

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1. Related Theory**

The major theory that is used by the writer is the Politeness theory of Brown and Levinson. This theory is used because it is complete and sufficient to support this study. Furthermore, it can help the writer to analyze the data. The next theory is theory of Holmes. Theories about request that she uses are the theories of Amy B.M. Tsul and Kenji Kitao. Moreover, she also uses theory about gender and politeness by Brown and Levinson.

##### **2.1.1. Politeness Strategies**

Politeness strategies are strategies that are developed in order to save the hearers' "face" (politeness: 1997). Face refers to the self-image that every member (person) wants to claim for himself. Face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). They stated that face consists of two, namely positive face and negative face. Positive face is the basic wants of every member (person) that his wants (including his values, his action, his achievement, his possession) be desirable to at least some others. Negative face is the basic wants of every member (person) to be appreciated by giving him

rights to non-distraction – i.e giving freedom for action and freedom from imposition.

According to Holmes (1992: 303) being polite in Javanese is obviously a complex linguistic matter. The factors, which determine the choice of appropriate level, however, include all those relevant to the choice of an appropriate address form in English (as well as some extra factors, such as the status of one's family which is irrelevant in many English-speaking societies these days). Age, sex, kinship relationship, and social status as determined by occupation and education are all relevant. Even the formality of the context is relevant.

#### **2.1.1.1. Negative Politeness**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 129-130) negative politeness is redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. Negative politeness is specific and focused; it performs the function of minimizing the particular imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects. The outputs are all forms useful in general for social 'distancing'. They are therefore likely to be used whenever a speaker wants to put social brake on the course of his interaction. Therefore, these automatically assume that there might be some social distance or awkwardness in the situation (Examples from Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies: 1997). There are five major class of negative politeness, they are:

### 1. *Be Direct*

Negative Politeness enjoins both on-record delivery and redress of an FTA. Now the simplest way to construct an on-record message is to convey it directly, as in Bald On-Record usages. The output of this class is:

#### Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

Conventional indirectness is the use of phrases and sentences that have contextually unambiguous meanings, which are different from their literal meanings.

Example: can you please pass the salt?

The door isn't shut. (Please close the door)

### 2. *Don't Presume/assume*

All other Negative Politeness strategies derive from the second specification that is redress should be given to the Hearer's negative face. Here we examine one way in which such redress can be given – by carefully avoiding presuming or assuming that anything involved in the FTA is desired or believed by the Hearer. The output of this class is:

#### Strategy 2: Question, Hedges

Our second output derives from the want not presume and the want not to assume Hearer

Example: I guess that Harry is coming

Close the window, if you can.

Would you close the window, if you don't mind?

Really, as for me, I don't want it.

### 3. *Don't coerce Hearer*

Another class of ways of redressing the Hearer's negative face want is used when the proposed FTA involves predicating an act of the Hearer – for example, when requesting his aid,.... For such FTA, negative face redress may be made by avoiding coercing the Hearer's response, and this may be done on the one hand by explicitly giving him the option not to do the act. The outputs of this class are:

#### **Strategy 3: Be pessimistic**

This strategy gives redress to Hearer's negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of Speaker's speech act obtain.

Example: I don't imagine there'd be any chance of you to lend me you new car

Perhaps you'd care to help me.

#### **Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition**

One way of defusing the FTA is to indicate that  $R_x$ , the intrinsic seriousness of the imposition, is not in itself great, leaving only P (Power) and D (social Distance) as possible weighty factors.

Example: I just want to ask you if you could lend me a little paper.

#### **Strategy 5: Give deference**

There are two sides to the coin in the realization of deference: one in which Speaker humbles and abases himself, and another where Speaker raises Hearer

(pays him positive face of a particular kind, namely that which satisfies Hearer's want to be treated as superiors)

Example: Good morning, Dr. Smith.

We look forward very much to dining with you.

It's not much, I'm afraid, but it'll fill our stomachs.

#### 4. *Communicate Speaker's want to not impinge on Hearer*

One way to partially satisfy the Hearer's negative face demands is to indicate that the Speaker is aware of the Hearer's demands and taking them into account in his decision to communicate the FTA. The outputs of this class are:

##### **Strategy 6: Apologize**

There are four feature of this strategy: admit the impingement, indicate reluctance, give overwhelming reasons, and beg forgiveness.

