

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the definition of politeness, several theories related to politeness strategies, and some previous studies related to the topic.

A. Theoretical Framework

1. The Definition of Politeness

Politeness is one of the themes of pragmatics. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that explores the meaning of linguistic uses according to the context of oral and written texts (Paltridge Brian, 2006). (Yule, 1996) states that pragmatic theory is the study of the meaning of the speaker's speech and the listener's interpretation. Interpretation of the meaning in pragmatics based on a particular context and how that context affects what is said. Based on the definition, it can be concluded that pragmatics is a discipline that discusses the contextual meaning of language use. Therefore, when the utterances are interpreted based on the context such as the setting, speakers, background knowledge, and others it can be named pragmatics.

Politeness is a concept in speech that serves to minimize conflict and misunderstanding in communication. In general, politeness promotes social peace and avoids social strife. Linguistic politeness, more specifically, refers to speaking techniques or language devices that are perceived or judged by others to have been used to maintain harmonious relationships and avoid difficulties. In many situations, politeness involves delicately adapting to changing social interactions (Holmes, 2013). Some writers are cautious enough to explain what they mean by the word. At length, current

formulations agree on the fundamental essence of the concept, namely, that it consists of mutually shared forms of regard for others. What they fail to consider is that what some may regard as a "mutually shared kind of care for others" may be viewed differently by others (Watts, 2003).

Goffman sought to study social interaction, which includes verbal communication, from the standpoint of individuals seeking stability in their relationships with others. As a result, participants in talks should not violate one another's face. Refusing a request or reprimanding someone is an action that can have a bad or good impact on the other person's face (Renkema, 2005). Hence, we always show a face to others and show others' face. When we do interaction with other people we such as play a mini-drama that shows the other claim for ourselves (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

According to (Brown & Levinson, 1987) politeness is a strategy consisting of the positive face and negative face in an attempt to avoid face threats and keep each others' face. Within their everyday social interactions, people generally behave as if their expectations concerning their public self-image, or their face wants, will be respected. Besides, Leech in (Watts, 2003) also states that politeness is a conflict avoidance strategy that can be measured by how much effort is made to avoid conflict in a situation and to establish and maintain harmony.

Sifianou in (Watts, 2003) states that people are more inclined to think because it gives them pleasurable pleasure. In return, they get attention and meet the needs of others. This is a multifaceted award. This does not mean that people act this way because of some hidden motive (which may

be true in some circumstances) or because they expect a specific benefit. In brief explanation, they have internalized the idea that to live in a peaceful society, they must give and receive to maintain the necessary balance in their relationship. Then she concludes politeness is a social principle that considers the satisfaction of both the speaker and listener following communication expectations.

2. Face Threatening Acts

A face-threatening act is an action that threatens an interlocutor's face desires (Yule, 1996). Thus, the speaker says anything that is threatening to another person's self-image expectations. Brown and Levinson state that there are two kinds of face threatening acts namely, positive face and negative face that threaten speaker's and hearer's face.

a. Face threatening acts as the hearer's face

1. Positive Face

Positive face indicates a face that provides information for the hearer's self image in order for the hearer to seem good and be able to be a desirable human being according to conventions. These items include the following: disapproval, criticism, complaints, accusations, contradictions, and disagreement.

2. Negative face

Face threatening act constraining the hearer's personal freedom that necessitates his participation in expressing the speaker's intent toward the hearer and predicating the future act. Negative face implies

independence, an open schedule, and freedom from imposition by others. Examples include the following:

- a) apologies (showing that S regrets to do the previous FTA so damaging the S's face) such as giving suggestion and advice.
- b) acceptance of compliment (S may feel compelled to degrade the object of H's previous compliment, so causing damage to his own face; or he may feel compelled to compliment H in exchange.)
- c) self-humbling, shuffling or crawling, acting dumb, contradicting oneself
- d) confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility, for example, for having done or failed to do an act, or for ignorance of something that S should know
- e) emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears

b. Face threatening acts as the speaker's face

1. Positive Face

Face-threatening behavior that directly threatens the speaker's self-image. The speaker makes the comment, which is harmful. In the midst of speaking, his freedom of action was threatened. The FTAs that is possibly threatened speaker's positive face such as apologies, acceptance of a compliment, emotional control, self-humiliation, confession, emotion leakage and speaker's face.

