

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews some related topics covering politeness strategy and some previous studies related to this topic.

A. Pragmatics

Pragmatics deal with the study of the ability of natural language speaking to process communication. Yule (1996:3) stated pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by speaker or writer and interpreted by a listener or reader. Consequently, it is more to do with the analysis of what mean by their utterances might mean by themselves. This study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with whom they are talking to, where, when and under circumstances, so pragmatics is also the study of contextual meaning in accordance with whom the speakers are talking to, where, when and under circumstances. Therefore, this approach also necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. It is explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. It is mine that pragmatics also the study of how more gets communicated than is said, then pragmatics also be defined as the study of the

expression of relative distance. There are many aspects that will be analyzed in studying pragmatics such as deixis, reference and inference, presupposition, cooperation and implicature, speech acts and event, politeness and interaction, conversation and preference structure, and discourse and culture. But here the researcher wants to focus on studying politeness and what exists inside

B. Politeness Strategies

Brown & Levinson's politeness theory (1978) is basically a theory politeness strategic behavior (strategic behavior), related how someone to act or speak in order not to lose face hearer (to loose face). The main theme of which is used as a major tool in the explanation of the concept Brown and Levinson's politeness is rationality and advance. Both central theme are believed to be universal traits shared by all the participants said in world and personified in Model Person. Rationality refers to the power rationality or logic while referring to the desire advance.

At first the term 'face' is used by Goffman (1956), which seeks analyzing the structure of social interaction (Hubler, 1983). He explained that sicologi social behavior of members of the community members do not differ much with the showman. As well as the performer, which every participant in social interaction must display a 'face', which is a self-image of public owned by any person with the best as possible for the role it plays. In this case, the face must be raised privately by a player and at the same time must be supported and maintained by other players so there is no face fell. In social interaction, each

participant is obliged to keep his own face interaction and partners while maintaining face he said that there is no face humiliated, insulted or missing.

In the theory of politeness Brown and Levinson (1978: 62), the concept of advance (face) defined as ' ... basic wants, the which every member knows every other member desires, and roomates in general it is in the interest of every member to partially satisfy '. Thus, the face is a fundamental desire that is inherent in every members of the public and in general any other individual and they are interested to fulfill that desire. Furthermore, it is assumed by the second face The expert has two aspects: (1) positive face, namely the desire of every individual sensible to be appreciated or accepted any measures and wishes by others, and (2) the negative face, the desire of individuals to be free from coercion or obligation to carry out something (imposition) or not prevented all actions and desires by others.

Related to the concept of face is then assumed that every utterance communication in the event of potentially contains a follow-threatening advance (Face Threatening Act), either on the face of the speaker and the hearer face. an act of said could threaten the advance of others because of the content and or pronunciation. For man of the sample (models person) which is not the origin of the sound in speaking, always trying to mitigate the speech-speech that contains a follow-threatening advance (FTA). Softening or mitigating actions are called acts of saving face (Face Saving Acts = FSA) as compensation for the FTA can not be inevitable that social relations among participants substitutions remain harmonious. From This is where the study can

be summarized that the politeness experts focused on strategy advance management (face-management), which is an effort that should be done speakers to demonstrate, nurture, and save face addressees in a conversation.

For one participant said that the rational (models person) in the sense of thinking healthy and normal, speak politely means a must choose a strategy substitutions are adapted to the situation, taking into account matters as to whom he says, where, on what, for what purpose, and so on. Theoretically, to be able to choose an appropriate strategy of a speaker must 'Calculate' weighted in danger advance or weightiness of an FTA (W_x) that is the total sum of the elements distance (D), power (P), and ranking of imposition (R_x). Mathematically, the FTA weight expressed in relation following:

$W_x = D(S, H) + P(S, H) + R_x$, where W_x is the amount of value that indicates the importance of the FTA, $D(S, H)$ is a value that indicates the magnitude of the factors of social distance between the speaker (s) and addressees (H), $P(S, H)$ is the magnitude of the power factor in he hearer (H) to the speaker (S), and R_x is the relative status of the imposition types in culture concerned.

