

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents brief description and explanation about the theories that support this study. There are several theories that are important to be discussed in this chapter: pragmatics, politeness, the concept of face, face threatening acts (FTA), and politeness strategies, political advertisement.

2. 1. Pragmatics

In interpreting someone's utterance, is not enough if we only depend on the meaning derived from words and the stucture of sentences. Therefore, according to Levinson (1983), we need to concern about the relation between language and the context that are basic to an account of language understanding. The study is about the relation between language and context called pragmatics.

Pragmatics includes the study of how to enterpretate and the use of utterances depend on knowledge of the real world. How the speaker use the understand speech acts and how the structure of sentence is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and hearer. Besides, pragmatics is often contrasted with semantics, which deals with meaning without reference to the users and communicative function, of sentences (Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics 1985:225) Furthermore, it is significant for participant to share knowledge each other so that the hearer may minimize to misinterpret the speaker intended meaning.

2. 2. Politeness

Politeness is a pragmatics phenomenon. Many people often say that politeness is the important thing in human's way for interacting with someone else. The politeness principle is probably universal across all cultures (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Speaking about politeness also very important because it is related to etiquette and norm in every different culture. The social distance between the speaker and the hearer and the need to feel accepted by other people, can also have a significant effect on how we interpret the politeness of utterance.

Cultures differ, however, in how they define politeness and in how important politeness is in comparison with, say, openness or honesty. For example, not interrupting, saying "please" and "thank you," maintaining a focused interaction with appropriate eye contact, and/or not criticizing someone in public are all examples of politeness messages but their importance differs from one culture to another.

Politeness is the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003:6). The goal of politeness is to make all of the parties relaxed and comfortable with one another, these culturally defined standards at times may be manipulated to inflict shame on a designated party. Being polite therefore consists of attempting to save face for another. There are some techniques to show politeness:

- a. Expressing uncertainty and ambiguity through hedging and indirectness.
- b. Doing Polite lying

c. Using of euphemism (which make use of ambiguity as well as connotation)

d. Preferring tag questions to direct statements, such as "You were at the store, weren't you?" o modal tags request information of which the speaker is uncertain. "You didn't go to the store yet, did you?"

There are several opinions toward politeness itself. According to Cutting (2002:45), politeness constitutes the choices that are made in language use, the linguistic expressions that give people space and show friendly attitude to them.

Politeness is showing awareness of another person's face (Yule, 1996:134).

Moreover, Grundy (2000:146) states that politeness phenomena are one manifestation of the wider concept of etiquette, or appropriate behavior.

Politeness is showing awareness of another person's face (Yule, 1996:134). Brown and Levinson (1987) describe politeness as showing an awareness of other people's face wants. They use four strategies such as Bald on record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness and Off record.

2.2.1 Face and Face in Linguistic Concept

There are some explanations about the concept of face and face threatening act (FTA).

2.2.1.1 Face

According to Yule(2006, p.119), Face in pragmatics is your public self-image. This is the emotional and social sense of self that every one has and expects every one else to recognize. In the study of linguistics politeness, the most

relevant concept is 'face'. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 61), face refers to the public self-image. There are two aspects to this self-image:

a. Positive face

Positive face is the need to be accepted and liked by others, treated as a member of the group, and to know one's wants are shared by others (Cutting, 2002: 45). For example: a wife who cooks fried rice for the family expects, her husband to give compliment on the meal and not to criticize it.

b. Negative face

Negative face is the need to be independent, have freedom of action, and not be imposed on by others. For example: a sister who is in the middle of giving advice to her brother expects that her brother does not tend to interrupt. In this example she or he applies freedom from imposition.

Yule (2006, p.119) stated that, the word 'negative' doesn't mean 'bad' here, it's simply the opposite of 'positive'. negative face is the need to be independent and free from imposition.

2. 2.1.2 Face Threatening Acts (FTA)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), FTA means act that threatens either the positive or negative face of the hearer. For the example of acts that threaten the negative face such as asking someone to lend us a car is a threat on that person's negative face as we have imposed our on him/her, that his/her want to be free from being imposed has been disturbed.

