

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter discusses the theories related to this study. Those are definition of face, politeness, face-threatening act, Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies, movie script/ film, and two previous studies related to what the writer conducts.

#### **2.1 Pragmatics**

According to Yule (1996) Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influence what is said.

#### **2.2 Face and Face-Saving Act**

Face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction. In general, people cooperate (and assume each other's cooperation) in maintaining

face in interaction, such cooperation being based on the mutual vulnerability of face (Brown and Levinson, 1978).

Face is divided into two different parts, positive and negative face.

Positive face is the desire to be respected or appreciated and approved. As a member in a group, a person needs to be connected to others or to belong to that group. While negative face is the desire to be free or not to be imposed on. In other words, the negative face is the time when there is a need to be independent and to have freedom from imposition. Yule (1996) says that there is an act which can save someone's face called face-saving act. Thus, we can save someone's negative face by showing concern about imposition and we also can save someone's positive face by showing solidarity and draw attention to a common goal.

### **2.3 Face-Threatening Act**

A face-threatening act (FTA) is an act which challenges the face wants of an interlocutor. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), face-threatening acts may threaten either the speaker's face or the hearer's face, and they may threaten either positive face or negative face.

If you say something that represents a threat to another person's self-image, that is called a face-threatening act. For example, if you use a direct speech act to get someone to do something (Give me that paper!), you are behaving as if you have more social power than the other person. If you do not actually have that



social power (e.g. you are not a military officer or prison warden), then you are performing a face-threatening-act. An indirect speech act, in the form associated with a question (Could you pass me that paper?), removes the assumption of social power. You are not only asking if it is possible. This makes you say something that lessens the possible threat to another's face, it can be described as a face-saving act Yule (2010).

## 2.4 Positive Face

Positive face is the need to be connected, to belong, to be a member of the group (Yule, 2010). FTAs threatening the hearer's self-image include (i) expressions negatively evaluating the hearer's positive face, e.g. disapproval, criticism, complaints, accusations, contradictions, disagreements etc., as well as (ii) expressions which show that the speaker does not care about H's positive face, e.g. expressions of violent emotions, taboo topics, bad news, emotional topics, interruptions etc.

## 2.5 Negative Face

Negative face is the need to be independent and free from imposition (Yule, 2010). FTAs restricting the hearer's personal freedom include (i) acts predicating a future act of the hearer, e.g. orders/requests, suggestions/advice, reminding, threats/warnings/dares, (ii) acts predicating a future act of the speaker towards the hearer, e.g. offers/promises, and (iii) acts expressing a desire of the

speaker towards the hearer or his/her goods, e.g. compliments, expressions of emotions.

## 2.6 Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), in the context of the mutual vulnerability of face, any rational agent will seek to avoid FTAs or will try to use certain strategies to minimize the threat. These are four possible strategies for doing FTAs; without redressive action, bald-on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record.

### 2.6.1 Bald on record

Bald on-record strategies usually do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. Brown and Levinson state that the prime reason for bald-on-record usage is whenever S wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy H's face, even to any degree, he will choose the bald-on-record strategy (1987).

There are, however, different kinds of bald-on-record usage in different circumstances, because S can have different motives for his want to do the FTA with maximum efficiency. These fall into two classes: those where the face threat is not minimized, where face is ignored or is irrelevant; and those where in doing the FTA baldly onrecord, S minimizes face threats by implication.



## 1. Cases of non-minimalization of the face threat

Where maximum efficiency is very important, and this is mutually known to both S and H, no face redress is necessary. In cases of great urgency or desperation, redress would actually decrease the communicated urgency (Brown and Levinson 1987).

Examples: 1. *"Help!"* (compare the non-urgent *'Please help me, if you would be so kind'*).

2. *"Watch out!"*

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

This illustrates 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.

Examples: *"Come in, dont hesitate, I'm not busy."*

### 2.6.2 Positive Politeness

Positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants (or the actions/acquisitions/values resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable.

Brown and Levinson later say that there are fifteen strategies in applying positive politeness in a conversation. The strategies are grouped into three major

classes: claim common ground, convey that S and H are cooperators, and fulfill H's want for some X.