Factors P , D , and the R_x is specific culture (Brown and Levinson, 1978:). Factor power $P(S, H)$ can have a maximum magnitude if addressees (H) is very influential, for example, the power possessed by a prince, magical healer, priest, religious, and so on. Meanwhile, the distance factor social (D) can be measured by the level of frequency of interaction between the speakers and addressees. And R_x is a cultural ratings of speech acts, namely how 'Threaten or harm' a speech act is perceived in the background certain cultures. Based on

the calculation factors P, D and R that speakers linguistically competent rational and certain cultures define strategies to avoid face-threatening speech acts (FTA). In other words, rational speakers always take into account the weight relatively against the desire for desire to (a) communicate the content of the FTA, (b) to be more efficient or Emergency in conveying the content of the FTA, and (c) maintain the face of addressees on the degree certain. If he wanted to be polite, in the sense that want to minimize the FTA in utterance, then he should turn down the desire to be more efficient in delivering FTA and simultaneously raise his desire to maintain face addressees.

This a Model Person choosing a particular strategy underlying the preparation of the forms of language he would use by calculations that he did to the sum of the variables P, D and R. The results of calculation that is what led him to choose to strategies politeness strategies such as (1) bald on record, (2) positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, (4) off the record, and (5) do not do the FTA.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) substitutions in any event, a addressees always be the situation ' Do the FTA ' which means that speakers must spend speech so that the FTA can not be avoided, and on situation Do not do the FTA, which means that the speaker does not issue speech or silence only. In situation Do the FTA this is the speaker must choose whether he should FTA frankly do (on record) or do murmur vague (off the record). Furthermore, if he chose to do an FTA with frank (on record), then to remain well behaved he can do it with softening or mitigation measures (with

redressive action) to power the FTA in said. For this, the speaker can choose a positive politeness strategy (positive politeness) and negative politeness (negative politeness). The first was stressed on the assumption that the speaker and the hearer has an interest which is almost the same and are part of the same social group while the latter refers to the assumption that the speaker is aware of the distance social with addressees and do not want to interfere with his freedom. Instead, FTA can be done without further ado and without any softening action (without redressive action or bald on record) against the FTA in a speech power, if he was more concerned with the efficiency of delivering messages or speech acts in his mind than to be polite to their dialogue partners.

Fifth politeness strategies can be described briefly as following. First, do a speech act openly or what their (bald on record) may be made by speakers in the event of an emergency or hazard communication so the use of expressions that are considered common courtesy is not required. speak - utterances included in politeness strategies are warnings in situations of danger such as: "Look out there crocodile! ', 'Get out there's a fire! 'Floods! ' etc. Such expressions do not contain imposition and non-threatening face because it is intended for safety addressees. For more completed explanation, below is the clasification of the theory of politeness strategies by Borwn And Levinson

1. Bald on Record

In the bald on record strategy, the speaker does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer"s face. The reason for its usage is that whenever a speaker (S) wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he or

she wants to satisfy the hearer's (Hs) face, even to any degree, the bald on record strategy chosen according to Brown and Levinson (1987:95). There are two kinds of bald on record usage

a. Non-minimization of the face threat

Non-minimization of the face threat is the standard uses of bald on record usage where other demands override face concerns. S and H both agree that the relevance of face demands may be suspended in the interest of urgency or efficiency. This strategy is often most utilized in situations where the speaker has a close relationship with the audience. Strategy 1: Maximum efficiency This strategy is known to speaker (S) and hearer (H) where face redress is not required, it is quoted in Brown and Levinson (1987:96). In case of great urgency or desperation, redress actually decreases the communicated urgency. For examples: a) HURRY!!! b) Listen to me!. Strategy 2: Metaphorical urgency for emphasis Quoted in the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:96), This strategy is used when speaker (S) speaks as if maximum efficiency is very important, it will provide metaphorical urgency for emphasis. Examples: a) Here, a cup of tea for you(...) b) Wait, she wants you to consider it(...). Strategy 3 metaphorical urgency for high valuation of hearer's friendship According to the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:96), this strategy describes why orders and begging, which have inverted assumptions about the relative status of S and H, seem