Therefore, if we do threaten someone's positive or negative face, but we do not mean to do that, we need to minimize it by applying politeness strategies; there are Bald on record, Positive Politeness, Negative politeness and Off record.

2.2.1.2.1 Positive Face Threatening Acts.

Positive face is threatened when the speaker or addressee does not care about their interlocutor's feelings, wants, or does not want what the other wants.

Positive face threatening acts can also cause damage to the speaker or the addressee. When an individual is forced to be separated from others so that their well being is treated less importantly, positive face is threatened.

a. Damage to the addressee

1. An act that expresses the speaker's negative assessment of the addressee's positive face or an element of his/her positive face. The speaker can display this disapproval in two ways. The first approach is for the speaker to directly or indirectly indicate that he dislikes some aspect of the addressee's possessions, desires, or personal attributes. The second approach is for the speaker to express disapproval by stating or implying that the hearer is wrong, irrational, or misguided.

Examples: expressions of disapproval (e.g. insults, accusations, complaints), contradictions, disagreements, or challenges.

2. An act that expresses the speaker's indifference toward the addressee's positive face.

The addressee might be embarrassed for or fear the speaker.

Examples: excessively emotional expressions.

- 3. The speaker indicates that he doesn't have the same values or fears as the addressee

Examples: disrespect, mention of topics which are inappropriate in general or in the context.

- 4. The speaker indicates that he is willing to disregard the emotional well being of the addressee.

Examples: belittling or boasting.

- 5. The speaker increases the possibility that a face-threatening act will occur. This situation is created when a topic is brought up by the speaker that is a sensitive societal subject.

Examples: topics that relate to politics, race, religion.

- 6. The speaker indicates that he is indifferent to the positive face wants of the addressee. This is most often expressed in obvious non-cooperative behavior.

Examples: interrupting, non-sequiturs.

- 7. The speaker misidentifies the addressee in an offensive or embarrassing way. This may occur either accidentally or intentionally. Generally, this refers to the misuse of address terms in relation to status, gender, or age.

Example: Addressing a young woman as "ma'am" instead of "miss."

b. Damage to the Speaker

1. An act that shows that the speaker is in some sense wrong, and unable to control himself.
2. Apologies: In this act, speaker is damaging his own act by admitting that he regrets one of his previous acts.
3. Acceptance of a compliment
4. Inability to control one's physical self
5. Inability to control one's emotional self
6. Self-humiliation
7. Confessions

2.2.1.2.2 Negative Face Threatening Acts

Negative face is threatened when an individual does not avoid or intend to avoid the obstruction of their interlocutor's freedom of action. It can cause damage to either the speaker or the addressee, and makes the one of the interlocutors submit their will to the other. Freedom of choice and action are impeded when negative face is threatened.

a. Damage to the addressee

1. An act that affirms or denies a future act of the addressee creates pressure on the addressee to either perform or not perform the act.

Examples: orders, requests, suggestions, advice, reminding, threats, or warnings.

2 An act that expresses the speaker's sentiments of the addressee or the addressee's belongings.

Examples: compliments, expressions of envy or admiration, or expressions of strong negative emotion toward the hearer (e.g. hatred, anger, lust).

3 An act that expresses some positive future act of the speaker toward the addressee. In doing so, pressure has been put on the addressee to accept or reject the act and possibly incur a debt.

Examples: offers, and promises.

b. Damage to the Speaker

1. An act that shows that the speaker is succumbing to the power of the addressee.
2. Expressing thanks
3. Accepting a thank you or apology
4. Excuses
5. Acceptance of offers
6. A response to the addressee's violation of social etiquette
7. The speaker commits himself to something he does not want to do

Brown and Levinson (1987:66) explain that some acts could threaten both positive and negative face at times, as follow: *Note that there is an overlap in this classification of FTA, because some FTA's intrinsically threaten both negative and positive face (e.g. complaints, interruptions, threats, strong expressions of emotion, requests for personal information)*

16

In accordance with Brown and Levinson's idea (1987) that some acts can at once threat both positive and negative face, Hayashi (1996:230-231) classifies rejection as an act which can threat addressee's positive and negative face. That is why people need to use the strategy to make rejection sounds more polite.