Example: I'm sure you must be very busy but I need your help. (Admit)

I hate to impose but I really need your help to remove my car.

(Indicate reluctance)

I'm sorry to bother you, but I need your help. (Beg forgiveness)

I can think of nobody else who could help me. (Overwhelming reasons)

##### **Strategy 7: Impersonalise Speaker and Hearer**

There are several ways to avoid the pronoun "I" and "You": By using performatives, imperatives, impersonal verbs, passive and circumstantial voices, replacement of the pronouns "I" and "You" by indefinites, Pluralization of the

“You” and “I” pronouns, address terms as “You” avoidance, reference terms as “I” avoidance, point-of-view distancing.

Example: It is regretted that you fail this time.

Ok, you guys, let’s get on with it.

**Strategy 8: State the FTA as general rule**

Instances of this strategy can be found in general social rule, regulation, and obligation. It is indicate that Speaker doesn’t want to impinge Hearer abut is merely forced to by circumstances.

Example: Passengers please refrain from flushing toilets on the train.

**Strategy 9: Nominalize**

In English, degrees of negative politeness (or at least formality) run hand in hand with degrees of nouniness; that is, formality is associated with the noun end of the continuum

Example: Your good performance on the examinations impressed us favorably  
(so as we nominalize the subject, the sentence get more formal)

##### **5. *Redress Other Wants of Hearer’s***

Another strategy of Negative Politeness consists in offering partial compensation for the face threat in the FTA be redressing some particular other wants of the Hearer. The output of this strategy is:

**Strategy 10: Go On-Record as incurring a debt or as not indebting Hearer**

Example: I’d be eternally grateful if you would lend me some money.

I’ll never be able to repay you if you would help me.

### **2.1.1.2. Positive Politeness**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 101-103) positive politeness is redressed directly to the addressee's positive face, his perennials desire that his wants (or the actions, acquisitions/values resulting from them) should be thought as desirable. Positive Politeness utterances are used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy, to imply common ground or sharing of wants to a limited extent even between strangers who perceive themselves, for the purposes of the interaction, as somehow similar. It is usually seen in groups of friend, or where people in the given social situation know each other fairly well. It is usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected (Examples from Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies: 1997). There are three major class of Positive Politeness, they are:

#### ***1. Claim common ground***

It means to indicate that Speaker (S) and Hearer (H) belong to some sets of persons who share specific wants. Moreover, it also means to convey that some wants of Hearer (H) is admirable/interesting to Speaker (S) too. The outputs of this strategy are:

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

Speaker should take notice of aspects of Hearer's condition (noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, anything which looks as though Hearer would want Speaker to notice and approve it)

Example: What a beautiful gown, where did you buy it?

Goodness, you cut your hair! (...) By the way I come to borrow some flour.

**Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interests, approval, sympathy with Hearer)**

This is often done with exaggerated intonation, stress and other aspect of prosodic, as well as with intensifying modifiers. The exaggerative or emphatic use of words or particles (like really, truly, exactly) is another feature of this positive politeness output.

Example: The girl's as beautiful as Laksmi

How absolutely marvelous

**Strategy 3: Intensify interest to Hearer**

Another way for Speaker to communicate to Hearer that he shares some of his wants is to intensify the interest of his own (Speaker's) contribution to the conversation, by 'making a good story'. The use of directly quoted speech rather than indirect reported speech is another feature of this strategy, as is the use of tag questions or expression that draw Hearer as a participant in the conversation. Another technique is to exaggerate facts, to overstate.

Example: See what I mean?, 'isn't it?', 'you know?'

There were a million people in the Co-op tonight

**Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers**

These include in-group usage of address forms (like mate, mac, buddy, honey, babe, papa, mom, guys), in-group usage of language or dialect (like code switching from English to Spanish among California Chicanos, switch from



nickname to full name), use of jargon or slang (for example, use of brand names in a request), contraction and ellipsis.

Example: Come here, honey/buddy.

I came to borrow some Allinsons if you've got any

Mind if I smoke?

**Strategy 5: Seek agreement**

The raising of 'safe topic' allows Speaker to stress his agreement with Hearer and therefore to satisfy Hearer's desire to be 'right'. Agreement may also be stressed by repeating part or all of what the preceding speaker has said, in a conversation.