2. Negative Face

The speaker's personal freedom was threatened by the face-threatening behavior. The speaker expresses himself because he has

no choice. Expressing thanks, acceptance the H's thanks or apology, excuses, acceptance of offers, and unwilling promises are the FTAs that is possibly threaten the speaker's negative faces.

3. Politeness Strategies

According to many experts, there are numerous politeness ideas; however, in this instance, the researcher only discusses four politeness concepts that are regarded the most renowned and frequently utilized in many studies.

a. Politeness Strategies According to Lakoff

1) *Formality (Keep Aloof)*

The first rule of politeness according to Lakoff is formality. This is perhaps the most common rule in etiquette books and other formal politeness concerns. It is evident in languages that distinguish between formal and informal modes of communication. These two distinctions help to create a barrier between the speakers and the addressee. This distances the speaker from both the hearer and what he is saying, suggesting that his speech lacks emotive content and hence allows the participant to keep aloof. For example, It is better to use the term *carcinoma* rather than cancer, which has negative emotional connotations. The doctor maintains both distance from and superiority over his addressee by employing these words (Lakoff, 2004).

2) *Deference (Give Option)*

The second rule of politeness according to Lakoff is deference. Deference can be employed alone or in collaboration with either of the other two principles, however, rules 1 and 3 are mutually incompatible. The use of this rule gives the impression that the addressee has the option of how to act or what to do. Of course, this is frequently a fake or convention, when the speaker is well aware that he can impose a decision. In general, this rule etiquette indicates, whether truly or conventionally, the hearer's supremacy over the speaker (Lakoff, 2004). For example: *Please come to my place for a bit if you have time before heading to work!* (It offers the addressee an option of coming or not.) (Sofiana, 2019).

3) *Camaraderie (Show Sympathy)*

The last rule of politeness according to Lakoff is camaraderie. The purpose of this rule is to make the listener feel that the speaker loves him, wants to be friendly with him, cares about him, etc. Example: You are as sweet as an angel. (It will make the hearer delighted with compliments.) (Sofiana, 2019).

b. Politeness Strategies According to Grice

1) *Maxim of Quantity*

The quantity maxim is the first maxim of the cooperative principle. The maxim of quantity asserts that speakers should be as informative as necessary, providing neither too little nor

too much information. Some speakers prefer to emphasize that they know how much information the hearer needs or can be bothered with (Cutting, 2002).

2) *Maxim of Quality*

The quality maxim is the second maxim of the cooperative principle. The maxim of quality asserts that speakers are supposed to be honest, to speak something that they feel to be true. They are expected not to state anything they feel is untrue or for which they lack evidence. Some speakers want to bring the attention of their hearers to the fact that they are simply stating what they think to be true and that they lack appropriate evidence (Cutting, 2002).

3) *Maxim of Relation*

The maxim of relation is the third maxim of cooperative principle. The maxim of relation asserts that speakers are expected to be expressing something related to what has come before (Cutting, 2002).

4) *Maxim of Manner*

The maxim of manner is the fourth maxim of the cooperative principle. The maxim of manner asserts that speakers should be concise and systematic, and keep away from ambiguity and obscurity (Cutting, 2002).

c. **Politeness Strategies According to Brown and Levinson**

Brown and Levinson introduced the concept of “face” in politeness. The term face means the public face image that every member wants to claim for himself. (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In this case, Politeness can be achieved in conditions of social distance or closeness. Expressing awareness for others' faces that appear socially distant is commonly referred to as respect or reverence while showing similar awareness for others' faces that appear socially close is commonly referred to as friendly, camaraderie, or solidarity (Yule, 1996). For example, is in the following shows the different ways to ask for a request. Point (a) shows how a student gives a question to his teacher and point (b) shows how to give a question to his friend with the same individual.