to occur in many languages with the same superficial syntax-namely, imperatives. This is the example: a) Pardon me. Strategy 4: case of channel noise Brown and Levinson (1987:96) stated this strategy happens where communication difficulties exploit pressure to speak with maximum efficiency such as calling across a distance. For example: "Come here now!" Strategy 5: task oriented/paradigmatic form of instruction In this kind of interaction, face redress will be irrelevant (Brown Levinson, 1987 :97). Example: Before you're very eyes. Strategy 6: power different between S and H (S is higher) In the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:97) this strategy used commonly when there are difference between speaker (S) and hearer (H),either because S is more powerful than H and does not fear retribution or non-cooperation from H. s does not have to redress the expression in order to satisfy H's face. For example: a) "Absolutely, my lord." b) Send me the report, dina. Strategy 7: Sympathetic advice or warnings Based on the theory of politeness strategy by Brown and Levinson (1987:97), speakers (S) does care about H and therefore about H's positive face, so that no redress is required. For examples: a) Watch out! The cliff is very steep. b) Thank you for your kindness. Strategy 8: Permission that H has requested Granting permission that hearer (H) has requested may baldly on record based on the theory of Brown

and Levinson (1987:98). This is the example: “Yes, you should listen to her”.

b. FTA- oriented bald on record usage

The theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:98) stated the use of bald on record is actually oriented to face. In other words, it is used where face involves mutual orientation, so that each participant attempts to foresee what the other participant is attempting to foresee. For in certain circumstances it is reasonable for S to assume that H will be especially worried with H’s potential violation or S’s maintaining. Strategy 1: Welcoming based on the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:99), it is used when speaker insist that hearer may impose on his negative face. For example, “Good evening”. Strategy 2: Farewells based on Brown and Levinson (1987:100), it is used when speaker insist that hearer may transgress on his positive face by taking his leave. For example, “See you when I see you”. Strategy 3: Offers, used when speaker insist that hearer may impose on speaker’s negative face (Brown and Levinson ,1987:100). For example: a) Take this!”. b) Go away!

2. Positive Politeness Strategy

Brown & Levinson (1987: 85) state that —Positive Politeness Strategy (PPS) is a strategy of speaking which is used a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy to imply common ground or sharing of wants to a

limited extent even between strangers who perceive themselves: for the purpose of interaction.

According to Brown and Levinson, positive face reflects the desire to have one's possessions, goals, and achievements desired by a socially or situationally relevant class of others; thus, positive politeness expresses either a general appreciation of the addressee's wants, or similarity between the wants of the speaker and addressee (1987: 63). It thus reproduces the characteristics of conversational interaction among intimates, where expressions of interest and approval, shared knowledge and desires, and reciprocity of obligations are routinely exchanged.

Brown and Levinson note that it is this identification with intimate language that gives positive politeness its redressive force, since such strategies are used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy“ which functions as a kind of social accelerator“ by means of which the speaker signals his or her desire to come closer“ to the hearer . Positive politeness strategies include compliments, seeking agreement, joking, claiming reflexivity of goals, claiming reciprocity, and expressions of sympathy, understanding and cooperation (Brown & Levinson (1987: 85). In other words, Positive politeness is a communicative way of building solidarity, showing the other is liked and seen as desirable. Redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants should be thought of as desirable. Redress consist in partially satisfying that desire by communicating that someone's own wants. But for some reasons positive

politeness strategy are usable not only for FTA redress, in general as a kind of social accelerator, where the speaker in using them indicates that he/she wants to come closer to the hearer.

Positive Politeness is usually seen in groups of friends, or where people in the given social situation know each other fairly well. It usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected (minimize the FTA). The speakers respect a person's need to be liked and understood. The speakers and addressee like to be cooperators. Typically, speaker asserts that he wants at least some of hearer's wants. Positive politeness strategies include statements of friendship, solidarity, complements. It is used by speaker to give impression that he/she wants H's or in wants or in other words, S wants H's face to be satisfied. This makes the hearer not take it seriously when the speaker does an FTA. To do the FTA given above using positive politeness, person A might say, Hey, that's a great suit you have on! Is it new? By the way, may I borrow your car, tomorrow? (adapted from Brown & Levinson, 1978: 108). By asking about person B suit, person A would be showing that she is interested in something that person B presumably finds desirable, for example, the suit. Positive politeness is used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy. It is also used to get closer to the hearer. In other words, positive politeness is used as a kind of social acceleration.

3. Negative Politeness Strategy

According to Brown & Levinson (1987: 75) Negative Politeness Strategies are kind of strategy which repressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. It is heart of respect behavior, which similar to positive politeness.

Negative politeness is specific and focused. It performs function of minimizing the particular imposition that the FTA unavoidable effects. Negative Politeness strategies are the strategy to assume that you may be imposing on the hearer, and intruding on their space. Therefore, these automatically assume that there might be some social distance or look in the situation. The speakers in this case asserts unwillingness to impinge on addressee. For instance: "Would you close the door, Mr. Taylor?" We can see in that example that the speaker is threatening the hearer's negative face which wants to have freedom of action.

