CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review of related literature is deals with the underlying theories, from which study is based on politeness strategies by Brown & Levinson (1987).

2.1. Related Theories

In regards to this current study, some theories are reviewed. They are positive and negative politeness strategies and social distance by Holmes (1992)

2.1.1. The Introduction of Politeness by James. Watts

Politeness is one of the ways in the communication of human being in the daily activity. Being linguistically polite is often a matter of selecting linguistic forms which express the appropriate degree of social distance or which recognize relevant status differences (Holmes, 1992:285). Politeness will give a good impression of someone when they are talking with their interlocutor. Most of us are fairly sure we know what we mean when we describe someone's behavior as 'polite'. To define the criteria with which we apply that description, however, is not quite as easy as we might think (Watts, 2003:1).

To characterize polite language usage, we might resort to expressions like 'the language a person uses to avoid being too direct', or 'language which displays respect towards or consideration for others' (Watts, 2003:1). Polite language also can be used to show about dishonest, distant, and bad feeling as stated by Watts (2003:2). From the explanation, it can be seen that polite language is used to express any feeling in the daily life.

2.1.2. Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies are strategies that are used to minimize or avoid the Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) that a speaker makes (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.91). According to Watts (2003), Face-threatening acts (FTAs) is any act, verbal or non-verbal, which threatens the way in which an individual sees her/himself or would like to be seen by others (face saving, etc). Actually, there are four politeness strategies by Brown & Levinson (1987) that Bald On Record (2 Strategies), and positive politeness (15 strategies), negative politeness (10 strategies), and Off Record (15 strategies).

2.1.3. Positive Politeness

It is used to satisfy the positive face of the hearer by approving, or including him/her as a friend or a member of group. This strategy is usually used by people who have known each other in order to indicate common ground and solidarity in which speaker shares hearer's wants. It means that the speaker wants to come closer to the hearer. In addition, when people decide to use positive politeness to talk to other people they will show intimacy and use informal language. On the other hand, Holmes (1992, p.297) also distinguishes two types of politeness which are positive and negative politeness.

Positive politeness is solidarity oriented; it emphasizes shared attitudes and values. In additions, positive politeness expresses solidarity and minimizes status differences. According to Brown & Levinson, positive politeness contains 15 strategies.

1. Notice, attend to hearer (his/her interests, wants, need, goods, etc)

This strategy suggests that the speaker should take notice or pay attention to the hearer's condition.

2. *Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer)*

Speaker uses heightened pitch; exaggerate stress, intonation to show interest, approval, and sympathy to hearer.

3. Intensify interest to hearer

In the strategy, speaker tries to put include the hearer into the middle of the events being discussed so that the hearer can share his or her interest in the speaker's story.

4. Use in group identity markers

It can be done through the use of certain terms of address forms, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis.

5. Seek agreement in safe topics

Speaker seeks ways to agree with hearer. By stressing his agreement to hearer, it means he is satisfying hearer's desire to be right or to be corroborated in hearer's opinions. Repeating is used to stress emotional agreement, interest, and surprise with the utterance. Besides, it is better to answer a question by repeating part of it rather than just simply by 'yes' or 'no'.

6. Avoid disagreement

Avoided disagreement divided into 4.

- a) Token agreement: speaker appears to agree by twisting his/her utterance.
 It is done to avoid or hide disagreement
- b) Pseudo-agreement: speaker use a conclusory marker in order to draw a conclusion that seems he or she agrees with hearer.
- c) White lie: speaker may do a white lie in order to avoid disagreement, so he or she can save hearer's face.
- d) Hedging opinions: speaker may choose to be vague about his own opinions to avoid disagreement. Hedging opinions usually use *sort of, kind of, like, in a way.*
- 7. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground

This strategy is usually used when that speaker wants to show that hearer is the central of the conversation and hearer's knowledge is same as the speaker's.

8. Joke

Joke is the basic positive politeness technique. It may share the mutual background knowledge and value. Moreover, it is used to minimize FTAs of requesting. If the speaker uses joke to the hearer, it might show that the speaker has a close relationship with the hearer.

9. Assert or presuppose speaker's knowledge of and concern for hearer's wants

17

It is a way to indicate and to put pressure that speaker and hearer are cooperators.

10. Offer, promise

Speaker show his cooperation with hearer by claiming that whatever speaker wants, she/he will help to obtain.

11. Be optimistic

Speaker assumes that hearer wants speaker's wants for speaker (for speaker and hearer) and will help to obtain them.

