

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, we discuss some important ideas and theories to make more accurate and reliable the topic we are observing in the research. It concerns to the Politeness, Positive and Negative Face, definition of Face Threatening Act (FTA), Types of politeness Strategies (Bald-on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off-record, and Don't Do FTA), Choice of Strategies (No Redressive Action, Positive Redressive Action, Negative Redressive Action, Off-Record, and Don't Do FTA), and Sociological Variables (Social Distance (D), Power Relation (P), The Absolute Ranking of The Threat of The FTA (R)) . The descriptions are as follows.

#### **A. Politeness**

In 1997, William Foley stated that Politeness Theory accounts for the redressing of affronts to a person's 'face' by face-threatening acts. Carl G. Hinze (2012: 11-27) found that the concept of face was derived from Chinese into English in the 19th century. Erving Goffman (1967) would then go on to introduce the concept into academia through his theories of 'face' and 'facework'. According to Richard J. Watts et al (2005) although politeness has been studied in a variety of cultures for many years,

Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson's politeness theory has become very influential. Sara Mills (2013) proposed that Politeness is the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward the listener. Another definition by William Foley (1997) is "a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure everyone feels affirmed in a social interaction". Therefore, being polite can be an attempt for the speaker to save their own face or the face of who he or she is talking to.

## **B. Positive And Negative Face**

Face is the public self-image that every person tries to protect. Brown and Levinson (1978:61-62) defined positive face two ways: as "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others executors", or alternatively, "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants". Negative face was defined as "The want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others", or "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction—i.e. the freedom of action and freedom from imposition". Whereas positive face involves a desire for connection with others, negative face needs include autonomy and independence.

Ten years later, Brown characterized positive face by desires to be liked, admired, ratified, and related to positively, noting that one would threaten positive face by ignoring someone. At the same time, Jennifer Coates (1998) characterized negative face by the desire not to be imposed upon, noting that negative face could be impinged upon by imposing on someone. Positive face refers to one's self-esteem, while negative face refers to one's freedom to act. These two aspects of face are the basic wants in any social interaction; during any social interaction, cooperation is needed amongst the participants to maintain each other's face. Melissa A. Riffe et al. (2004) Participants can do this by using positive politeness and negative politeness, which pay attention to people's positive and negative face needs respectively.

### **C. Face-Threatening Acts**

According to Brown and Levinson, positive and negative face exists universally in human culture; it has been argued that the notion of face is the actual universal component to their proposed politeness theory. A face threatening act is an act that inherently damages the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other. Face threatening acts can be verbal (using words/language), paraverbal (conveyed in the characteristics of speech such as tone, inflection, etc.), or non-verbal (facial expression, etc.). Based on the terms of conversation in social interactions, face-

threatening acts are at times inevitable. At minimum, there must be at least one of the face threatening acts associated with an utterance. It is also possible to have multiple acts working within a single utterance. There are two distinctions acts that threaten positive and negative face of the hearer and speaker face. It is summarized in table 1 (the table is adapted from Brown & Levinson theory, 1987: 65-68).

**Table 1. Examples of Face-Threatening Acts Based on Brown and Levinson**

**Theory**

	Negative FTAs	Positive FTAs
Affecting Hearer	Orders/Requests Suggestions/Advice Reminders Threats/Warnings/Dares Offers Promises Compliments/Envy/Admiration Strong Negative Emotions	Disapproval/Criticism/Contempt/Ridicule Complaints/Reprimands/Accusations/Insults Contradictions/Disagreements/Challenges Violent Emotions Irreverence/Taboo Bad News/Boasting Emotional/Divisive Subject Matter Non-Co-Operation Inappropriate Terms Of Address
Affecting Speaker	Giving Thanks Acceptance Of Thanks/Apology Excuses Acceptance Of Offers Responses To Hearer's Faux Pas Unwilling/Reluctant Promises/Offeres	Apologies Acceptance Of Compliment Breakdown Of Physical Control Self-Humiliation/Depreciation Confessions/Admissions Of Guilt Emotional Leakage/Non-Control Of Laughter/Tears

**(Brown & Levinson, 1987: 65-68)**

### **a. Negative Face-Threatening Acts**

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

#### ***a) Affecting Hearer***

The following are cases in which the negative face of the hearer (the person being spoken to) is threatened.

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

*Examples: orders, requests, suggestions, advice, reminders, threats, or warnings.*

- An act that expresses the speaker's sentiments of the hearer or the hearer's belongings.