2.2.2 Brown & Levinson's Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies are strategies that are used in order to avoid or minimize the Face Threatening Acts (FTA) made by the speaker. According to Brown and Levinson(1987: 92). Politeness strategies consist of Bald on Record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness and Off Record. The detail explanation would be discussed as follows.

2.2.2.1 Bald on Record

According to Brown and Levinson, the prime reason for bald on record is the usage whenever speaker (S) wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy hearer's (H's) face, even to any degree (1987: 95). If a speaker makes a suggestion, request and offer in an open and direct way, it means that we are doing Bald on Record. Bald on Record itself consists of two strategies:

1. Cases of non-minimization of the face threat

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

For example (1): *"Help, Your pants are on fire!"*

2. Cases of FTA-oriented bald on record usage

Actually this strategy is oriented to face. The way, in which respect for face involves mutual orientation, so that each participant attempts to foresee what the other participant is attempting to foresee. This strategy is usually used in (i) welcomings (or post-greetings), where S insists that H may impose on his negative face, in (ii) farewells, where S insists that H may transgress on his positive face by taking his leave, in (iii) offers, where S insists that H may impose on S's negative face.

For example (2): *"Don't bother, I'll clean it up"*

"Wash your hands"

2.2.2.2 Off Record

Off record utterances are essentially indirect uses of language (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 211). Although ut theory, bis part is involved as Brown and Levinson theory but it is not the focus of this study. There are some types of off record, they are presented below:

1. Invite conversational implicatures: This is the first type of off record which explains that if the speaker wants to do an FTA, and chooses to do it indirectly, he must give H some hints and hope that H picks up on them and thereby interpreters what S really means (intends) to say. This type is divided into ten strategies:

1. Give hints (Strategy 1)

If S says something that is not explicitly relevant, he invites H to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance.

For example (28): *"It's cold here. (e.i. shut the window)"*

2. Give association clues (Strategy 2)

Related of implicature triggered by relevance violation is provided by mentioning something associated with the act required of H, either by precedent in S-H's experience or by mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience.

For example (29): *"oh God, I've got headache again"*.

3. Presuppose (Strategy 3)

An utterance can be almost wholly relevant in context and yet violate the relevance maxim just at the level of its presuppositions.

For example (30): *"I wash the car again today" (he presupposes that he has done it before (e.g last week) and therefore may implicate a criticism).*

4. Understate (Strategy 4)

Understatements are one way of generating implicatures by saying less than is required.

For example (31): *"she's some kind of idiot (e.i. she's an idiot)"*

5. Overstate (strategy 5)

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

For example (32): *"I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer."*

6. Use tautologies (Strategy 6)

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

For example (33): *"if it's road, it's road! (e.i. Boy, what a terrible road!)"*.

7. Use contradictions (Strategy 7)

S makes it appear that he can not be telling the truth. He thus encourages H to look for an interpretation that reconciles the two contradictory propositions.

For example (34): *A: are you upset about that?*

B: well, yes and no

8. Be ironic (Strategy 8)

S can indirectly convey his intended meaning. If there are clue that his intended meaning is being conveyed indirectly such as; prosodic (e.g. nasality), kinesic (e.g. a smirk) or simply contextual.

For example (35): *"John's a real genius (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row)"*.

9. Use metaphors (Strategy 9)

It is possibility that exactly which of the connotations of the metaphor S intends may be off record.

For example (36): *"Harry's a real fish. (e.i. he swims like a fish)"*

10. Use rhetorical questions (Strategy 10)

To ask a question with no intention of obtaining an answer is to break a sincerity condition on questions. S wants H to provide him with the indicated information.