Example: That garden is beautiful, isn't it?

A: John went to London this weekend!

B: To London!

**Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement**

Using token agreement (pretending to agree with Hearer), pseudo-agreement (Speaker is drawing a conclusion to a line of reasoning carried out cooperatively with the addressee), and social 'white lie'. Alternatively, Speaker may choose to be vague about his own opinions, so as not to be seen to disagree (hedging opinions).

Example: I'll be seeing you then.

Sorry, I don't have any money (as response to a request to borrow money)

It's really beautiful, in a way.

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

The feature of this strategy consists of the use of gossip and small talk, point-of-view operations (personal center switch, time switch, place switch) avoidance of adjustment of reports to Hearer's point of view, and presupposition manipulations (presuppose knowledge of Hearer's wants and attitudes, presuppose Hearer's values are the same as Speaker's values, presuppose familiarity in Speaker-Hearer relationship, presuppose Hearer's knowledge).

Example: Oh dear, we've lost our little ball, haven't we?

This was a lovely party.

Don't you want some dinner now?

Harry took me to the movies the other day

**Strategy 8: Joke**

Example: How about lending me this heap of junk? (New caddilac)

**2. Convey that Speaker and Hearer are cooperators**

It means that to express that the Speaker (S) and the Hearer (H) are cooperatively involved in the relevant activity. The outputs of this strategy are:

**Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose**

To assert or imply knowledge of Hearer's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants in with them.

Example: Look, I know you want the car back by five, so should I go to town now? (A request)

**Strategy 10: Offer, promise**

Speaker may, that is, claim that (within a certain sphere of relevance) whatever Hearer wants, Speaker wants *for* him and will help to obtain.

Example: I'll drop by sometime next week.

**Strategy 11: Be optimistic**

Such optimistic expressions of FTAs seem to work by minimizing the size of the face threat –  $W_x$  – implying that it's nothing to ask (or offer, etc) or that the cooperation between Speaker and Hearer means that such small things can be taken for granted.

Example: Wait a minute; you haven't brushed your hair!

I'm borrowing your scissors for a second, OK!

**Strategy 12: Include both Speaker and Hearer in activity**

By using an inclusive 'we' form, when S really means 'you' or 'me', he can call upon the cooperative assumption and thereby redress FTAs. Noting that Let's in English is an inclusive 'we' form.

Example: Let's have a cookie, then. (e.i. me)

Shall we eat?

**Strategy 13: Give or ask for reason**

Indirect suggestions, which demand rather than give reasons, are a conventionalized positive-politeness form.

Example: Why not lend me your cottage for a week?

**Strategy 14: Assume/assert reciprocity**

Example: I'll do X if you do Y for me

### 3. *Fulfill Hearer's Want for Some X*

Speaker deciding to redress the Hearer's 'face' directly by fulfilling some of the Hearer's wants. The output of this strategy is:

**Strategy 15:** give gifts to Hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

Hence we have the classic positive politeness action of gift-giving, not only tangible gifts, but human-relation wants.

#### 2.1.1.3. **Bald On-Record**

Brown and Levinson (1987: 69) stated that doing an act baldly, without redressing, involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way possible (for example, for a request, saying 'Do X!'). Brown and Levinson (1987: 95) also stated that the prime reason for Bald On-Record usage may be stated simply. In general, whenever a speaker wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency *more than* he wants to satisfy the hearer's face, even to any degree, he will choose Bald On-Record strategy. This type of strategy is commonly found with people who know each other very well, and are very comfortable in their environment, such as close friends and family (Examples from Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies: 1997). These fall into two cases:

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

Where maximum efficiency is very important and this is mutually known by both Speaker (S) and Hearer (H), no face redress is necessary. There

are some motivation for Bald on Record (non-minimization of FTA), they are:

- a. In cases of great urgency or desperation. For example: 'Watch out!', 'Help!'
- b. In cases when Speaker (S) speaks as if maximum efficiency were very important. For example: 'Listen, I've got an idea', 'Hear me out!'
- c. In cases of channel noise or where communication difficulties exert pressure to speak with maximum efficiency. For example: 'Come home right now!'
- d. In cases when the focus of interaction is task-oriented, like instructions and recipes. For example: 'Give me the nails', 'Add three cups of flour and stir vigorously'
- e. In cases when the Speaker's want to satisfy Hearer's face is small. For example: 'Bring me wine, Jeeves'
- f. In cases when the Speaker (S) wanted to convey that he does care about H (and therefore about H's positive face), so that no redress is required. For example: 'Your slip is showing', 'Your wig is askew; let me fix it for you'