12. Include both speaker and hearer in the activity

Speaker uses the form "we" while actually the speaker means "you" or "me", in order to show his/her cooperation and to redress FTAs.

13. Give or ask for reasons

Speaker gives reasons to what and why he/she wants and assumes. If there is no good reason for hearer to refuse it, the hearer will cooperate.

14. Assume or assert reciprocity

Speaker gives evidence of obligations obtained between speaker and hearer. Thus, speaker may say "I'll do χ for you if you do γ for me" to soften his FTAs.

15. Give gifts to hearer (good, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

Speaker satisfies hearer not only by giving tangible gift but also human relation wants such as the wants to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, and listened to, and so on.

2.1.4. Impoliteness Strategies

Lachenict, one of the linguists, makes a theory about the act of attacking the addressee's face. He makes a term of 'aggravating language' which is the further scope of politeness theory. Aggravating language is a lesson of rude and insulting language (Turner in Bousfield, 2008: 83). Aggravating language has the same goal as the impoliteness strategy in which to attack the addressee's face. Lachenict (1980: 619) has proposed four strategies of 'aggravation'.

First, off record employs an aggravating language with the forms of vague insults, allusions, clues, and irony. Second, bald on record produces face threatening act and interruption directly. Third, positive aggravation shows an aggravation to the hearer that he or she is not accepted as the part of certain group. Fourth, negative aggravation designs an aggravating language which is intended to impose the hearer, disturb his or her freedom, and to damage the position of the hearer in the society.

Moreover, Culpeper also makes a theory which explains an intended act to attack someone's face. He calls his theory as the theory of impoliteness strategy. Compared to Lachenict's strategies, Culpeper's strategies are more comprehensive as they consist of five strategies; meanwhile, Lachenict's strategies consist of four strategies. By using Culpeper's impoliteness strategies, the researcher can gain complete and obvious finding of the data analyzed. Hence, the researcher uses Culpeper's impoliteness strategies to analyze the data. Impoliteness strategies which proposed by Culpeper (1996: 356-357) can be described as follows.

a. Impoliteness

People often express their feelings with impolite language that can cause conflict. They often cannot control their behavior or language when they communicate to others. They do not think about politeness strategy but they prefer to perform impoliteness strategy to express their feelings. According to Bousfield and Locher (2008: 3), impoliteness is a manner which is face-aggravating in a specific situation. It can be defined that impolite act is the behavior which is intended to irritate someone's face.

Eelen (2001: 15) also states that impoliteness is employed by people when they do not return a salutation or they prefer to keep silent. People often expect others to reply the salutation when they communicate. However, in some cases, some people often prefer to keep silent to perform impolite act.

In addition, there are some terms that refer to the same meaning with impoliteness; it is the term of rudeness. The term of impoliteness and rudeness have the same meaning in negative attitude. Rude behavior does not use the strategies of politeness when those strategies are hoped to do, in other ways that the utterance can be meant as deliberately and negatively argumentative (Lakoff, 1989:103).

Culpeper et al. (2003: 1564) also add that impoliteness intends to damage someone's face and it can make a disagreement between people. The use of impolite language also can make the relationship between people become disharmonious. When someone chooses to perform impoliteness strategy on his or her utterance, he or she has a purpose to damage or attack the hearer's face. He or she can attack the hearer's face through his or her utterance. There are some types of impoliteness strategy according to the expert of linguistics, they are Lachenict and Culpeper. Those strategies are explained in the following part.

b. Strategy

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the term *strategy* hails from ancient Greece, where it had the sense of a military leader. This sense survives in the meaning of the collocation "military strategy", that is, a plan to achieve certain military objectives. Within linguistics broadly conceived, we find a range of relevant collocations, including "rhetorical strategy", "text strategy", "discourse strategy", "communication strategy", "(text) comprehension strategy", "pragmatic strategy", "communicative strategy" and "politeness strategy".

Rhetorical strategies, as the name clearly suggests, evolve from classical rhetoric. Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric* (Book 1, Chapter 2) written in the fourth century BC, proposed that rhetoric concerns the ability to see the available means of persuasion. These "means" subsequently became labeled strategies, or devices, tactics, and so on. Text strategies, associated with text linguistics, have been elaborated by Nils Erik Enkvist, who wrote that they "involve an adjustment of goals to resources or vice versa" (1987: 204). Discourse strategies form the bedrock of interactional sociolinguistics, as elaborated by Gumperz (1982). Gumperz (1982: 29) introduced the notion to meet the

need for a sociolinguistic theory which accounts for the communicative functions of linguistic variability and for its relation to speakers goals without reference to untestable functionalist assumptions about conformity or non--conformance to closed systems of norms.