The threat is the speaker asks the hearer to close the door. To minimize the threat, the speaker applies 'hedge' (would you please) to soften the utterance and 'give deference' (Mr. Taylor) to show his/ her respect to the hearer. Negative politeness, on the other hand, is orientated mainly toward partially satisfying (redressing) His negative face, his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination. Negative politeness, thus, is essentially avoidance based, and realizations of negative politeness strategies consist in assurances that the speaker

recognizes and respects the addressee's negative face wants and will not (or will only minimally) interfere with the addressee's freedom of action.

Hence negative politeness is characterized by self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of H's self-image, cent on his want to be unimpeded. Face-threatening acts are redressed with apologies for interfering or transgressing, with linguistic and non-linguistic deference, with hedges on the illocution force of the act, with impersonalizing mechanisms (such as passives) that distance S and H from the act, and with other softening mechanisms that give the addressee an 'out', a face-saving line of escape, permitting him to feel that his response is not coerced.

There is a natural tension in negative politeness, however, between (a) the desire to go on record as a prerequisite to being seen to pay face, and (b) the desire to go off record to avoid imposing. A compromise is reached in conventionalized indirectness, for whatever the indirect mechanism used to do an FTA, once fully conventionalized as a way of doing that FTA it is no longer off record. This many indirect requests, for example, are fully conventionalized in English so that they are on record (e.g., 'Can you pass the salt?' would be read as a request by all participants; there is no longer a viable alternative interpretation of the utterance except in very special circumstances). And between any two (or more) individuals, any utterance may become conventionalized and therefore on record, as is the case with passwords and codes.

A purely conventional 'out' works as redressive action in negative politeness because it pays a token bow to the negative-face wants of the addressee. That is, the fact that the speaker bothers to phrase his FTA in a conventionally indirect way shows that he is aware of and honour the negative-face wants of H.

The latter strategy is not doing speech acts threaten advance (FTA). In this case, the speaker chose speak inwardly in the sense of not say anything to the addressees in the event of communication for utterance less deserve to be answered.

x: Our new neighbor was a civil servant's all very luxurious lifestyle. only each the purchase of new goods.

y: (Silence does not respond) In essence,

Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) looked Politeness as a form of behavior that is chosen, it was decided, and are used strategically by an individual. Thus, the study is directed to strategies and super-strategies that should be considered carefully by a speaker before he speak or act (Eelen, 2001). Strategy and super-strategy politeness hereinafter referred to as positive and negative politeness, which is also related to advance the notion of positive and negative face.

4. Off record strategies

The final politeness strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is the indirect or off-record strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987: 211) "A communicative act is done off record if it is done in such a way 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.”. “off record utterance are essentially indirect uses of language: to construct an off record utterance one says something that is either more general (contains less information in the sense that it rules out for possible states of affair) or actually different from what one means (intends to be understood).

”Referring to Brown and Levinson statement above, off record strategy is a communicative action which has some purpose. Therefore, when speaker doing off record, its didn’t mean just give an information but the speaker has some purpose. Beside that, the language that use in off record strategy is indirect language. When the speaker uses this strategy, he would only give a clue, so the hearer must have to interpret it self. The following is explanation of fifteen off record strategy according to Brown and Levinson theory (1987:213-227).a. Strategy 1: Give hints

“One of the off record strategies which is used by the speaker to state some desired acts of the speaker to be done by addressee by giving hints. Speaker hopes that addressee knows what he means what the speaker means.”

This strategy is used by the speaker to implicit an information to the hearer. The information may be a “demand” or “request” from the speaker to the hearer to do something. Example:(1) “ Ouh I’m so thirsty” (give me a drink). In this example S implies that S wants H to give some water. (2)

