CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1   Pragmatics

As a field of study, linguistics offers various objects to be analyzed in language through many theories it has, and one of them is pragmatics. In this study, the writer focuses on the pragmatics field. Brown and Levinson are widely regarded as one of the co-founders of pragmatics. Pragmatics is the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said (Yule, 1996, p.3). Pragmatics is about the interaction of semantic knowledge with our knowledge of the world, taking into account contexts of use (Griffiths, 2006, p.1). Brown and Yule (Levinson, 1983 p.25) explained that the environmental, circumstances, and context are the important aspects which must be referred to the basic condition. It means that between the speaker or the writer and context are interrelated to each other. When we want to know that the listener or the reader can understand what is interpreted by the speaker or the writer , this is the reason why we should know the context.

2.1.2   Politeness Strategy

There are some topics discussed in pragmatics, one of them is politeness strategies. According to Brown and Levinson (1987, p.61), "politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer's "face". Face refers to a speaker's sense of linguistic and social identity, which is defined as "the public self-image that every member (of the society) wants to claim for himself". Brown and Levinson

9

(1987, p. 61) stated that every individual has two types of face, positive and negative. They defined positive face as the individual's desire that they want to be appreciated in social interaction or the need to have positive image accepted by others. Meanwhile, negative face is the individual's desire for freedom of action or from imposition.

Brown and Levinson also explained about face concept. They said that this concept is universal. There is naturally a variety of speeches that tends to be not displeasing, called as Face Threatening Act (FTA). The FTA concept itself can be reduced by using four kinds of politeness strategies: bald on record, off record, positive and negative politeness. But the way they convey it may be different due to the distance (D), power (P), and ranking of imposition (Rx) (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Brown and Levinson (1987) formulated the factors of seriousness the FTA are influenced: D is the values that measures the social distance between the speaker (S) and the hearer (H), P is a measure of the power that the H has over the S, Rx is a value that measures the degree to which the FTA is rated an imposition in that culture.

a. **Bald on record**

In *bald on record* strategy, the speaker does nothing in order to minimize threats to the hearer's face. The main reason of its usage is that whenever a speaker (S) wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy the hearer's (H) face, even to any degree, he will choose bald on record strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 74). Although there are ways that bald on record politeness can be used in trying to minimize FTAs implicitly. Often using

this strategy will shock and sometimes make the hearers feel uncomfortable where the speaker does not know them very well. This type of strategy is commonly found in people who know each other very well, such as close friends and family. There are two cases here, those are:

1. *Cases of non-minimization of the face threat*

It occurs when maximum efficiency is very important and this is mutually known by both the speaker (S) and the hearer (H), no face redress in case of a great urgency, for instance "*Watch Out*". This example shows that the speaker does not care about the hearer's face.

2. *Cases of FTA-oriented Bald on-record usage*

Another use of Bald on Record is actually oriented to the face. It illustrates the way in which respect for face involves mutual orientation so that each participant attempts to foresee what the other participants are attempting to foresee. It is usually used in welcoming farewells and offers. The examples are "come in", "I have no plan for Saturday night". Both examples can be associated as an offer or invitation so that the hearer feels unwilling toward them.

3. Positive Politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), Positive Politeness strategy shows that the hearer has desire to be respected. The positive politeness strategy is usually seen in groups of friends, or where people in the given social situation know each other fairly well. It usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's needs to be respected in order to minimize the FTA (Brown and Levinson 1987, p.73). Some

positive politeness strategies include statement of friendship, solidarity and compliments. There are three main classes here: Claim common ground, Convey that the Speaker and Hearer are cooperator and Fulfill hearer's wants for some

Claim common ground means to indicate that the S and H belong to some sets of people who share specific wants.

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

You must be hungry. It's a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch? (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 2: Exaggerate interest in H and his interest

What a fantastic garden you have! (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 3: Intensify interest to Hearer

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 (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 4: Use solidarity in group identity markers

Help me with this bag here, will you son? (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 5: Seek for agreement

I agree. Right. Manchester United played really badly last night (Watts,2003)

Strategy 6: Avoid Disagreement

Well in a way, I suppose you're sort if right. But look at it like this. Why don't you …? (Watts,2003)

Strategy 7: presuppose/ raise/ assert common ground

People like me and you, Bill, don't like being pushed around like that, do we?