### 1. Claim common ground

This is the first group of politeness strategies according to Brown and Levinson. Claim common ground indicates that S and H both belong to some set of persons who share specific wants, including goals and values. The strategies in this group are as follows (all of the following strategies below are based on Brown and Levinson 1987):

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

This strategy suggests that S should take notice of aspects of H's condition (noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, anything which looks as though H would want S to notice and approve of it).

Example: *"Goodness, you cut your hair!..... by the way, I came here to borrow some flour."*

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

This is often done with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodics, as well as with intensifying modifiers.

Example: *"What a fantastic garden you have!"*

- c) Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H

Another way for S to communicate to H that he shares some of his wants is to intensify the interest of his own (S's) contributions to the conversation, by 'making a good story'.



Example: *"I come down the stairs, and what do you think I see? –a huge mess all over the place, the phone's off the hook and clothes are scattered all over..."*

d) Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers

By using any of the innumerable ways to convey in-group membership, S can implicitly claim the common ground with H that is carried by that definition of the group. These include in-group usages of address forms, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis.

Example: *"Come here, kid"*

e) Strategy 5: Seek agreement

Another characteristic way of claiming common ground with H is to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with him. The raising of 'safe topics' allows Sto stress his agreement with H and therefore to satisfy H's desire to be 'right', or to be corroborated in his opinions.

Example: A: *"John went to London this weekend"*

B: *"To London."*

f) Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

The desire to agree or appear nwith H leads also to mechanism for pretending to be agree.

Example: A: *"That's where you live, Florida?"*

B: *"That's where I was born."*

g) Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert common ground

The value of S's spending time and effort on being with H, as a mark of friendship or interest in him, gives rise to the strategy of redressing an FTA by talking for a while about unrelated topics.

Example: *"I had a really hard time learning to drive, didn't I."*

h) Strategy 8: Joke

Since jokes are based on mutual shared background knowledge and values, jokes may be used to stress that shared background or those shared values. Joking is a basic positive-politeness technique, for putting H 'at ease'.

Example: *"Ok if I tackle those cookies now?"*

## 2. Convey that S and H are cooperators.

The second major class of positive-politeness strategies derives from the want to convey that the speaker and the addressee are cooperatively involved in the relevant activity. If S and H are cooperating, then they share goals in some domain, and thus to convey that they are cooperators can serve to redress H's positive-face want (Brown and Levinson 1987).

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

One way of indicating that S and H are cooperators, and thus potentially to put pressure on H to cooperate with S, is to assert or imply knowledge of H's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants with them.



Example: *“Look, I know you want the car back by 5.0, so should I go to the town now?”*

j) Strategy 10: Offer, promise

In order to redress the potential threat of some FTAs, S may choose to stress his cooperation with H in another way. He may, that is, claim that (within a certain sphere of relevance) whatever H wants, S wants *for* him and will help to obtain. Offers and promises are the natural outcome of choosing this strategy; even if they are false, they demonstrate S's good intentions in satisfying H's positive-face wants.

Example: *“I'll drop by sometime next week”*

k) Strategy 11: Be optimistic

S is presumptuous as to assume H will cooperate with him may carry a tacit commitment for S to cooperative with H as well, or at least a tacit claim that H will cooperate with S because it will be in their mutual shared interest.

Example: *“Look, I'm sure you won't mind if I borrow your car tonight”*

l) Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity

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

Example: *“Let's go get some coffee.”*

m) Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons

Another aspect of including H in the activity is for S to give reasons as to why he wants what he wants.

Example: *"Why don't we go to the seashore!"*

n) Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

The existence of cooperation between S and H may also be claimed or urged, by giving evidence of reciprocal rights or obligations obtaining between S and H.

Example: *"I will lend you some money if you do the dishes."*

### 3. Fulfill H's want for some X

The last class of positive politeness strategy 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 as stated by Brown and Levinson (1987).

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

This is the last strategy of positive politeness strategy. S may satisfy H's positive want (that S want H's wants, to some degree) by actually satisfying some of H's wants.