It's cold here (shut the window) in this example S implies that S want H to open the window .In those example above, S asked for a request by giving hint. b. Strategy 2: Give association clues Brown and Levinson (1987: 215) state, "The speaker mentions something associated with either precedent addressee's experiences or mutual knowledge of other interpretation experiences". The strategy is conducted 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 interaction experience. Example:(1) When someone needs a ride to a market, she says "Are you going to market tomorrow? There's a market tomorrow, I suppose"(2) "My house, it is not very far away" ("there is the path that leads to my house").c. Strategy 3: Presuppose Brown and Levinson (1987: 217) state "The speaker presupposes something which is relevant with the context of the conversation". This strategy is done through an utterance which relevant in context and invites H to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance just at the level of its presuppositions. Example:(1) when someone implicates a criticism on his friend responsibility to wash the car, he says "I washed the car again today".(2) "I threat again". (he was threatened before)d. Strategy 4: Understate "The speaker chooses one way of generating implicature by saying less than is required it is choosing a point on scalar predicates" (Brown and Levinson (1987: 219). The speaker uses this strategy to express understatement; S says less than is required and as result generates implicatures. Example:(1) when someone doesn't really

like a friend's new haircut, she just says "It's pretty nice".(2) A: "What a marvelous place you have here", B: "oh I don't know it's a place".e.

Strategy 5: Overstate According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 219), "The speaker exaggerates or chooses a point scale which is higher than the real situation or to make important situation". The strategy is done by saying more than is necessary, or by exaggerating or choosing a point on scale which is higher than the actual state of affair. It also called hyperbole. Example:(1) "I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer".In this context, speaker exaggerates like he was called his friend for a hundred times.(2) "You never do the washing up".In this context exaggerates like the hearer never washing up.f. Strategy 6: Use tautologies A very obvious statement in which speaker encourages the hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance, because the speaker just other. Using the strategy tautology means S encourage H to look for an informative interpretation of then on-informative utterance. Example:(1) "You are men. Why don't you do something about it?"(2) Why didn't you come last night? Promise is promise."(3) War is war. In this context, the speaker uses tautologies to show the hearer that the bold sentence aims to pressuring the information. g. Strategy 7: Use contradictions The speaker by stating two things that contradict each other, speaker makes it appear that he cannot be telling the truth. Thus the speaker encourages to addressee looking an interpretation. The strategy is done by stating to contradict things. By doing so, S makes it appear that he cannot

be telling the truth, thus encourage H to look for an interpretation that reconciles the two contradictory propositions. Example: (1) A: Are you upset about that? B: Well, I am and I'm not. (2) Oh, I'm ok. Disappointed, No. Not disappointed, not also. h. Strategy 8: Be ironic Brown and Levinson (1987: 221) state that, "By saying the opposite of what he means speaker can indirectly convey his intended meaning". To be ironic means by saying the opposite of what s means. Through that way, S can indirectly convey his intended meaning, if there are clues (prosodic, kinesics, or textual) which relevant to the context. Example: (1) when a man and his guest passing through a slum area for instance, he says "lovely neighborhood, eh?" (2) Ouh, you always come on time. In this context the speaker actually wants to tell that the hearer always coming late. i. Strategy 9: Use metaphor Brown and Levinson (1987: 222) state that, "The speaker uses a word that described a first subject as being equal to a second subject". The use of metaphor is usually on record, but there is possibility that the connotations of the metaphor uttered by S may be off record. Example: when someone says "Harry's a real fish" which means Harry drinks like a fish. In this context the speaker shows that Harry like a fish, because the fish love the water. Harry as being equal to the fish, because both of them love the water. j. Strategy 10. Use rhetorical questions The speaker uses a linguistic expression used to make a request for information or else itself made by such an expression". The use of this strategy is by raising questions that leave their answers hanging in the air or implicated to do FTAs. Example: "How

many times do I have to tell you?" In this context, the speaker has to tell to the hearer for many times, but the hearer still understands.k.

Strategy 11: Be ambiguous When the speaker produces an ambiguous utterance it means the speaker is trying to minimize the threat of FTA, because the utterance has more than one possible meaning". The term „ambiguity“ includes the ambiguity between the literal meaning of an utterance and any possible implicatures inside. Example:(1) Lovely neighborhood, uh? This context indicates ambiguity, because it could mean that S really has lovely neighborhood or otherwise (his neighbors is very annoying).(2) “John“s a pretty smooth cookie” can be intended as compliment or insult, depending on which the connotations of smooth are latched on to.(3) Mmm, there is a new one, guys! in this context, the word “new” indicates ambiguity. Its depend on the context.l. Strategy 12: Be vague According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 226), “The speaker may go off record with FTA by being vague about who the object of the FTA or what the offence is”. This strategy is conducted by being vague about who the object of the FTA is, or what the offence is. Example:(1) “Perhaps someone did something naughty”. In this context, the speaker uses the word “someone”, because he didn“t want to tell who did something naughty.(2) You must have known, where I go. In this context the speaker is being vague, because he didn“t want to tell where he goes. m. Strategy 13: Over-generalize This strategy is done by saying utterance that may leave the object vaguely off record, and then H has the choice of deciding whether