For example (37): *“how many times do I have to tell you that my name is Nery. (e.i. too many)”*

5. Be vague or ambiguous: Violate the Manner Maxim: the second type of off record explain that S may choose to go off record by being vague or ambiguous (that is, violating the Manner Maxim) in such a way that is communicated intent remains ill-defined. This type is divided into five strategies:

11. Be ambiguous (Strategy 11)

Term ‘ambiguity’ to include the ambiguity between the literal meaning of an utterance and any of its possible implicatures, every off record strategy essentially exploits ambiguity in this wider sense.

For example (38): *“John’s a pretty sharp cookie”*.

12. Be vague (Strategy 12)

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

For example (39): *“looks like someone may have had too much to drink. (Vague understatement)”*

13. Over-generalize (Strategy 13)

Rule instantiation may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record.

14. Displace H (Strategy 14)

S may go off record as to who the target for his FTA is, or he may pretended to address the FTA to someone whom it wouldn't threaten and hope that the real target will see the FTA is aimed at him.

15. Be incomplete, use ellipsis (Strategy 15)

By leaving an FTA a half undone, S can leave the implicature "hanging in the air", just as with rhetorical questions.

2.2.2.3 Politeness Strategy

Politeness strategy is a strategy used to avoid or minimized the Face Threatening Act (FTA) that the speaker makes (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with these FTA's. According to Brown and Levinson, politeness strategies are proposed to save the hearers' face. Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that "self-esteem" in public or in private situations.

Usually we try to avoid embarrassing the other person, or making them feel uncomfortable. There are two kinds of politeness strategy which could be applied according to Brown and Levinson:

2.2.2.3.1 Positive politeness

Positive politeness orients to satisfy the positive face of the hearer. When we use positive politeness, we use speech strategies that emphasize our solidarity with the hearer.

Positive Politeness can be classified into:

1. Claim common ground: This is the first type of positive politeness; this strategy is usually used by people who know each other in order to indicate common ground in which S shares H's wants. S can claim 'common ground' with H, by indicating S and H belongs to the same set of persons, who share specific wants, including goals and values.

Three ways of making this claim:

1. S may convey that some want (goal) of H's is admirable or interesting to S too. (strategy 1-3)
2. S may stress common membership in a group or category. (strategy 4)
3. S can claim common perspective with H without necessarily referring to in- group membership. (strategy 5-8)

The strategies which can be used in this classification are:

- a. Strategy 1: Notice, attend, to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods)

S pays attention of aspects of H's condition (noticeable changes, remarkable possession, etc).

For example (3): *"what a beautiful vase this is! Where did it come from?"*

- b. Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)

This strategy is showing exaggerated intonations, stress and other aspects of prosodic, as well as with intensifying modifiers.

For example (4): *"how absolutely devastating!"*

- c. Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H

S to communicate to H, he shares some of his wants to intensify the interest of his own (S's) contribution to the conversation by making a good story and using tag questions or expressions that include H as a participant in the conversation, such as "you know?", "see what I mean?"

"Isn't it?."

For example (5): *"There were a million people in this apartment tonight"*.

d. Strategy 4: use in-group identity markers

S implicitly suggests common ground with H. This can use of certain terms of address form, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang and of ellipsis.

For example (6): *"Bring me your dirty clothes to wash, darling!"*

e. Strategy 5: Seek agreement

S talks about something to H in which it is possible to seek agreement. For instance, we are talking about the weather or the beauty of a park.

Seeking agreement can be stressed by repeating part of all of what the preceding S has said in the conversation and by using particles that function to indicate emphatic agreement such as "yes", "uhuh", "really!", etc.

For example (7): A: *"I just got a new girlfriend"*

B: *"Really!"*

f. Strategy 6: avoid disagreement

S pretends to agree by twisting their utterances in order to hide disagreement.

For example (8): A: *"can you hear me?"*

B: *Barely*

g. Strategy 7: presuppose/raise/assert common ground

The value of S's spending time and effort to talk for a while with H about unrelated topics to show that S is interested in H and does not come only to impose him/her.