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

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

*Examples: offers and promises.*

### ***b) Affecting Speaker***

The following are cases in which the negative face of the speaker (the person talking) is threatened.

- An act that shows that the speaker is succumbing to the power of the hearer.
- Expressing thanks
- Accepting a thank you or apology
- Excuses
- Acceptance of offers
- A response to the hearer's violation of social etiquette
- The speaker commits himself to something he or she does not want to do

### **b. Positive Face-Threatening Acts**

Positive face is threatened when the speaker or hearer does not care about their interlocutor's feelings, wants, or does not want what the other wants. Positive face threatening acts can also cause Affecting speaker or the hearer. When an individual is forced to be separated from

others so that their well-being is treated less importantly, positive face is threatened.

***a) Affecting hearer***

The following are cases in which the positive face of the hearer (the person being spoken to) is threatened.

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

*Examples: expressions of disapproval/ criticism/ contempt/ ridicule; complaint/ insults/ reprimands/ accusations; contradictions/ disagreements/ challenges.*

- An act that expresses the speaker's indifference toward the addressee's positive face.
- The addressee might be embarrassed for or fear the speaker.

*Examples: excessively emotional expressions.*

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

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

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

*Examples: belittling or boasting.*

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

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

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

*Examples: interrupting, non sequiturs.*

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

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



### ***b) Affecting speaker***

The following are cases in which the positive face of the speaker (the person talking) is threatened.

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

### **D. Politeness Strategies**

Politeness strategies are used to formulate messages in order to save the hearer's positive face when face-threatening acts are inevitable or desired. Brown and Levinson outline five main types of politeness strategies: Bald-on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off-record, and Don't Do FTA.

**Table 2. Politeness Strategies Brown & Levinson Theory**

<b>Politeness Strategies Summary Chart</b>				
<b>Politeness Strategy</b>	<b><i>Bald on-record</i></b>	<b><i>Positive politeness</i></b>	<b><i>Negative politeness</i></b>	<b><i>Off-record (indirect)</i></b>
<b>Explanation</b>	Does nothing to reduce the threat to the hearer's face and is therefore used in close relationships or when information needs to be shared quickly.	Is used as a way to make the hearer feel a sense of closeness and belonging.	Is used as a way to interact with the hearer in a non-imposing way.	Is used to completely remove the speaker from any potential to impose on the hearer and only alludes to the speaker's idea or specific request.
<b>Situation of use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Situations with no threat minimization</li> <li>• Urgency or desperation</li> <li>• When efficiency is necessary</li> <li>• Task-oriented</li> <li>• Little or no desire to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attend to the hearer's interests, needs, wants</li> <li>• Use solidarity in-group identity markers</li> <li>• Be optimistic</li> <li>• Include both speaker (S) and hearer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be indirect</li> <li>• Use hedges or questions</li> <li>• Be pessimistic</li> <li>• Minimize the imposition</li> <li>• Use obviating structures, like nominalizat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relies on implication</li> </ul>

	<p>maintain someone's face</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doing the face-threatening act is in the interest of the hearer</li> <li>• Situations where the threat is minimized implicitly</li> <li>• Welcomes</li> <li>• Offers</li> </ul>	<p>(H) in activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer or promise</li> <li>• Exaggerate interest in H and his interests</li> <li>• Avoid Disagreement</li> <li>• Joke</li> </ul>	<p>ions, passives, or statements of general rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologetic</li> <li>• Use plural pronouns</li> </ul>	
<b>Use examples</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Watch out!</li> <li>• Hear me out...</li> <li>• Pass me the hammer</li> <li>• Don't forget to clean the blinds!</li> <li>• Your headlights are on!</li> <li>• Come in</li> <li>• Leave it, I'll clean it up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You look sad. Can I do anything?</li> <li>• Heh, mate, can you lend me a dollar?</li> <li>• I'll just come along, if you don't mind.</li> <li>• If we help each other, I guess, we'll both sink or swim in this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would you know where Oxford Street is?</li> <li>• Perhaps, he might have taken it, maybe.</li> <li>• Could you please pass the rice?</li> <li>• You couldn't</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wow, it's getting cold in here.</li> </ul>