the general rule applies to him. The speaker did not give clear information by saying something general Example:(1) “Mature people sometimes help do the dishes”.In this context, the speaker uses this strategy to show that mature people generally have a responsibility help to serve the dishes.(2) You are mature. Why do you always cry?In this context, the speaker indicates that mature shouldn’t be like that (never cry).n.Strategy 14: Displace H Brown and Levinson (1987: 226) state,“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 to him.” Example:(1) “Jane, could you run to the stock-room and borrow a stapler for me? ”One case happens when a secretary in an office asks another to pass stapler, in situation where a professor is much nearer than the other secretary. In this case, the professor should be a Hearer, but he displaced to another as the hearer.(2) “Tito, please bring daddy’s bag, honey!!In this context, Tito is still a child, then his wife out while bring the bag”o. Strategy 15: Be incomplete, use ellipsis“The speaker may be pretend to address the FTA to somehow one who would not threaten and hope the real target will see that the FTA is aimed at him/her (Brown and Levinson, 1987:227).The strategy is done by leaving the implicature „hanging in the air“,without rhetorical question .For example: S got headache and ask H to go for an aspirin, he just says: “Oh sir, a headache....”

C. Comparison of Model Theory of Politeness

In this section, the author critically compares some theoretical models politeness influential as Lakoff (1990), Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1978), Blum-Kulka (1992) and Fraser and Nolen (1990) in order clarify the perspective and position in the discussion about the phenomenon politeness. Broadly speaking, each of these models can be grouped into several general perspective, namely: (1) the perspective of Maksim Conversations (MP), (2) the perspective Rescue Front (PM), (3) Norma perspective Social (NS), and (4) Contract perspective Conversation (KP).

MP perspective put forward by Lakoff (1990) and Leech (1983). Second The experts attempt to explain the concept of modesty by associating it with PK Grice. PK-maximum along maxims suspect that basically the participants said it was mutually cooperate and strive seinformatif may communicate. PK explain how the participants said can understand each other outside the literal meaning of the words they use in conversation.

But in informal situations, PK and maxims- maximum often adhered to by the participants said. This trend is explained by Lakoff (1990) Rule suggests politeness (Politeness rule) as a complement to PK.Said participant disobedience against PK caused attitude of participants said that more give priority to social issues such as not wanting to offend the opponent he says than said prioritize clarity.

In line with Lakoff (1990), Leech (1983) also proposes principles politeness (PS) as a complement in order to explain the PK Grice disobedience

against PK tendency in situations of everyday conversation. For example, a violation of the maxim of quantity will trigger the process of understanding in addition to the speech of a speaker by the addressees. Thus Leech (1983) emphasizes that a violation of the general PK due to attitude speakers who want to uphold the principles of politeness.

Equation concept of politeness Lakoff (1990) and Leech (1983) is that both defines civility as an attempt circumvention of conflict (conflict avoidance). Lakoff (1990) explicitly defines civility as "[...] interpersonal relationships of a system designed to expedite the interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation that are naturally present in all forms of human relations' (Lakoff, 1990). The concept of modesty Leech also directed at circumvention conflict embodied in thoughts mind conceived by maxims PS and its recognition that politeness used to foster harmony (comity).

The difference can be noted between the concept of modesty Lakoff (1990) and Leech (1983) is as follows. The first framework for the preparation of rules of politeness Lakoff (1990) differs from the framework of Politeness Principle Leech (1983). Rules of politeness Lakoff (1990) are affected by Linguistics Generative, especially generative semantics. Lakoff (1990) proposed that the rules Politeness should be seen as part of a system of rules Pragmatics in order to formulate a pragmatic competence. Thus, the rules of politeness is primarily a linguistic tool (linguistic tool) to catch systematics the review process as the syntactic rules that are within the realm of study linguistics (Eelen, 2001). Meanwhile politeness Leech (1983) placed in

preparation of a general model of pragmatic, not pragmatic competence. Approach used Leech (1983) to assess the general Pragmatics is rhetoric, which generally refers to the use of language effectively in ordinary language day. So Leech (1983) is not interested in formulating the rules of formal languages then in the realm of the study of syntax and semantics. He asserted that oriented semantic rules (rule-governed) whereas the general pragmatic oriented in principle (principle of controlled or rhetorical) (Leech, 1983).