The term communication strategy evolved in the context of language learning in the 1970s, in order to describe "language devices used to overcome communication problems related to interlanguage deficiencies" (Dörnyei and Scott 1997: 182). (Text) comprehension strategies are associated with text comprehension, and, notably, the model of text comprehension devised by van Dijk and Kintsch (1983). One of the key insights here is that cognition is strategic. For example, one can have strategies regarding how one distributes one's attention. The notion of pragmatic strategy seems to overlaps substantially with communicative strategy, and partly overlaps with the first three notions, rhetorical strategy, text strategy and discourse strategy. The overlap with rhetoric, for example, is particularly clear in Leech (1983), who adopts the term because of "the focus it places on a goal--oriented speech situation, in which S uses language in order to produce a particular effect in the mind of H" (1983: 15). Despite the fact that Leech's model of pragmatics is very much oriented to linguistic acts as the means by which certain goals are achieved, much of it focuses on pragmatic principles as communicative constraints, not on elaborating pragmatic strategies. Where pragmatic strategies are mentioned (e.g. 1983: 97--99), it is to discuss particular linguistic manifestations that are shaped by those constraints.

Brown and Levinson (1987) deploy the notion of the politeness strategy. Like Leech (1983), they have in mind "rational means--ends reasoning" (1987:7). Their notion of strategy involves the meaning whereby "people can be seen to be doing something before doing, or in order to do, something else" (1987: 8). They elaborate:

We continue to use the word 'strategy', despite its connotations of conscious deliberation, because we can think of no other word that will imply a rational element while covering both (a) innovative plans of action, which may still be (but need not be) unconscious, and (b) routines – that is, previously constructive plans whose original rational origin is still preserved in their construction, despite their present automatic application as ready--made programmes. (1987: 85)

The idea of mapping out logical, rational choices in order to achieve particular goals is typical of the pragmatics of that era. For example, in their scheme, one choice is between doing the FTA (faced threatening act) and not doing the FTA. They propose five "super strategies" (general orientations to face) that are systematically related to the degree of face threat. A rational actor – a "Model Person" (Brown and Levinson 1987) – will select an appropriate super strategy to counterbalance the expected face threat. The super strategies are: Bald-on--record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness, off record and don't do the FTA. For the super strategies Positive politeness, Negative politeness and Off-record they develop charts which display hierarchies of strategies embedded within the particular super strategy. For example, "claiming common ground" is a lower order strategy embedded within the super strategies" to denote "the final choice of linguistic

means to realize the highest goals" (1987: 92). Thus, for example, claiming common ground might be achieved the output strategy of presupposing common ground.

Each of these notions of strategy has in common the fact that strategy is conceived of, at least in part, as a means of achieving a particular end, though of course each defines the notion in somewhat different ways and associates it with a different field. Some of those differences are important. Indeed, it is worth noting part (b) of Brown and Levinson's quotation above. Although the elaboration of politeness routines and formulae as output strategies constitutes a large part of their work, there is in fact very little discussion of what these are, though there is a nod towards the idea that they might involve conventions which themselves may – they cite Lewis (1969) – involve rationality (1989: 85--87). This stands in contrast with the approach taken by Gumperz:

I believe that understanding presupposes conversational involvement. A general theory of discourse strategies must therefore gain by specifying the linguistic and socio cultural knowledge that needs to be shared if conversational involvement is to be maintained, and then go on to deal with what it is about the nature of conversational inference that makes for cultural, Subcultural and situational specificity of interpretation. (1982: 3)

Instead of an emphasis on the speaker using particular means to pursue particular ends, we find an emphasis on the "shared" "linguistic and sociocultural knowledge" that enables understandings of strategies in conversation to proceed. Indeed, Gumperz puts conversational interaction at the heart of his model. The first sentence of his book reads: "Communication is a social activity requiring the coordinated efforts of two or more individuals" (1982: 1). In contrast, Brown and Levinson's model is about the *speaker* selecting strategies to achieve particular goals. The role of the hearer or target interacting with the speaker is barely mentioned.