- a. Excuse me, Mr. Buckingham, but can I talk to you for a minute?*
- b. Hey, Bucky, got a minute?*

Those examples show the different kinds of politeness related to the assumption of closeness or social distance between the speakers. Within daily interaction, the speakers want that their public self-image or face wants will be respected by others. According to (Brown & Levinson, 1987) there are four types of politeness strategies as follows:

1) *Bald On-Record*

Bald on record strategy is a straight, clear, explicit, and brief method of stating things. (Brown & Levinson, 1987) state that the primary argument for using bald-on-record is simple and clear: if S desires maximum efficiency above

satisfying H's face, even to a degree, he will select the bald-on-record strategy. There are, however, several types of bald-on-record use in multiple situations, since S may have a variety of motivations for intending to conduct the FTA as efficiently as possible. A bald on-record strategy is a direct approach that frequently uses imperative forms. This type of strategy is often used by people who know each other very well and are very comfortable with their surroundings, such as close friends or family members. (Aditiawarman & Elba, 2018) . This strategy is usually followed by 'please' and 'would you?' expression (Yule, 1996).

Example: There is a person who asks for something directly.

- a) Give me a pen.
- b) Lend me your pen.

2) *Off-Record*

Brown and Levinson (1978:216) describe off-record strategy as a communication activity that is performed in such a manner that it is impossible to attach a single obvious communicative aim to the conduct in question. In this instance, the actor provides herself or herself with a variety of defensible interpretations, so giving herself or himself an "exit." S/he cannot be seen to have committed herself/himself to a single interpretation of her/his actions since she/he did not. In other words, according to the BL claim, the actor leaves it

up to the addressee to choose how the act should be interpreted (Aditiawarman & Elba, 2018).

It is important in indirect language usage that utterances be made off the record. One expresses themselves in a rather general manner. In this situation, the hearer will have to draw certain inferences to figure out what was meant (Aditiawarman & Elba, 2018). For example, if a person says, "It is really hot in here," it is possible that the hidden meaning of the statement is a request to open a window or turn on the air conditioner.

3) *Positive Politeness*

As a kind of reparation, positive politeness is aimed at the hearer's positive face, the hearer's constant desire to be seen as attractive in the sight of others. By implying that one's desires (or at least some of them) are in some ways comparable to those of the hearer, one can partly fulfill that need. In contrast to negative politeness, which is limited to the imposition itself in terms of relevant redress, positive politeness is broadened in terms of relevant redress to include an appreciation of the alter's wants in general or the expression of similarity between egos and the alter's wanted (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Positive-politeness expressions are utilized as a form of a metaphorical extension of closeness, to suggest a common ground or a shared desire to a limited degree even between strangers. Positive-politeness Emotional expressions are

utilized as a form of a metaphorical extension of closeness, to suggest a common ground or a shared desire to a limited degree even between strangers (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

For example:

- a) How about letting me for using your pen?
- b) Hey, Buddy, I'd appreciate it if you'd let me use your pen.

Those expressions represent a greater risk for the speaker of suffering a refusal and may be preceded by some 'getting to know you talk.

4) *Negative Politeness*

Negative politeness is restitution directed at the addressee's negative face: his need for unrestricted activity and attention. It serves the purpose of reducing the specific pressure that the FTA inevitably imposes on the parties involved (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

As a language expression of negative politeness by BL, there are five primary elements to consider: conveying the receiver's desire not to impose on the recipient, not coercing the receiver, not presuming/assuming, being (conventionally in) direct, and redressing the receiver's wishes (Aditiawarman & Elba, 2018).

For example:

- a) I couldn't borrow \$30, could I, if you don't need it right now?

b) Could I borrow \$30?

The example in point (a) shows that the speaker gives negative question. This question seems to anticipate refusal from the hearer and it is more polite than the second question.

d. Politeness Strategies According to Leech

Leech (1983) proposed six politeness strategies which are well-known as the politeness principle with conversational maxims. The first maxim is the tact maxim, the second maxim is the generosity maxim, the third maxim is the approbation maxim, the fourth maxim is the modesty maxim, the fifth maxim is the agreement maxim, and the last maxim is the sympathy maxim.