Second, the concept of pragmatic competence that is implied in the model of pragmatic Leech general more complex and weighty than the concept of pragmatic competence proposed by Lakoff (1990). Leech (1983) suggests that the competence pragmatic rhetoric includes two different domains, namely interpersonal and textual, which are translated into principles that enough detailed. Interpersonal rhetoric specified into Cooperation Principles, Principle Politeness and irony while rhetoric textual Principles include Principle Process, Clarity Principles, Principles of Economics and Principles of Disclosure. Fraser (1990: 224) Grice Cooperation Principles call translation by Leech (1983) is quite detailed and carefully as a ' a grand elaboration of the conversational approach to politeness '. Meanwhile, Lakoff politeness competence only covers rules conversation, which is entirely similar to the principle of cooperation and rules politeness, which show into three rules only.

One drawback of the Conversations view toward the politeness Maksim is the lack of clarity to the benchmarks of various scale value (profit and loss, sympathy-antipathy, agreement-disagreement). Therefore, according to the

manners of speech Politeness Principles and Rules Politeness Leech Lakoff is not easy to implement by the participants said in a communication activity. Almost impossible for a language users consider the maxim in Principle politeness and irony principle in formulating an utterance.

The concept of politeness based perspective Rescue Front (PM) Levinson stated by Brown (1978) has a central theme such as 'reason' and 'face' which is believed to be the universal traits possessed by the participants said ideal called Model Person. Related to the themes that politeness Brown and Levinson (1978) is placed, namely the selection of linguistic forms as strategies for the speech act to save or improve face of a threat.

If judging from goal, politeness and civility MP PM alike circumvention oriented conflict (conflict avoidance). Brown-Levinson (1978) considers that politeness is a fundamental part in the structure social life, especially in the expression of social relationships (Brown and Levinson, 1978). In this case the politeness give verbal ways to reduce and defuse social tensions (social tension) arising from communicative purposes that are contrary to the needs and social status. So, modesty serves as a means for creating and maintaining social relationships in order to meet social needs associated with control potential aggression in society.

In addition, some of the terms put forward by Brown Levinson (1978) is almost the same as that proposed by Leech in order explains the concept of politeness. The notion of authority addressees (hearer authority) as a measurement element of the cost-benefit scale in the maxim of wisdom by

Leech is almost no different from the notion of power (power) in politeness Brown, Levinson (1978). Neither Brown, Leech and Levinson uses the term distance social (social distance) with the understanding that is almost the same. as inference made Brown-Levinson, Leech also implies that the degree hidden meaning a speech act is directly proportional to the loss (cost) speaker and inversely proportional to the advantage (benefits) addressees (Check Watts, 2003).

The difference between the PM and MP can be identified as follows. The first difference is related to how the explanation of the essence of politeness. Politeness PM is verbal strategies considered by speakers taking into account the factor P, D, and R in order to soften the power illocutionary-threatening advance. Meanwhile, politeness MP stressed on the extent to which the speaker obey maxims in PS tends give priority consideration to the interests of others wise rather than self-interest.

The next difference is the difference in meaning of the same term namely about the negative and positive politeness. Brown Levinson defines negative politeness as election verbal forms which contain the expression self-control in order to save face negative while Leech defined as an effort to minimize the negative politeness that is in-illocutionary illocutionary which is naturally not polite as in the follow ask. While Brown-Levinson (1978) defines positive politeness as the selection of verbal forms that contain an expression of solidarity in order to face-saving positive, positive politeness Leech defines as

an attempt maximizing the politeness that is in illocutionary illocutionary naturally mannered as in the follow invited to the party.