For example (9): *"Hi, Nen, I see your effort in diet program. Now you look slimmer and more charming. By the way Nen, can you lend me five pounds?"*

h. Strategy 8: Joke

Joke is a basic positive politeness technique for putting H 'at ease' or may minimize an FTA.

For example (10): *"how about lending me this old heap of junk? (his new Cadillac)"*.

2. Convey that S and H are cooperators: This is the second type of positive

politeness that shows the S and the addressee are cooperatively involved in the relevant activity. If S and H are cooperating, then they share the goals

in some domain, and thus to convey that they are cooperators can redress H's positive face. Three ways of convey cooperation:

a. S's may indicate his knowledge of and sensitivity to H's wants. (strategy

9)

b. S and H can claim some kind of reflexivity between their wants. (strategy 10-13)

c. S may indicate, that he believes reciprocity to be prevailed between H and himself, thus that they are somehow locked into a state of mutual helping. (strategy 14)

The strategies which can be used in this classification are:

a. Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants.

It is a way to indicate that S and H are cooperators, and thus potentially to put pressure on H to cooperate with S. This strategy is to assert or imply knowledge of H's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants between H and S.

For example (11): "look, I know you want the car back by 5.00, so shouldn't I go to town now?"

b. Strategy 10: offer, promise

To redress the potential threat of some FTAs, S may choose to stress his cooperation with H in other way. It's natural outcome of choosing this strategy; even if they are false. It demonstrates S's good intention in satisfying H's positive face wants.

For example (12): "I'll drop by sometimes next week"

c. Strategy 11: Be optimistic

This strategy shows a tacit claim that H will cooperate with S because it will be in their mutual shared interest.

For example (13): *“look, I’m sure you won’t mind if I borrow your laptop”*

d. Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity

By using an inclusive ‘we’ form when S actually means ‘you’ or ‘me’. This way, he can call upon the cooperative assumptions and thereby redress FTA.

For example (14): *“Give us a break “(I.e. me)”*

e. Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons

Including H in the activity for S gives reasons as to why he wants what he wants.

For example (15): *“why don’t go to seashore?”*

f. Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

S asks H cooperate with him by giving evidence of reciprocal rights or obligations between S and H. Thus, S may say, in effect, ‘I’ll do X for you if you can do Y for me’.

For example (16): *“I’ll give you my love if you buy a branch of roses”*

3. Fulfill H’s want for some X : This the last type of positive politeness that involves S deciding to redress H’s face directly by fulfilling some of H’s wants, thereby indicating that he (S) wants H’s wants for H, in some particular respects, there is only one strategy in this type :

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

S satisfies H ‘s positive face want by giving gift, not only tangible gifts, but human-relation wants which are the wants to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, listened to, and so on.

For example (17): *"I can understand how you feel"*

2.2.2.3.1 Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is repressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 129). It means that negative politeness is used as the way to minimize the potential loss of face of the hearer. When we use negative politeness, it means we use speech strategies that emphasize our deference for the hearer. There are some types of negative politeness, they are presented below:

1. Be direct: This is the first type of negative politeness which explains that sometimes directs one to minimize the imposition by coming rapidly to the point. There is only one strategy in this type:

- a. Strategy 1 : Be conventionally indirect

The S tries talk to H to be indirect, and the desire to go on record, so there can be know misunderstanding of what he means. So, he uses an understandable indirect speech act.

For example (18): *"can you please pass the salt?"*

2. Do not presume/assume: This is the second type of negative politeness which explains that by carefully avoiding presuming or assuming that anything involved in FTA is desired or believed by H. This will include avoiding presumptions about H, his wants, what is relevant or interesting

or worthy of his attention- that is keeping ritual distance from H. There is only one strategy in this type:

a. Strategy 2: Questions, hedge

This strategy is used to modify the force of a speech act.