## **2. Cases of FTA-oriented bald-on-record usage**

Another use of Bald on Record is actually oriented to face. This nicely illustrates the way in which respect for face involves mutual orientation, so

that each participant attempts to foresee what the other participants is attempting to foresee. For example:

- a. Invitation (welcoming), like: 'Come in'
- b. Greeting and farewell, and in general rituals of beginning or terminating encounters, like: 'Sit down', 'Go', 'Come again', 'don't worry about me'
- c. Offer, like: 'Have some more cake', 'Leave it to me'

#### **2.1.1.4. Off-Record**

Brown and Levinson (1987: 211) stated that 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. Thus if a speaker wants to do an FTA, but wants to avoid the responsibility of doing it, he can do it Off-Record and leave it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it. In this strategy, you are removing yourself from any imposition whatsoever (Examples from Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies: 1997). There are two major class of Off-Record, they are:

##### ***1. Invite Conversational Implicatures***

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. The outputs of this strategy are:

**Strategy 1: Give hints**

By stating motives for doing act A and by asserting/questioning the condition for doing act A

Example: It's cold in here (e.i. shut the window)

That window isn't open.

**Strategy 2: Give association clues**

By mentioning something associated with the act requested of Hearer, either by precedent Speaker-Hearer's experience or by mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience

Example: My home isn't far away .... (please come, visit me)

Are you going to market tomorrow? ... There's a market tomorrow,  
I suppose (e.i. give me a ride there)

**Strategy 3: Presuppose**

Example: I washed the car again today.

**Strategy 4: understate**

By saying less than is required

Example: It's not half bad (Speaker thinks it's surprisingly good)

**Strategy 5: Overstate**

By exaggerating or choosing a point, which is higher than the actual state of affairs.

Example: I tried to call you hundred times.

**Strategy 6: Use tautologies**

By uttering a tautology, Speaker encourages Hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance.

Example: Boys will be boys

War is war

**Strategy 7: Use contradictions**

State two things that contradict each other.

Example: A: Are you upset about that?

B: Well, yes and no

**Strategy 8: Be ironic**

By saying the opposite of what he means

Example: Beautiful weather, isn't it? (to postman drenched in rainstorm)

**Strategy 9: Use metaphor**

Use utterances which are literally false

Example: Harry's real fish (He swims like a fish)

**Strategy 10: Use rhetorical questions**

Ask question with no intention of obtaining an answer.

Example: How many times do I have to tell you...?

**2. *Be Vague or Ambiguous***

The Speaker may choose to go Off-Record by being vague or ambiguous (that is, violating the Manner Maxim) in such a way that his communicated intent remains ill defined. The outputs of this strategy are:



**Strategy 11: Be ambiguous**

Using utterances, which have ambiguous meaning.

Example: John's pretty sharp cookie.

**Strategy 12: Be vague**

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

Example: Perhaps someone did something naughty.

**Strategy 13: Over-generalize**

Example: Mature people sometimes help do the dishes.

**Strategy 14: Displace H**

Pretend 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.

Example: Mia, can you pass the salt to me? (in fact the salt is nearer to her director than to Mia)

**Strategy 15: Be incomplete, use ellipsis**

Leave an FTA half undone.

Example: Well, I didn't see you.....

**2.1.2. Request**

According to Tsul (1995: 103-104) requests are intrinsically face-threatening acts. They either predicate a future action of the addressee and in so doing put some pressure on him to do or to refrain from doing an action, hence infringing on his freedom of action; or they predicate a future action of the

speaker and in so doing put some pressure on the addressee to accept or reject it, hence incurring a debt or a responsibility for the action done. Furthermore, Tsui also stated that there are various strategies to minimize the threat, such as using hedges, apologizing for transgression, using softening mechanism, that give the addressee a face-saving way out and so on.