The weakness of the PM can be found courtesy of some serious criticism raised by some quarters. Bargeila (2000), for example, criticize that Brown and Levinson experiencing a misunderstanding of the concept of 'face'. Advance the concept, borrowed from Goffman, actually comes from the Chinese, whose meaning must be understood in context of Chinese culture. He has two elements: (i) mianzi, which means the reputation or prestige and (ii) lian, which contain meaning 'revently' of a community group against someone who have good moral reputation. So, mianzi is something that should championed while lian is something that should a person (Fukushima, 2000). In the context of Chinese culture, advance overall is concern for the person who attempted to be placed in a position appropriate in a social group or society at large. notion advance by Brown and Levinson tend to be individualistic, which do not enough to give direction to the negotiations going on between the participants in a conversation. Although it covers ways to manage relationships harmonious, it is not associated with matters related to the interest, manipulation of behavior, external pressure, and the person's relationship with society as consideration for a person to choose and decide the type of language appropriate and suitable to the situation conversation faces.

Related to this criticism, Held (1992: 145) proposed the term 'fear' (fear) instead the term 'face'. The term 'fear' can clearly be attributed to the 'feeling fear of the occurrence of social disharmony, or fear of being accused behaved

wrong, fear that other people will berate us, or fear for claims can damage the self-image of the other person.

Similar criticism was also expressed by Spencer-Oatey (2000), which emphasizes the need for replacement of the term 'face' with the term (rapport management), that means management of the harmony and disharmony between individuals. According to them, the term 'face' is more focused on the interests or self-awareness of his own while rapport management (RM) has meaning that implies a balance of self and others. It can be used for look at how language is used in order to establish, maintain, and or damaging social relationships and includes the management of the rights of sociality, including the rights that have been conceptualized in terms of 'face'.

So, this concept emphasizes the social aspects in politeness. RM consists of two components, namely (i) the management of advance (face management) and sociality rights management (the management of sociality rights) (Spencer Oatey, 2000: 13). The first is related to the rights of the face such as dignity individual and honor given to a person by another person while the latter refers to personal or social expectations, concerns group of justice (fairness), social considerations, and the incorporation or exclusion social. Furthermore, the concept should advance further divided into (i) quality of face, namely the role of a person in the group; (Ii) identity face, which is related a role that is given to a person by another person in the group. Besides, the conception Face Threatening Acts (FTA) also need to be considered back because FTA is not just a threat to a person's self-image, but behaviors that threaten the rights of a

person (rights-threatening behavior), that a general conception about the behavior of someone who is fair (fair) and worth (Appropriate) in the group (check Spencer - Oatey, 2000: 16).

In addition to the conception of 'face' Brown and Levinson's politeness theory also get criticism in terms of the order of politeness strategies they stated. For Blum-Kulka (1992) super-ranking strategy and the strategy is not clear. Utterances are indirect and vague (off-record) indeed there In each said but such utterances are not always more polite rather than direct speech (direct) and without further ado (bald on record) or shape Additional politeness strategies. An indirect form of expression is only considered Polite in communities that have norms and culture 'hidden meaning' like British society. In a society that has culture 'directly, such as Morocco, the requests made by not directly can be considered not polite because it would be understood as a gesture of their social disharmony has occurred among the participants of communication.

Discussion on the concept of modesty in the perspective of Social Norms (NS) appears when in the 1980s several international researchers such as the Blum-Kulka, Horse and Kasper efforts to examine the realization of speech acts that are closely related politeness in various European languages. Of the various implications findings about the phenomenon of politeness, Blum-Kulka et al ultimately express politeness theory they call the theory of politeness 'cultural konstruktivist' or 'politeness as cultural script' (Watts, 2003: 71; Eelen, 2001).

In essence, the views politeness Blum-Kulka is about the propriety social behavior which is based on the expectations or cultural norms. Blum-Kulka justify that any particular socio-cultural group in this world has its own way of expressing the phenomenon of politeness is universal. As such, it supports the theory of politeness PM view modesty as a follow-threatening face softening strategy but the realization of forms of softening the face follow-threatening experience filtration culture (cultural filtering), a statement as follows:

"At the theoretical level, systems understanding of politeness tangible culturally filtered which results from an interaction between the four main parameters: social motivation (social motivation), forms of expression (expressive mode), social differences (social differentials) and social meaning (social meaning) ... the notion of culture play a role in determining a variety of features on each of the parameters affecting the social understanding of politeness in various communities in the world '(ibid: 1992: 270). So, we can conclude that civility NS stressed that every society has a set of norms that include rules explicit that regulate behavior, social affairs, and way of thinking members society (Fraser, 1990: 220). NS supports the view politeness politeness PM associated with the claim of universality of politeness in the sense that all societies The world knows and has a system of politeness but new ways of expression politeness is specific in line with expectations and local cultural norms.