Why don't you go and complain? (Watts. 2003)

Strategy 8: Joke

How about lending me this old heap of junk? (the Hearer's new Cadillac)

(Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Conveying that S and H are cooperator means to express that S and H are cooperatively involved in the relevant activity.

Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose

I know you can't bear parties, but this one will be really good- do come!

(request/offer) (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 10: Offer, promise

I'll take you out the top of dinner on Saturday (Watts, 2003)

Strategy 11: Be optimistic

I've come to borrow a cup of flavor (Brown and Levinson,1987)

Strategy 12: Include both S and H in activity

I'm feeling really hungry. Let's shop for a bite (S wants to stop and have something to eat and wants to get H to agree to do this) (Watts, 2003)

Strategy 13: Give or ask for a reason

Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend? (Brown and Levinson,1987)

Strategy 14: Assume/ assert reciprocity

I'll do X for you if you do Y for me (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Fulfill Hearer's want for some x means that S decide to redress the H's face directly by fulfilling of the H's wants.

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

Not at all, I wonder if I could confide in you for a minute or two (Watts, 2003)

4. Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is mainly oriented to satisfy the hearer's negative face. Its basic orientation is to claim territory and self determination (Brown and Levinson 1987, p.75). The tendency to use negative politeness is because the speaker is aware of and respect the social distance between the speaker and the hearer. There are five main classes of negative politeness, namely: Be direct, Don't presume/ Assume, Don't coerce Hearer, Communicative Speaker's want to not impinge on Hearer, Redress Other Wants of Hearer's.

1. Be Indirect

The strategy involved is:

Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

Can you please pass the salt? (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

2. Don't Presume/ Assume

The strategy involved is:

Strategy 2: Question and Hedges

I wonder whether I could just sort of ask you a little question. (Watts, 2003)

3. Don't coerce Hearer

The strategy involved is:

Strategy 3: Be pessimistic

Would you do X? (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition

Could I talk to you for just a minute? (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 5: Give Deference

Excuse me sir, but would you mind if I close the window? (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

4. Communication Speaker's want to no impinge on hearer

The strategies involved are:

Strategy 6: Apologize

Sorry to bother you, but… (Watts, 2003)

Strategy 7: Impersonalize Speaker and Hearer

A: That car is parked in a no-parking area

B: It's mine, officer

C: Well, it should have a parking ticket (Watts, 2003)

Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule

Parking on the double yellow lines is illegal, so I'm going to give you a fine (Watts, 2003)

Strategy 9: Nominative

Your cooperation is urgently requested (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

5. Redress Other wants of Hearer's

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

I'd be eternally grateful if you would … (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

5. Off Record

The last politeness strategies outlined by Brown and Levinson is the Off-Record strategy or the indirect strategy. A communicative act is done through off-record if it is done in such a way so that it is impossible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act (Brown and Levinson, 1987). This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing. There are fifteen strategies of Off- Record, namely:

Strategy 1: Give hints

It's cold here (Shut the window) (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 2: Give association clues

Oh God, I've got a headache again

May be used to convey a request for borrowing H's swimsuit, is H and H mutually known that both have an association between S having a headache and S wanting to borrow H's swimsuit in order to swim off his headache (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 3: Presuppose

I wash the car again today

He presupposes that he has done it before (e.g last week) and therefore may implicate criticism (Nadar, 2009).

Strategy 4: Understate

A: What do you think of Harry?

B: Nothing wrong with him (I don't think he's very good) (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 5: Overstate

I tried to call a hundred times, but there was no any answer (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 6: Use tautologies

a. War is a war

b. Boys will be boys (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 7: Use contradictions

A: Are you upset about that?

B: Well I am, but I'm not (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 8: Be ironic

John is really genius (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row

(Nadar,2009)

Strategy 9: Use metaphors

Harry is a real fish (He is cold-blooded like a fish) (Nadar, 2009).

Strategy 10: Use rhetorical questions

How many times do I have to tell you? (Too many) (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 11: Be Ambiguous

John's a pretty sharp/smooth cookie (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 12: Be vague

Looks like someone may have too much drinking (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 13: Over-generalize

Mature people sometimes help to do dishes (Nadar, 2009)

Strategy 14: Displace H

Where one secretary in an office asks another 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" (Nadar, 2009).