For example (19): *“you’re quite right”*

3. Do not coerce: This is the third type of negative politeness which explains that Negative-face redress may be made by avoiding coercing H’s response, and this may be done on the one hand by explicitly giving him the option not to do the act. This type is divided into three strategies:

a. Strategy 3: be pessimistic

This strategy gives redress to H’s negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of S’s speech act obtain.

For example (20): *“could you jump over that five-foot fence?”*

b. Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition, R_x

S redresses the intrinsic seriousness of the FTA to pay H deference.

For example (21): *“just a second” (a few minutes).*

c. Strategy 5: Give deference

S humbles and abases him and another where S raises H to satisfy H’s want to be treated as superior.

For example (22): *“that’s all right, sir”*

4. Communicate S’s want to not impinge on H: This is the fourth type of negative politeness which is used to indicate that S is aware of them and taking them into account in his decision to communicate the FTA. Thus he

communicates that any infringement of H's territory is recognized as such and is not undertaken lightly. This type is divided into four strategies:

a. Strategy 6: apologize

By apologizing for doing FTA, the speaker can indicate his reluctance to impinge on H's negative face and thereby partially redress that impingement.

For example (23): *"I don't want to interrupt you, but I have a different opinion"*.

b. Strategy 7: impersonalize S and H : avoid the pronouns "I" and "you"

S does not want to impinge on H is to phrase the FTA as if the agent were other than S, or at least possibly not S or not S alone, and the addressee were other than H only inclusive of H. This results in a variety of ways of avoiding the pronouns "I" and "you".

For example (24): *"it is necessary that the letter is received by the manager"*

c. Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule

S does not want to impinge but is merely forced to by circumstances. Thus he states that FTA as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation.

For example (25): *"student mustn't wear sandals in class"*

d. Strategy 9: Nominalize

Nominalize notices that formality which is associated with the noun end of the continuum.

For example (26): *“your cooperation is urgently requested”*

6. Redress other wants of H's: This is the last type of negative politeness that is offering partial compensation for the face threat in the FTA by redressing some particular other wants of H's; there is only one strategy in this type:

- a. Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debts, or as not indebteding H

S can redress an FTA by explicitly claiming his indebtedness to H or disclaiming any indebtedness of H.

For example (27): *“I could easily do it for you”*

2.2.3 The Politeness Maxims Principle

According to Geoffrey Leech(1993), there is a politeness principle with conversational maxims besides cooperative principle that is needed in an interaction. He lists six maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. The first and second maxim form a pair, as do the third and the fourth one.

2.2.3.1 The Tact maxim

The tact maxim states: 'Minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other; maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other. The first part of this maxim fits with Brown and Levinson's negative

politeness strategy of minimizing the imposition, and the second part reflects the positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interests, wants, and needs.

Could I interrupt you for a second?

If I could just clarify this then

2.2.3.2 The Generosity maxim

Leech's Generosity maxim states: 'Minimize the expression of benefit to self; maximize the expression of cost to self. Unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker, and says that others should be put first instead of the self.

You relax and let me do the dishes

You must come and have dinner with us

2.2.3.3 The Approbation maxim

The Approbation maxim states: 'Minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other. It is preferred to praise others and if this is impossible, to sidestep the issue, to give some sort of minimal response (possibly through the use of euphemisms), or to remain silent. The first part of the maxim avoids disagreement; the second part intends to make other people feel good by showing solidarity.

I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. It was, um... different

John, I know you're a genius - would you know how to solve this math problem here?

2.2.3.4. The Modesty maxim

The Modesty maxim states: 'Minimize the expression of praise of self; maximize the expression of dispraise of self.'

Oh, I'm so stupid - I didn't make a note of our lecture! Did you?

2.2.3.5. The Agreement maxim

The Agreement maxim runs as follows: 'Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximize the expression of agreement between self and other.' It is in line with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies of 'seek agreement' and 'avoid disagreement,' to which they attach great importance. However, it is not being claimed that people totally avoid disagreement. It is simply observed that they are much more direct in expressing agreement, rather than disagreement.