A further point that Gumperz emphasizes is methodology: "Empirical methods must be found to determine the extent to which underlying knowledge is shared" (1982: 30). The thrust of Brown and Levinson's work is the traditional one of proposing a model and then testing its predictions against the data. It is not to derive empirically the model from the data, though clearly the data must have informed numerous aspects of the model. To be fair, every output strategy from their model is illustrated, but that does not necessarily mean that it is routine, which is purported to be part of their understanding of a strategy. And even if it is routine, we do not know the extent to which it is, the extent to which knowledge of that strategy is shared. Are some strategies frequent and well-known and others less so? What exactly is understood by the strategy and in what context?

In this paper, I take strategies to be ways of achieving particular goals in interaction that are conventional for a particular community. I understand conventionalization here in the same way as Terkourafi (e.g. 2003), namely, items conventionalized for a particular context of use.

1) *Bald--on--record impoliteness*: the FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized.

2) *Positive impoliteness*

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants, e.g. ignore, and snub the other -- fail to acknowledge the other's presence. Exclude the other from an activity. Disassociate from the other -- for example, deny association or common ground with the other; ; Avoid sitting together. Be disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic. Use inappropriate identity markers -- for example, use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains. Use obscure or secretive language -- for example, mystify the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target. Seek disagreement -- select a sensitive topic. Make the other feel uncomfortable -- for example, do not avoid silence, joke, or use small talk. Use taboo words -- swear, or use abusive or profane language. Call the other names -- use derogatory nominations.

3) *Negative impoliteness*

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants, e.g. Frighten -- instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur. Condescend, scorn or ridicule -- emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives). Invade the other's space -- literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship). Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect -- personalize, use the pronouns T' and 'you'. Put the other's indebtedness on record. Violate the structure of conversation – interrupt.

4) *Off--record impoliteness*

The FTA is performed by means of an implicative but in such a way that one attributable intention clearly outweighs any others. *Withhold politeness*: the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness.

2.1.5. Social Distance

A social distance is concerned with participant relationships (Holmes, 1992,p.12). Social distance is useful in emphasizing how well people know someone. In addition, using title and last name are to express social distance and respect status differences. For instance, "Mrs.Billington" and "Yes, Sir". Language can be various, one of the reasons is because the effect of social distance. The social distance or well known as the solidarity is one of the most basic factors in choosing the appropriate language in societies. In addition, according to Brown & Levinson (1987), people should try to identify relative social distance as a relevant social dimension in all cultures. Distance is a symmetric social dimension of similarity or difference within which speaker and hearer stand for the purposes of this act.

2.1.6. The Response from the Addressee of Carl's Impoliteness in "Yes Man" Movie

All three responses of impoliteness strategy, i.e. accepting the face attack, countering the face attack of countering the face attack, such as offensive countering and defending countering appear in this movie.

a. Accepting the Face Attack

According to Bousfield (2008: 193), the addressee accepts the face attack from the speaker, when he or she may agree with the speaker's utterances which perform impoliteness strategy. Meanwhile, accepting the face attack becomes the lowest response used by the main character, Carl, in "Yes Man" movie. The examples of accepting the face attack are presented in the following.

b. Countering the Face Attack

Countering the face attack is divided into two subcategories; they are offensive countering and defensive countering (Bousfield, 2008:193). All of the subcategories of countering the face attack; offensive countering and defensive countering appear as Carl's responses toward the impoliteness strategies which are employed by the other characters in "Yes Man" movie.

1. Offensive Countering

The addressee uses offensive countering by replying the face attack with face attack (Bousfield, 2008: 193). The choice of offensive

countering is the dominant type used by the main character, Carl in "Yes Man" movie. Each of the examples can be seen as the following.

2. Defensive Countering

Bousfield (2008: 193) states that defensive countering means that the addressee defends his or her own face. An example of defensive countering can be seen from the conversation between Allison and Carl. Allison accuses Carll not serious to live with him because it means Carl not like Allison and he considers this relationship for only a necessity because Carl will always say yes to whatever it is. Carl trying to explain what is the real reason he was a bit of thinking to stay with Allison's invitation. Accusations that were made defensive countering appeared to defend of his face. This illustrates defense of the own face against charges rendered impoliteness.

c. No Response

The addressee can give no response by being silent (Bousfield, 2008: 188). Carl as the main character in "Yes Man" movie often prefers to remain silent as the form of giving no response. Meanwhile, the choice of giving response has some different reasons behind it.