Strategy 15: Be incomplete, use ellipsis

Well, if one leaves one's tea on the wobbly table (Nadar, 2009)

Those kinds of strategies are used to analyze politeness strategies in *Hitam Putih* Talk Show.

2.1.3   The Factors of Face Threatening Act (FTA)

According to Brown and Levinson, FTA is an act that inherently damages the face of the hearer by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other (1987). There are many motives for the speaker to do FTA to the hearer's face. For an example, the prime reason for Bald on Record usage is the speaker wants to do FTA with maximum efficiency, where it is necessary to not minimize the hearer's face in case of urgent. The concept of FTA itself can be reduced by using four kinds of politeness strategies, but the way they convey it may be different due to *the distance (D), power (P) and ranking imposition (Rx)*. D is the values that measure the social distance between the Speaker (S) and Hearer (H), P is a measure of the power that the H has over the S, Rx is a value that measures the degree to which the FTA is rated an imposition in that culture (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

2.1.4 Talk Show

Talk Show is a daytime television genre which deals with sensationalist topics and whose guests are mainly ordinary citizens (Gregori, 1998, p. 98). According to Morrisan (2008), talk show is classified as a soft news which reviews particular problems, but it does not deliver it immediately. Soft news is a kind of interesting and important information delivered in-depth by the host (Morrisan, 2008). The most common topic of the program is usually the discussion of a controversial topic or issue. The talk show program usually takes American style of dialog that is considered as open, direct, and self-experience (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994). In particular, talk show is one of television genres featuring a panel of guests, usually consisting of a group of people who have great experiences in relation to the issues discussed on the show for that episode (Bell 1996, p.76).

The host usually presents more than one guest in order to support the truth of the topic. Morrisan (2008) stated that the guest is interviewed for two reasons. First is because the guest is capable in handling the topic of discussion. Second is the guest is directly or indirectly involved in one of the events served as the topic of discussion. In talk show, we can see the way people use politeness strategies from their stress, intonation, the choice of words and many other factors. Every person's utterance potentially generates FTA. Therefore, Brown and Levinson proposed the theory to minimize the FTA, namely politeness strategies.

2.2 Review of Related Studies

There are several studies conducted in understanding politeness and TV talk show. The first study is conducted by Sari (2008), in her research on the Pragmatics of Politeness Strategies. She focuses on seeing how the politeness strategies used by *The Host of Empat Mata* to his female guest by using pragmatic approach. The result of the study is that *Empat Mata* contains women stereotyping in media. Tukul treats his female guest improperly.

The second study is conducted by Astuti (2010), in her research on the Pragmatics in Politeness Strategies. She focuses on seeing what factors influence the participants of *Just Alvin* Talk show towards the choice of politeness strategies. She analyzes what politeness strategies are used by the host of *Just Alvin* Talk Show. The result of this study is that Alvin, as the host, is more concerned on satisfying the guest's positive face by mostly applying positive politeness strategies.

Another related study is conducted by Yuka (2009), in his research on the Pragmatics in Politeness Strategies. The writer focuses on how many and what kind of address terms are presented, which is one of the important positive politeness strategies and also the ways of presentation that will also be examined to see if they are suitable for the learners in the light of the findings of previous studies on teaching of pragmatic skills**.** The result of this study is Oral Communication I textbooks provide somewhat sufficient variety of address terms as a whole, but as for each textbook, many do not have enough of them. Even, textbooks which have many address terms do not provide sufficient information

about the function of address terms explicitly. There is only one textbook explaining the role of 'showing friendliness' of address terms, but there is no explanation about the other functions of address terms in any other textbooks.

The other one is conducted by Kenji (2003), in his research on the Pragmatics in Politeness strategies. The writer focuses on how Korean and Americans use two politeness strategies of involvement and independence differently depending on the power of relationship with the interlocutors. The result of this study shows that Japanese tends to use more negative politeness (the kind that minimizes imposition) than American. Americans tend to use positive politeness (the kind that satisfies the speaker's need for approval) than Japanese and they usually use negative politeness to those outside the group.