Kitao (Politeness Strategies Used in Requests – A Cybernetic Model: 2000) stated that people use politeness strategies to maximize the possibility of gain in requests without damaging the relationship with the hearer. There are three situational variables, which influence the choice of level of politeness. They are necessity of the requests, hearer's ease to carry out the requests, and cultural variables. The social Distance between the speaker and the hearer (familiarity) and social status (power) also affect politeness strategies in requests (Brown and Levinson, 1978; Scollon & Scollon, 1983 in Kitao, Politeness Strategies Used in Requests – A Cybernetic Model: 2000)

### **2.1.3. Gender and Politeness**

Brown and Levinson (1987: 251-252) stated that in Tenejapa society, it appears that the women are more positively polite: that is, their speech is highly elaborated for Positive Politeness, whereas the men are, relatively, more Bald On Record in their speech. Turning to cross-sex dyads, .... For we find that women are polite to men – now mostly with the use of negative politeness strategy – and men are brusque (relatively Bald On Record) to women, unless a high D (Social Distance) demands Negative Politeness. For men, the social world is less sharply

divided; men treat everyone regardless of sex relatively Bald On Record, unless a high D (Distance) or high Rx (Rank of imposition) in particular circumstances forces them to choose a higher strategy. Women are vulnerable to men in a society where wives, sisters, and daughters may be beaten, and marriageable women may be abducted; their predominantly negatively polite speech to men derives then largely from the P (Power) variable. Turning to the contrast between women talking to women and men to men, perhaps a dominant factor is that men have a higher weighting wants that conflict with face wants – for example, wants that support a goal of communicative efficiency which conflicts with the elaboration of face-redressive strategy. Moreover, women treat some FTA more cautiously than men; the vulnerability of women means that more acts, and particular acts (such as talking to an unrelated male at all), are defined as face-threatening, motivating women to assess Wx higher than men do in general. Brown and Levinson (1987: 246) also stated that in most cultures, women among women have a tendency to use more elaborated positive-politeness strategies than do men among men. Compared with women, men may assimilate more to upper-class dignity and competition for power, while women, excluded from this area, maintain solidarity ties with one another. Women, after all, are allegedly ‘co-operative’ conversationalists who express frequent concern for other participants in talk;... (Cameron, et.al ed. Jackson, 1993: 424).

## **2.2. Related Studies**

In this study, the writer uses two studies to support her study. The first study is a study by Saeko Fukushima. Fukushima analyzed Requests and culture: Politeness in British English and Japanese. The second study is a study by Masrah. She analyzed the politeness strategies used by a male and a female in a play “Private Lives” by Noel Coward.

### **2.2.1. A study by Masrah (1997)**

In her study, she intended to find out the differences of politeness strategies by a male and a female in their use of language in a play “ Private Lives” by Noel Coward. In analyzing the data, she used “Private Lives” a play by Noel Coward. This play is the story of misadventures caused by an exchange of husbands and wives. In her research, she only chose two characters, Elliott and Amanda. The reasons of choosing those two characters are because those two characters talked much more than other characters, the number of their utterances is almost equal, and the play focused more on their problem.

The finding of her study is that the two characters, Elliot and Amanda, used much more Positive politeness than Negative politeness. However, the male character, Elliot, used more Positive politeness than the female character, Amanda.

### **2.2.2 A study by Saeko Fukushima (2000)**

Her study is about politeness in British English and Japanese. In her study, she wanted to compare the use of politeness strategies between the British and the Japanese in making and responding requests. Here, she presented a cross-cultural comparison between British and Japanese cultures focusing on requests and responses. The study based on data elicited from a questionnaire which lists the choices of strategies for making requests and responding to Off-Record requests, taking into account the variables of power, social distance, and imposition. In her study, she investigated 133 Japanese undergraduate students (32 males; 101 females) and 121 British undergraduate students (48 males; 73 females).

The finding of her research is that Japanese and British (undergraduate students) cultures display differences in the politeness strategies they use when making requests and responding to Off-Record requests. She suggested that the differences, in part, because of the distinction between individualist (the explicit British) and collectivist (the implicit Japanese) cultures. Furthermore, she also found out that the type of response to Off-Record requests is mainly driven by rank of imposition rather than power or social distance.

PUSPITER SINGA

CHAITAN

DATA REPRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

*Karunia*

*Fotocopy & Penjilidan*

5032728

SKRIPSI

THE SIMILARITIES AND...

PUSPITER