### 2.6.3 Negative politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), 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. It is the heart of respect behaviour, just as positive politeness is the kernel of 'familiar' and 'joking' behaviour.



Negative politeness strategies are oriented towards the hearer's negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer. These strategies presume that the speaker will be imposing on the listener and there is a higher potential for awkwardness or embarrassment than in bald on record strategies and positive politeness strategies.

The strategies here are grouped into 5 different classes as the following:

### **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. However, it turns out that this clashes with the need for redress attuned to H's negative face, so in fact one does not issue negatively polite FTAs completely directly (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

#### **a) Strategy : Be conventionally indirect**

In this strategy a speaker is faced with opposing tensions: the desire to give H an 'out' by being indirect, and the desire to go on record.

Example: *"Can you please pass the salt?"*

### **2. Don't presume assume**

The desire to be direct derives from the aspect of negative politeness that specifies on-record delivery of the FTA, all other negative-politeness strategies derive from the second specification that redress be given to H's negative face. Such strategy can be given by carefully avoiding presuming or assuming that anything involved in the FTA is desired or believed by H (Brown and Levinson 1987).

b) Strategy 2: Question, hedge

In the literature, a 'hedge' is a particle, word, or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set.

Example: *"I think that Harry is coming."*

### 3. Don't coerce H.

Another class of ways of redressing H's negative-face want is used when the proposed FTA involves predicating an act of H (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

c) 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.

Example: *"Could you close the window?"*

d) Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition, Rx.

One way of defusing the FTA is to indicate that Rx, the intrinsic seriousness of the imposition, is not in itself great, leaving only D and P as possible weighty factors.

Example: *"I just want to ask you if I can borrow a little paper."*

e) Strategy 5: Give difference

There are two sides to the coin in the realization of deference: one in which S humbles and abases himself, and another one where S raises H (pays him positive face of a particular kind, namely that which satisfies H's want to be treated as superior).

Example: *"Excuse me, sir, but would you mind if I close the window?"*



#### 4. Communicate S's want to not impinge on H.

One way to partially satisfy H's negative face demands is to indicate that S is aware of them and taking them into account in his decision to communicate the FTA (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

##### f) Strategy 6: Apologize

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

Example: *"I hope this is not going to bother you too much, I ....."*

##### g) Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H

One way of indicating that 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, or only inclusive of H.

Example: *"I tell you that it is so."*

##### h) Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule

One way of dissociating S and H from the particular imposition in the FTA, and hence a way of communicating that S does not want to impinge but is merely forced to by circumstances, is to state the FTA as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation.

Example: *"I am going to spray you with DDT to follow international regulations."*

i) Strategy 9: Nominalize

The degrees of negative politeness is formality which is associated with the noun end of the continuum.

Example: *"You performed well on the examinations and we were favourably impressed."*

### 5. Redress other wants of H's.

A final higher-order strategy of negative politeness consists in offering partial compensation for the face threat in the FTA by redressing some particular other wants of H's (Brown and Levinson, 1987)..

j) Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not incurring H

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

Example: *"I'd be eternally grateful if you would....."*

### 2.6.4 Off record

A communicative act applies 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. In other words, the actor leaves himself an 'out' by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations; he cannot be held to have committed himself to just one particular interpretation of his act. This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing. For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say "wow, it's getting cold in here"



insinuating that it would be nice if the listener would get up and turn up the thermostat without directly asking the listener to do so, Brown and Levinson (1987)..

According to Brown and Levinson there are two types of off record strategy which classify 15 strategies as presented in the following:

### **1. Invite conversational implicatures.**

The basic way for the speaker to give hints is to invite conversational implicatures by violating, in some way, the Gricean Maxims of efficient communication.

#### **a) Strategy 1: Give hints**

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

Example: *"It's cold in here."*

#### **b) Strategy 2: Give association clues**

A related kind of implicature triggered by relevance violations 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.

Example: *"Oh God, I've got a headache again."*

#### **c) Strategy 3: Presuppose**

A third set of clues to S's intent is related in a different way to the Relevance Maxim.