1) *Tact Maxim*

This maxim has a function to maximize the benefit to others and minimize the cost to others (Leech, 1983). The tact maxim is used in impositive and commissive speech acts. The impositive speech act such as ordering, requesting, commanding, advising, recommending, etc., and commissive speech act such as promising, vowing, offering, and so on (Watts, 2003).

The tact maxim may be the most significant kind of politeness in society today. This maxim matches Brown and Levinson's negative politeness approach of limiting the imposition. (Cutting, 2002).

For example:

- a) You know, I really do think you ought to sell that old car. I'll cost more and more money in repairs and it uses up far too much fuel.

The speaker follows this maxim, which reduces the "cost" for the listener by using two utterances. One is to call for solidarity, *you know*, and the other as a hedge modifier, *really*, and an attitude predicate, *I think*, and a modal verb, *ought to*. The speaker, on the other hand, maximizes the advantage to the addressee in the second portion of the turn by stressing that selling the car would allow him or her to save a significant amount of time and money.

2) *Generosity Maxim*

The generosity maxim is a maxim that has a function to minimize the benefit to self and maximize the cost to self (Leech, 1983). The speakers of this maxim are expected to show their respect for each other. This maxim is used in impositive and commissive speech acts. The generosity maxim is the opposite of the tact maxim. This kind of maxim matches Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategy of responding to the hearer's interests, desires, and needs. The contradiction is that if the hearer agrees to accept the terms of the bird table, they will be denied the opportunity to reduce the cost to others. In this sense, if they both attempt to be courteous at the same time, they will come to a standstill (Cutting, 2002).

For example:

- a) A cup of tea.
- b) A cup of tea, please!
- c) Could you give me a cup of tea, please?

In these three sentences, politeness progressively shifts from being a cost to the hearer to being a benefit to the hearer, and thus from being impolite to be more courteous to the hearer. The utterance of A comes across as rough as if it is being rejected. B's speech seems to be a bit kind, causing the listener to reap the benefits to a greater or lesser extent. C maximizes the cost himself, causing the listener to be grateful for the opportunity to provide tea to the speaker (Yu & Ren, 2013).

3) *Approbation Maxim*

Approbation maxim is the maxim that has a function to minimize dispraise to others and to maximize praise to others (Leech, 1983). This maxim is employed in expressive and assertive speech acts. Thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling, boasting, complaining, claiming, and reporting are some examples of expressive and assertive. It signifies that this maxim is utilized to avoid talking negative things to others to the one who is listening.

For example:

- a) Dear Aunt Mabel, *I want to thank you so much for this wonderful Christmas present. It is very thoughtful of you.*

This example shows the expression of thanking which is the speaker maximizing the praise to the hearer.

b) I wonder if you can maintain the noise out of your Saturday events down a bit. *I'm locating it very difficult to get sufficient sleep over the weekends.*

This example shows the expression of complaining which is the speaker minimizing dispraise to the hearer (Watts, 2003).

4) *Modesty Maxim*

The Maxim of modesty is to minimize encouragement to self and to maximize blame to self (Leech, 1983). This maxim is used in expressive and assertive speech acts. This sub-maxim establishes the speaker as the initial point; boasting is unpleasant, thus dispraising oneself is more courteous in this situation.

For example:

a) *Good game! What a great performance! I wish I could sing well too.*

This example shows the praise as a function of illocutionary, to draw attention to the accomplishments of the addressee, the speaker downplays her or his capabilities.

5) *Agreement Maxim*

The agreement maxim is to make disagreement and agreement between self and others as maximal as possible (Leech, 1983). This maxim is used in assertive speech acts. This maxim pays particular attention to whether the speaker's point of view is in agreement with the listener's point of view.

If it is maintained in line with the agreement, the agreement maxim is respected.

For example:

- a) *I know we haven't always agreed in the past and I don't want to claim that the government acted in any other way than we would have done in power, but we believe the affair was essentially mismanaged from the outset.*

This example shows that there is a political argument going on between the speaker and the addressee. The speaker of the short dialogue above wants to make a point about his political party while keeping the scope of a dispute with the interlocutor to a minimum disagreement.

6) *Sympathy Maxim*

The primary purpose of the sympathy maxim is to show antipathy between self and others and to show sympathy between self and others as maximal as possible (Leech, 1983). This maxim is used in assertive speech acts. This sympathy maxim includes expressions such as congratulating, commiserating and expressing condolences (Cutting, 2002).

For example:

- a) *Despite very serious technical disagreements, we have done our best to coordinate our efforts to reach an agreement, but so far we have found something in common.*

This case demonstrates the function of the report's in-verbal act in which the speaker seeks to reduce the antipathy that exists between the speaker and the reported person.

B. Previous Studies

Politeness strategies is a topic of research that has been selected by several researchers. Hence, there are several previous studies with the same topic as this study. The first previous study is a thesis written by (Muhasibi, 2021) entitled “Politeness Strategies Used by Teacher and Students on Online English Teaching Learning Process at SMPN 2 Tanon, Sragen in Academic Year 2020/2021”. The purpose of this study is to explore the types of politeness strategies used by teachers and students in the learning process of teaching English online and the most dominant politeness strategies. This study was conducted in a descriptive qualitative study method using observations to collect data. This study used the theory of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson. This study found that there are four types of politeness strategies used by teacher namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record strategy and the students only use three types of politeness strategies namely bald on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. The most dominant politeness strategies used by teacher are the bald on-record strategy and the most dominant used by students are positive politeness strategies.

The second previous study is a journal article written by (Mahmud, 2019) entitled “The Use of Politeness Strategies in The Classroom Context by English University Students “.The purpose of this study is to learn about

strategies of politeness used by English language students at the university in Makassar. This study was conducted by collecting data using a descriptive qualitative research method through observation and documentation. This study applied Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies to analyze the data. As result, there are some expressions of politeness strategies shown by students. Greetings, thanking, addressing terms, apologizing, and fillers are some expressions found in this study that are categorized as positive and negative politeness.

The third previous study is a journal article written by (Fitriyani & Andriyanti, 2020) entitled “Teacher and Students’ Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom Interactions”. This study is to know the use of politeness strategies by senior high school teacher and students in EFL Classroom interaction. This study was conducted in a descriptive qualitative research design by using documentation (video recording) to collect the data. Brown and Levinson’s politeness strategies were applied by the researcher to analyze the data. This study shows the result that teacher and students in EFL classroom use three types of politeness strategies namely positive politeness, negative politeness, and bald-on record strategy.

The fourth previous strategy is a thesis written by (Harahap, 2018) entitled “Politeness Strategies Used by English Teacher at SMP Bina Satria Mulia Medan.” This study aims to investigate the types of politeness strategies used by an English teacher at SMP Bina Satria Mulia Medan and to know how the teacher realized the politeness strategies. This study was conducted in a descriptive qualitative research method by using video recording to collect the

data. This study used Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies to analyze the data. The result of the study shows that there are four politeness strategies used by the teacher namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record strategy. The use of bald on record is realized because Bald on record was realized as a result of the tight interaction that existed between the teacher and the students. Positive politeness was realized as a result of showing respect to students during the teaching-learning process, whereas negative politeness was realized as a result of maintaining stronger friendships among them. Off the record was realized because the teacher wants the students to comprehend the teacher more simply by providing a hint in the teaching-learning process.

The fifth previous study is a journal article written by (Annisah et al., 2021) entitled "Politeness Maxims Used by English Students Program Study at STKIP Taman Siswa Bima". This research aims to investigate the categories and the function of the dominant types of politeness maxims used in classroom interaction by the students of the English department at STKIP Taman Siswa Bima. This study was conducted in a descriptive qualitative method by using video recording to collect the data. This study uses Leech's politeness theory to analyze the data. As a result of this study, there are six maxims of Leech that are used by the students in classroom interaction namely Tact Maxim, Generosity Maxim, Approbation maxim, Agreement Maxim, Sympathy Maxim, and Modesty Maxim. The dominant maxim that is used by students is the tact maxim which serves a variety of functions, including declarative, interrogative, imperative, and apology.