A: I don't want my daughter to do this; I want her to do that

B: Yes, but ma'am, I thought we resolved this already on your last visit

2.2.3.6 The Sympathy maxim

The sympathy maxim states: 'minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other.' This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration, and expressing condolences - all of which is in accordance with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interests, wants, and needs.

I was sorry to hear about your father

2.3 Political Advertisement

Political advertisement of president candidate first appeared in 1952 for the campaign of president candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower in serial television “ Eisenhower Answer America which is produced by Disney studio entitled “I Like Ike”, whereas in Indonesia political advertisement has progressed starting from the press democracy in 1999. The instability of the political movement has provided a space for mass media to have deeper and narrower participation on it.

Political advertisement according to Kaid and Holtz-Bacha in Danial, Akhmad (2009:93) is moving image programs that is designed to promote the interest of a given party or individual. In order to emphasize their political control, Kaid and Holtz-Bacha expand the definition become any controlled message communicated through any channel designed to promote the political interest of individual, parties, groups, government or other organizations.. it can be in the form of speech, moving slogans, and song which are contain promises, oath and pledge. It used to show the candidate’s quality, characters, physical postures, skill, hobbies, achievement, track record, and certain abilities that are consider special.

The object of advertisement here are The 2009 Indonesia President candidates (Megawati from PDI, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono from Democrat Party, and Jusuf Kalla from Golkar).

2.4 Previous Studies

The study of politeness strategies has been done by some persons with different perspectives and data. Astuti(2008), in her research entitled Politeness

Strategies Used by SIM CARD Providers on Advertisements in “JAWA POS”, showed that SIM card’s advertisement used aspect of politeness strategies. The result of the data analysis showed that politeness strategies which was commonly applied in the advertisement of SIM card providers was negative politeness, by using “be conventionally indirect”. The Advertisement of SIM card’s providers that was dedicated for the competitors of business, used negative politeness more frequently than positive politeness in order to attract the customers. Although, their slogan actually wanted to overthrow but still appreciate one another.

Another study was conducted by Elvandari (2012) entitled Politeness Strategies Used by the President Candidates of Indonesia in 2009 Presidential Debate. She analysed FTA and politeness used by president candidates in presidential debate 2009. She found that one of the president candidates, Megawati, did most of the FTAs and another candidate, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono applied most of the politeness strategies. From the analysis result, it was found out that the candidates attacked mostly each other’s negative face as they often agreed and appreciated their rival’s opinion. Moreover, they applied more often positive politeness strategies than the others. The strategies were: the 5th strategy (seek agreement) of claiming common ground and 11th strategy (be optimistic) of conveying that S and H are cooperators.

Moreover, the study was conducted by Kawantoro (2012) entitled Politeness Strategies Performed by the Two Main Characters in the Movie Entitled “The Prestige”. He analysed the politeness strategies in the conversation of the main characters through the script of the movie entitled “The Prestige”. He found that

politeness strategies (positive politeness and negative politeness) are applied by the characters in the movie especially by the two main characters. From the occurrence of all politeness strategies, Robert Angier, tends to use strategies which belong to positive politeness. Angier applies them in his on stage and daily conversation to make himself become more friendly toward the people around him. It can be seen that the character of Angier in the movie is always easy going toward people he meets. He is always able to attract the audiences or the people with his charismatic personality on stage and in daily life. In other side, Alfred Borden prefers to use negative politeness strategies which expresses his introvert personality which always builds gab between the people and him. It is purposed to protect his secret.

The study that is conducted by the writer is rather different from Astuti (2008) since her finding used more negative politeness strategies than positive politeness strategies. Meanwhile, the research similar to Elvandari (2012) since the candidate threats negative face using positive politeness strategies. Moreover the research also different from Elvandari since her object of study is presidential debate and the writer object of study is political advertisement, and her finding did not include 12nd strategy (include both S& H in the activity). Furthermore, this research differ from Kawantoro (2012), because on his finding there is no dominant politeness strategies that are used by the character.