Example: *"I washed the car again today."*

d) Strategy 4: Understate

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

Example: *"It's pretty nice."*

e) Strategy 5: Overstate

Overstate is when S says more than is necessary, thus violating the Quantitu Maxim in another way, he may also convey implicatures.

Example: *"You never do the washing up."*

f) Strategy 6: Use tautologies

Another method of generating inferences by violations of the quantity maxim is to utter patent and necessary truths.

Example: *"Boys will be boys."*

g) Strategy 7: Use contradiction

This strategy involves the violaion of Quality Maxim. By stating two things that contradict each other.

Example: A: *"Are you upset about that?"*

B: *"Well, I'm and I'm not."*

h) Strategy 8: Be ironic

By saying the opposite of what he means, S can indirectly convey his intended meaning.

Example: *"Lovely neighborhood, eh?" (in a slum)*

i) Strategy 10: Use rethorical question



To ask a question with no intention of obtaining an answer is to break a sincerity condition on questions.

Example: *"What can I say?"*

## 2. Be vague or ambiguous: Violate the manner maxim

Rather than inviting a particular implicature, S may choose to go off record by being vague or ambiguous in such a way that his communicated intent remains ill-defined as explained by Brown and Levinson (1987).

### j) Strategy 11: Be ambiguous

Proposeful ambiguity may be achieved through metaphor, since it is not always clear exactly which of the connotations of a metaphor are intended to be invoked.

Example: *"John's a pretty smooth cookie."*

### k) 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."*

### l) Strategy 13: Over-generalize

The use of proverbs, although their implicature may be conventionalized to the extent of being on record, may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record.

Example: *"People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones."*

m) Strategy 14: Displace

S may go off record as to who the target for his FTA is, or he may 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: *"Pass the stapler please."* (this is the conditions when there is her professor where he is closer than her mate, but she asked her mate to pass the stapler.

n) Strategy 15: Be incomplete, use ellipsis

Elliptical utterances are legitimated by various conversational contexts.

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

## 2.7 Politeness

Linguistic politeness has generally been considered the proper concern of 'pragmatics', the area of linguistics that accounts for how we attribute meaning to utterances in context, or 'meaning in interaction' (Thomas, 1995).

Politeness is best expressed as the practical application of good manners or etiquette. It is a culturally defined phenomenon, and therefore what is considered polite in one culture can sometimes be quite rude or simply eccentric in another cultural context.



## 2.8 Previous Studies

The writer uses two previous studies before his study to back up the study that he conducted since two of them have the similar study which conduct the same study, Politeness Strategy. However, the writer reviews two different kinds of study, one is a case study and the other is textual analysis.

The first one about the case study was conducted by Fibrini (2011) entitled 'A study of Language Politeness Used by a Sumbawane in Daily Conversation'.

She conducted how FTAs and the politeness strategy used among Sumbawane in their daily conversations and the reason behind the use of the certain strategy. Fibrini used Brown and Levinson Politeness strategy. According to Fibrini, culture and social aspects influenced the relationship as well as its conversation.

In this case, she tried to analyse how politeness strategies were applied in real life.

There were so many bald-on record strategies applied and commonly threatening the H's negative face. Negative politeness strategy was more occasionally applied rather than the positive one.

The other study that also used politeness strategy in analysing conversation was conducted by Willu (2011). She conducted about the use of politeness in movie entitled "The Curious Case of Benjamin Button". Willu analysed how politeness strategy was used by the main character Benjamin Button in his conversation with people with different relationship. The result showed that negative politeness was used more than positive one in the conversation done by main character Benjamin Button. She also used Brown and Levinson Politeness

strategies in conducting her study. She found that different relationship could influence the use of politeness strategies. This study becomes the prior reference for the writer since she conducted the same study and the same kind of study, it is textual analysis.

Through the results above, the writer can conclude that the daily life conversations are similar to the conversations done in movie since it reflects the real communication in life. The differences is, if in the movie, not all the conversations commonly happen in real life, while in the real life, the conversations are commonly done by the impact of the culture. The difference among those previous studies with the writer's study is, unlike those previous studies, the writer also conducted the FTA which is connected to the politeness strategies. While the similarity among those previous studies with the writer's study is the theory used, it is Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies.