

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses a review of the thesis's related literature. This chapter discusses relevant ideas and provides a review of previous findings.

A. Politeness

In everyday conversations, we as civilized human beings will certainly think about what we say, to whom we say it, or who our partners are, in what kind of situations we say so as not to offend listeners.

So that politeness is one of the important things that people use in communicating. Politeness is applied to develop mutual respect, support one another, build good relationships, increase and strengthen one's self-esteem and self-confidence, and is good for honing communication skills.

Leech (1993) says that language politeness is a field of pragmatic research. The term pragmatics has been widely used by experts, but in essence, refers to the research of the use of language concretely by considering the situation of its use or common called context.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness is an action to prevent and handle speech acts that threaten the self-image or face of other people or oneself (Face Threatening Acts).

According to Watts (2003: 13), the theory of politeness is almost exclusively used to refer to the various ways of conceptualizing politeness. However, doing only obscures the issue because polite and politeness are lexemes in the English language whose meanings are open to interpretation by those interacting in English.

Yule (1996), as cited by Manik and Hutagaol (2015), politeness is an interaction, and it can be defined as the means used to show awareness of another person's face. In this sense, politeness can be achieved in situations of social distance or closeness. Politeness can be achieved in situations of social distance or closeness in this sense. Respect or deference are often used to describe showing awareness for another person's face when that other appears social distance.

B. Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategy is a strategy that aims to demonstrate polite behavior when communicating with others. Politeness strategies are used when the speaker and the listener interact or converse. However, the definition of politeness varies from expert to expert.

Being polite is an important thing when having conversations with other people in cultures with norms and values. According to Yule (1996) it is very important to investigate Politeness strategies. This is because in certain contexts it is widely used by people in their interactions, such as knowing how to say, what to say, when to say it, where to say it, and with whom to say it. With a polite attitude, it will impress to give respect to other people to the speaker when he is talking. This causes the formation of comfortable conditions when conducting a conversation.

Politeness in language according to Leech (1993) (1) cost-benefit scale (this scale refers to the large and small losses and gains caused by a speech act. The more detrimental the impact of the speech is to the speaker, the more speech is considered to be more compensation. And vice versa), (2) choice scale (this scale refers to the number of alternative choices conveyed by speakers), (3) indirect scale (this scale refers to whether or not an intention is conveyed. Speeches are considered polite if

delivered not directly), (4) the scale of authority (this scale refers to the social status relationship between the speaker and the speaker), and (5) the social distance scale (this scale refers to the social relationship between the speaker and the speaker involved in the conversation).

The most influential approach to politeness is the theory formulated by (Brown and Levinson 1987) associated with the concept face saving. These experts define politeness as doing action that considers the feelings of others in it pay attention to the positive face (positive face), namely the desire to be recognized and the negative face (negative face) namely the desire not to be disturbed and free from burdens. The need for face is considered valid at all cultural levels where face defined as something that can be lost, needs to be maintained, or needs to be supported. The assumption underlying this theory is that faces are constantly present in a risky condition because of all forms of language action called face threatening act (FTA) that has a function connecting the speaker with the interlocutor is seen as a threat to the opponent language. Therefore, all actions that threaten the face must be neutralized using the correct dose of politeness. To be precise, politeness is understood as a basis in producing a social order and is a tool for expedite interaction.

In relation to this politeness strategy, there are ways to avoid the Face Threatening Act (FTA). As an example:

1. Hey, could you lend me a hundred dollars? (Bald-on record)
2. Could you lend me a hundred dollars, friend? (Positive politeness)
3. I'm sorry to bother you, but could you lend me \$100? (Negative politeness)
4. Oh no, I've run out of money! Today I forgot to go to the bank. (Off the record)

This theory tries to overcome the social disturbances faced by speakers in interactions with other people. When carrying out actions that are considered threatening face, the speaker will try to minimize possible threats to face arise unless the speaker is in a particular situation that requires him to do so efficiency of language i.e. in times of emergency such as accidents etc.

The concept of politeness is widely discussed by experts in the field sociolinguistics, including Lakoff (1975) which states that being polite is to say something that relates to society properly. With a more general approach, Fraser and Nolen (1981) argue that to be polite one must comply with the rules that apply in each social bonds. A speaker will be considered impolite when he violates applicable rules. The concept of politeness is closely related to the elements of right and wrong a person's attitude as measured by a tool called a rule.

Lakoff's theory of politeness is incorporated into Grice's cooperative principle theory. She adopted the cooperative principle's framework and renamed it the rules of conversation. Furthermore, she proposes pragmatic competence rules, which are a combination of conversation and politeness rules (Lakoff in Watts, 2003). The rule of conversation, which is based on Grice's cooperative principles, includes rules such as providing informative information as needed, being honest, being relevant, and communicating clear information. Meanwhile, the second rule, the rule of politeness, consists of three rules: avoid imposition, provide options, and maintain a friendly atmosphere in interactions.

However, criticism of Lakoff's theory has emerged, primarily addressing the fact that if a speaker follows the second rule, which is the rule of politeness, then he or she will violate the rule of conversation in the interaction (Watts, 2003).

Furthermore, Lakoff's theory on politeness could not provide empirical evidence related to cross-cultural politeness, which is another criticism of Lakoff's theory on politeness (Shahrokhi and Bidabadi, 2013).

Through these strategies, the researcher chooses the right strategy to use in his research, namely Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy theory.

C. Brown and Levinson's Theory

In this research researcher focused on the most prominent theory of politeness is from Brown and Levinson (1987). They believe that within a person occurs positive and negative face. Face means a public self image. It refers to the emotional and social sense of self that every person has and expects to be recognized by everyone (Yule, 1996:60). Negative face refers to the individual's desire for freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Positive face refers to the individual's desire that his wants be appreciated and approved of in social interaction. Therefore, they propose strategies the goal is to maintain the face of the hearers. There are four strategies namely:

1. Bald On-Record

The first strategy is known as bald-on-record. It is used to convey information or a message to the listener directly (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Furthermore, they explain that because the speaker speaks effectively and directly, this strategy is used to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation between interlocutors. As a result, the utterances must be delivered directly, vividly, unambiguously, and succinctly. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), one type of bald-on-the-record strategy is a direct imperative or direct command. They go on to say that the speaker employs this strategy in two instances. The first

instance is the failure to minimize the face threat. When the speaker employs the strategy of not softening the face threat, four conditions apply. When they are in an urgent situation, the speaker has more power than the hearer, the speaker wants to show sympathy, and the speaker does not want to keep their face. Furthermore, they claim that the second case occurs when this strategy is 'actually oriented to face'. It appears in three contexts: welcoming or inviting, farewells, and offers.

There are kinds of bald-on record that cited in (Brown & Levinson, 1987) consist of some strategies are:

a. Showing disagreement

The speaker shows disagreement to the hearer without softening the threat. For example: *No one makes your hair stronger*

b. Giving suggestion

The speaker gives suggestion to the hearer without regarding of who the person is. For example: *Dress like a goddess and gods will flock to you!*

c. Requesting

It shows when speakers directly request the interlocutors to do what they want. It usually deals with imperative sentences. For example: *Put your jacket away!*

d. Warning

In emergency situation, the speaker uses direct command to the hearer without softening the threat. Example: *Don't hide your body smell!*

e. Using imperative form

When the speaker uses imperative form, she/he did not regard who the person is. For example: *Go away!*

f. Offering

The speaker directly offered for something. Example: *Leave it, I'll clean up later!*

g. Task-oriented

It happens when speakers directly order the hearers to do what they want them to. Example: *Pass me the hammer!*

From those strategies, it is used to minimize the effort from the speaker to avoid some conversation that useless and wasting time. These strategies often make the hearer startled, shy, not comfort and do it spontaneously. Thus, this strategy seems as a command or instruction.

2. Positive Politeness

Positive politeness is the second strategy. It is intended to boost the listeners' positive attitude. Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 101) elaborate that it can be expressed by making the hearers feel appreciated by others by satisfying their faces. There are a lot of strategy that use in positive politeness:

Brown and Levinson (1987: 103-129) divide positive politeness strategy into 15 strategies. They are:

a. Noticing, attending to hearer (her/his interests, wants, needs, goods, etc.)

The strategy is applied by noticing changes, remarkable possession or anything which looks or through the hearer. Would want speaker notices and approve. For example: *Jim, you're really good at solving computer problems.*

I wonder if you could just help me with a little formatting problem I've got.

b. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer)

This strategy is applied by using exaggerated intonation, stress and another prosodic aspect as well as by intensifying modifier. Example: Good old Jim.

Just the man I wanted to see. I knew I'd find you here. Could you spare me a couple of minutes?

c. Intensify interest to hearer

To intensify interest to the hearer, a speaker can make a good story. Speaker also can use tag question to draw hearer into the conversation. Example:
You'll never guess what Fred told me last night. This is right up your street.

d. Use in-group identity markers

The speaker can implicitly claim the common ground with the hearer that is carried by that definition of the group (address forms, use of language or dialect within the group, use of jargon or slang, contractions and ellipsis). For example: Here's my *old mate* Fred. How are you doing today, *mate*? Could you give me a hand to get this car to start?

e. Seek agreement in safe topics

Raising a "safe topic" allows the speaker to emphasize his/her agreement with the hearer that the listener's opinion is correct. For example, if your neighbor comes home with a new car and you think it is very big and polluting, you might still be able to say sincerely, "Isn't your new car a beautiful color!". Big and polluting, you might still be able to say sincerely, "*Isn't your new car a beautiful color!*". Therefore, your neighbor's positive face is safe because we are not telling him about his bad car. Or it can be applied by repeating other's words. For example: *I agree. Right. Manchester United played really badly last night, didn't they?* D'you reckon you could give me a cigarette?

f. Avoid disagreement

The application of hedging opinion to avoid a disagreement. Token agreement (to pretend to agree), quasi-agreement (speaker draws his own conclusions), white lies, and hedging of opinions. Example: *Well, in a way, I suppose you're sort of right. But look at it like this. Why don't you...?*

g. Presupposing, raising, asserting common ground

One way to accomplish this strategy is through gossiping or small talk. Besides, it also can be applied by using point of view operations and presupposition manipulations. For example: *People like me and you, Bill, don't like being pushed around like that, do we? Why don't you go and complain?*

h. Joke

This strategy may be used as an exploitation of politeness strategies as well, in attempting to reduce the size of the FTA. Jokes are also used as a basic positive politeness technique for putting the hearer 'at ease'. Example:

Speaker : *Great summer we're having. It's only rained five times a week on average.*

Hearer : *Yeah, terrible, isn't it?*

Speaker : *Could I ask you for a favor?*

i. Asserting or presupposing knowledge of and concern for hearer's wants.

This strategy is done by asserting or implying knowledge of the hearer's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants with them. For example: *I know you like marshmallows, so I've brought you home a whole box of them. I wonder if I could ask you for a favor...*

j. Offering, promising

Offering and promising are naturally outcomes of choosing this strategy even if they are false. They just demonstrate the speaker's good intentions in satisfying the hearer's wants. Example: *I'll take you out to dinner on Saturday. If you will cook the dinner this evening.*

k. Being optimistic

Speaker assumes that hearer wants to do something for speaker and will help to obtain the goal because it will be in their shared interest. Example:

I know you're always glad to get a tip or two on gardening, Fred. So, if I were you, I wouldn't cut your lawn back so short.

l. Including both speaker and hearer in the activity

S wants to stop and have something to eat and wants to get H to agree to do this. Example: *I'm feeling really hungry. Let's stop for a bite.*

m. Giving (or asking) for reasons

The speaker includes the hearer in the speaker's practical reasoning and assuming reflexivity that the hearer wants the speaker's wants. This strategy can be used for complaining or criticizing by demanding reasons why his hearers do or do not do something. For example: *I think you've had a bit too much to drink, Jim. Why not stay at our place this evening?*

n. Asserting reciprocal exchange

The speaker may say in effect. Example: *Dad, if you help me with my mathematics homework, I'll mow the lawn after school tomorrow.*

o. Giving gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

When applying this strategy, the speaker may give not only a tangible gift,

but also a human relation wants gift. Example:

Speaker : *Have a glass of malt whisky, Dick.*

Hearer : Terrific! Thanks.

Speaker : Not at all. I wonder if I could confide in you for a minute or two.

Those strategy in positive politeness can be concluded as a good attitude or action to reach convenience in interaction among people, so the hearers assume that the speaker really wants to be a friend in closeness.

3. Negative Politeness

The third strategy is negative politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) define this strategy as "remedial action" directed at the listener's negative face. This strategy aims to reduce interference with the listener's freedom of action. This strategy is a little similar to positive politeness, they both aim to facilitate their interactions and needs. This strategy will usually be used when the speaker is socially distant or feels awkward in front of the listener. There are some strategies to do in negative politeness:

a. Being indirect

By being indirect, the speaker is faced clash between the need to go on record and the need to give the hearer redress. The degree of politeness in the expression of indirect speech acts is that the more effort the speaker expends to maintain face, the more he will be seen to be trying to satisfy the hearer's face desires. And strategic choices will be preferred over other strategies that satisfy to a lesser extent. Being indirect can be realized by questioning. For example:
Could you tell me the time, please?

b. Questioning using hedge

Hedge can be defined as caution notes expressed about how an utterance is to be taken. Do not coerce H. Give the H the option not to take action: be indirect, do not assume that the H is able/willing to take action, assume that the H will not take action. For example: I wonder whether I could just sort of ask you a little question.

c. Being pessimistic

Speaker explicitly expresses doubt. It can be applied by using subjunctive (if). Example: If you had a little time to spare for me this afternoon, I'd like to talk about my paper.

d. Minimizing the imposition

Minimizing the imposition between the speaker and the hearer. Example: Could I talk to you for just a minute?

e. Giving deference

The speaker may use honorific to address the hearer. Example: Excuse me, *officer*. I think I might have parked in the wrong place.

f. Apologizing

When asking for apologize, speaker may admit the impingements, indicates reluctance, gives over whelming reasons and beg forgiveness. For example: Sorry to bother you, but...

g. Impersonalizing the speaker and the hearer

People may use performatives, imperatives, impersonal verbs, passive and circumstantial voices, replace, the pronouns I and you by indefinites, pluralize the I and your pronouns and use point of view distancing. Example:

Speaker : *That cars parked in a no parking area.*

Hearer : It's mine, officer.

Speaker : *Well, it'll have to have a parking ticket.*

h. Stating the FTA as general rule

The strategy can be applied by stating the FTA as a general rule. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that stating FTAs as instances of regulation, obligation or social rules is one way to separate speakers and interlocutors from the particular coercion in FTAs. This can be indicated as a way of communicating that the speaker did not intend to commit the offense but was constrained by the circumstances. offense but is constrained by the circumstances. In example: Parking on the double yellow lines is illegal, so I'm going to have to give you a fine.

i. Nominalizing

Nominalizing the hearer also can save other's face. By nominalizing speaker can avoid the possible threat on the hearer's face. This strategy has the main point of making the sentence more formal by using the level of nominalization. This can be seen from the negative politeness, formality, which goes hand in hand with the degree of discomfort. Example: Participation in an illegal demonstration is punishable by law, could I have your name and address, madam?

j. Going on record as incurring a debt

The strategy can be applied by easily going on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting hearer. Example: If you could just sort out a problem I've got with my formatting, *I'll buy you a beer at lunchtime.*

4. Off-Record

The final strategy is known as off-the-record. It enables the speaker to perform FTA in an indirect manner. As a result, the speaker's utterance has multiple interpretations. Because there are numerous interpretations that can be drawn from the speaker's utterances, it is up to the listener to choose how to interpret them. For example, when we need to borrow a pen, we simply search our pockets and then rummage in our bags. Even if we need to say something, we are not required to ask for anything. "Uh, I forgot my pen," we could simply say. Such an off-the-record statement may or may not succeed.

According to (Brown & Levinson, 1987), the strategy in Off Record are as follows:

a. Give hints

Speaker violates the maxim of relevant, the hints can be realized through 'raising the issue' of some desired acts. For instance, by stating motives or reasons for doing a certain act. It can be applied by asserting or questioning.

Example: It's cold here instead of shut the window!

b. Giving association clues

When applying the strategy, speaker also violates the maxim of relevance. It is done by mentioning something associated with the act required of hearer. The association clues could be either by precedent in speaker-hearer's experience or by mutual knowledge of their international experience. Example: Oh God, I've got headache again.

c. Presupposing

This strategy violates the relevant maxim, but in a different way. When applying the strategy, speaker might say something which seems relevant, yet violates the maxim just at the level of its presupposition. For example: I cleaned the home again today.

d. Understating

When understating, speaker generates by saying less than it is required.

Example: The red dress is quite nice for you. (quite means not too good)

e. Overstating

Overstating is the contrary of understating strategy. Here, speaker exaggerates or chooses a point of view on scale which higher than the actual state of affair.

Example: I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer.

f. Using tautologies

In the application, strategy of tautologies also violates the quantity maxim.

Example: War is a war.

g. Using contradictions

Using contradiction is applied by saying two things that one seems to be opposite of the other. Example: Mmm maybe, between yes and no.

h. Being ironic

In its application, usually there are clues that speaker conveys indirect intended meaning in his utterance. Example: John is a real genius. (he'd just done many stupid things).

i. Using metaphors

In the application, speaker utters an utterance which is literary false. Example:

Harry is a real fish. (he swims like a fish)

j. Using rhetorical questions

When applying the strategy, speaker ask question with no intention of obtaining answer. For example: *How many times do I should tell you?*

k. Being ambiguous

Speaker leaves hearer with more than one intended communication meaning.

Example: John is a pretty sharp or smooth cookie

l. Being vague

Speaker can carry the FTA by being vague about whom the object of the FTA is. Example: I'm going down the road for a bit. (go to the local pub)

m. Over-generalizing

Speaker may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record. Example: Mature people sometimes help do the dishes.

n. Displacing hearer

Speaker may go off record by pretending to address the FTA to someone whom it would not threaten and hope the real target person will see that the FTA is addressed to him. Example:

Speaker : Someone has to be responsible with this mess.

Hearer : You know who was having time with his friends tonight here.

(C, the one who was having time there, is close to A and B, A pretends that the FTA is addressed to B, but he hopes C will realize that the FTA is threaten to him).

- o. Being incomplete, using ellipsis

By leaving an utterance half undone, speaker either says less than is required. It means that speaker leaves implicature 'hanging.' Example: *Well, I'll just...*

Hence, Brown and Levinson (1987) add that the more those strategies are used, the more polite those acts are. The strategy can be told as the polite one if used in an appropriate context. So that, when the students and also the lecturers can understand more about politeness and all the strategies, the interaction will be warmer and peaceful.

D. Previous Study

A number of studies have been conducted to investigate politeness strategies and approaches. The following are mentioned in their report:

Fitriyah, et al. conducted research for the journal "*Lecturers' Politeness Strategies and Students' Compliance in English for Foreign Language (EFL) Class*" (2020). This study aims to find out the politeness strategies used by English students at one of the universities in Makassar. The researcher applied descriptive qualitative research method to find politeness in EFL class interaction. The participants of this study were two English literature program classes consisting of 50 students. The main data sources were individual student presentations that had been recorded with fifty transcriptions of five to seven minutes for each presentation. The transcriptions were analyzed and discussed based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. The findings of this study reveal that English language students use a wide variety of expressions to encode their politeness in the classroom. Some terms derived from students' everyday language were used as a softening mechanism in

their presentations. These expressions are categorized as positive and negative politeness.

The second study examined "How EFL teacher Modelling Politeness: Pragmatic Analysis of Classroom Interaction" by Nuril Habibatus Sa'idah, and Toyyibah in *Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language* (2022). This study aims to find out the types of politeness strategies used by English teachers during the learning process at SMA Negeri 1 Prambon. This study uses a qualitative research method with an ethnographic communication design to find politeness strategies in speech used by English teachers. Observations and interviews are the methods used to obtain research data taken.

The third previous study was "Teacher and Students' Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom Interactions" by Santi Fitriyani, and Erna Andriyanti in *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (2020). This study aims to explore the use of politeness strategies which occur in EFL classroom interactions in a senior high school. This study applied a descriptive qualitative research design to explore the politeness strategies used by the teacher and the students in their interactions.

Ni Wayan Prami Wahyudiantari conducted a study "An Analysis of Politeness Strategies Used By Fifth Semester Students At UNDIKMA" published in the *Journal of Social Sciences and Education* (2022). This research aims to find out the politeness strategies used by fifth semester students at UNDIKMA by using qualitative descriptive methods. The theory used to explain the analysis of politeness strategies is Brown and Levinson's theory (1987). Researchers found four politeness strategies used by fifth semester students at UNDIKMA. fifth semester students at

UNDIKMA. The results showed that Bald on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness and Off Record. The most dominant politeness strategy that is most dominantly used is Positive Politeness. Other dominant politeness strategies other dominant politeness strategies used are Bald on Record, Negative Politeness and the last one is Off Record.

Meli Unaina in English Education Journal "*An Analysis of Politeness Strategy in Teacher-Students EFL Classroom Interaction.*" (2021) with the aim of analyzing the types of politeness strategies used by teachers and students, and analyzing linguistic forms of polite greetings of teachers and students in EFL class interactions. This study uses a qualitative method that collects data through observation, videotape, and interviews. The findings show that teachers use different types of politeness strategies during lessons. Of the 30 utterances, these include positive politeness (5), bald on record (14), negative politeness (2), and off record (9). The bald on record strategy has the highest frequency used by teachers in class interactions. In addition, one type of linguistic form in speech is not only used for one type of politeness strategy, but can also be used in two or three types of politeness strategies.

This research and previous research are similar in that they both use qualitative descriptive methods. The author also has the same theory as the previous study, namely uses Brown and Levinson's theory as it is presented in the theses. Several studies on politeness strategies in the EFL classroom have been conducted. Some of the research concentrated only on teachers' politeness strategies. Few studies are also carried out in universities, not junior high schools. The difference between previous research and this research is in the subject matter. In this study politeness strategies in EFL classroom interaction are focused on teachers and students.