person who is older than you.

## c. Size of Imposition

Size of imposition (R) can be seen from the relative status between one-speech act to another in a context. For example, borrowing a car in the ordinary time will make us feel reluctant, but in urgent situations it will natural. Thus, in the first context we will employ polite utterance. Meanwhile, in the second context it is not necessary to employ polite utterance because the situation is urgent.

## 2.6 Previous Study

The previous study about Politeness Strategies that is 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 ZainulHasan" 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 ZainulHasan? 2. What factors motivated santriwati and ustadz/ ustadzah of Pesantren ZainulHasan to employ politeness strategies in their interactions?

Second, the thesis titled "Politeness Strategies used by Joe and Kathleen in you've Got Mail" by IlenaWongso 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 email based around the remake of the 1940 film. There is several questions about politeness expression as follows: 1. What is the politeness strategies produced 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.

Fourth, the thesis titled "Politeness Strategies used by George Milton in John Steinbeck's Of Mice and Men". She intended to know how the politeness strategies used by George Milton in his directive utterances in Steinbeck's Of Mice and Men and the reasons why certain politeness strategies used by George Milton in his directive utterances. She used the theory of Brown and Levinson of four categories of the politeness strategies and also two factors why the speaker chooses certain strategy based on Brown and Levinson theory to analyze the data. The result of the research shows that there are some commands, requests and suggestion, which include in four categories of Brown and Levinson theory, used by George Milton in his directive utterances. George's choice of certain strategy to deliver his directive utterances was mostly influenced by the situation and the hearer's condition.

Another research is "Politeness Strategies in John Grisham's Novel the Client" done by Yuli Fitriyana (2007). In his research, the writer focuses on what politeness strategies used in John Grisham's The Client. Like previous study, the writer also

used Brown and Levinson to analyze the data. She can conclude that there are many politeness strategies including bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record are applied by portrayed characters although not all strategies are covered.

Based on the previous study above, this research has similar study. Politeness strategies but the writer only focuses on Positive 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 the novel "memoirs of geisha". In this research, the writer uses Descriptive to analyze her research. The writer chooses that previous study to her references because it has some things that relevant with her research.