	<p>later.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eat!</li> </ul>	<p>course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you wash the dishes, I'll vacuum the floor.</li> <li>• That's a nice haircut you got; where did you get it?</li> <li>• Yes, it's rather long; not short certainly.</li> <li>• Wow, that's a whopper!</li> </ul>	<p>find your way to lending me a thousand dollars, could you?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So I suppose some help is out of the question, then?</li> <li>• It's not too much out of your way, just a couple of blocks.</li> <li>• I hope offense will not be taken.</li> <li>• Visitors sign the ledger.</li> <li>• Spitting will not be tolerated.</li> <li>• I'm sorry; it's a lot to</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

			ask, but can you lend me a thousand dollars? • We regret to inform you.	
--	--	--	--	--

(Brown & Levinson, 1987:101-211)

#### a. Bald On-Record

Bald on-record strategy does not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face, although there are ways that bald on-record politeness can be used in trying to minimize face-threatening acts implicitly, such as giving advice in a non-manipulative way. Often using such a strategy will shock or embarrass the addressee, and so this strategy is most often utilized in situations where the speaker has a close relationship with the listener, such as family or close friends. Brown and Levinson outline various cases, in which one might use the bald on-record strategy, including:

- Situations with no threat minimization
- Urgency or desperation: *Watch out!*
- When efficiency is necessary: *Hear me out:...*
- Task-oriented: *Pass me the hammer.*

- Little or no desire to maintain someone's face: *Don't forget to clean the blinds!*
- Doing the face-threatening act is in the interest of the hearer: *Your headlights are on!*
- Situations where the threat is minimized implicitly
- Welcomes: *Come in.*
- Offers: *Leave it, I'll clean up later; Eat!*

#### b. Positive Politeness

**Table 3. Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies**

Negative	Positive
1. Be indirect	1. Notice/attend to hearer
2. Question/Hedge	2. Exaggerate
3. Be pessimistic	3. Intensify interest
4. Minimize Imposition (Verbally)	4. Use in-group markers
5. Give deference/humble oneself	5. Seek agreement
6. Apologize/admit imposition/indicate reluctance/give overwhelming reasons/beg forgiveness	6. Avoid disagreement
7. Impersonalize speaker and hearer (pronominally/passive voice/indefinites/reference terms/point of view distancing)	7. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground
8. State FTA as general rule	8. Joke
9. Nominalize	9. Assert/presuppose knowledge of/concern for hearer's wants
10. Go on-record with indebtedness	10. Offer/promise
	11. Be optimistic
	12. Include both speaker and hearer
	13. Give (or ask for) reasons
	14. Assumes/assert reciprocity
	15. Give gifts (goods/sympathy/understanding/cooperation)

(Brown & Levinson, 1987:101-211)

Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face. These strategies are used to make the hearer feel good about themselves, their interests or possessions, and are most usually used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well. In addition to hedging and attempts to avoid conflict, some strategies of positive politeness include statements of friendship, solidarity, compliments, and the following examples from Brown and Levinson:

- Attend to H's interests, needs, wants: *You look sad. Can I do anything?*
- Use solidarity in-group identity markers

*Heh, mate, can you lend me a dollar?*

*'Güey, ¿me haces un paro?'*\*

Translation: "Do a favor for me?" "Güey" can be an in-group solidarity marker, usually associated with certain regions of Mexico; literally meaning 'ox', it can be used to belittle someone and/or their intelligence. Therefore, you could only use it with friends without running the risk of a confrontation. To use it in-group, however, is an indication of friendship/solidarity, depending on intonation.

- Be optimistic

*I'll just come along, if you don't mind.*

- Include both speaker (S) and hearer (H) in activity

*If we help each other, I guess, we'll both sink or swim in this course.*

- Offer or promise

*If you wash the dishes, I'll vacuum the floor.*

- Exaggerate interest in H and his interests

*That's a nice haircut you got; where did you get it?*

- Avoid Disagreement

*Yes, it's rather long; not short certainly.*

- Joke

*Wow, that's a whopper!*

Positive politeness strategies can also emerge in situations where the speakers do not know each other well. For example, Charlotte Rees and Lynn Knight (2008) have explored the role politeness theory plays in general practice consultations. They found that, in an effort to remain polite, patients agreed to the presence of a student observer during a general practice consultation even when the



patient preferred a private consultation. Rees and Knight concluded that politeness strategies in the medical field can inhibit patients from providing complete and accurate information. Another use of positive politeness is polite or formal speech such as Japanese honorifics. Again, this type of formal speech can be used to protect the hearer's positive face.

### **c. Negative Politeness**

Negative politeness strategies are oriented towards the hearer's negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer. Lounis Maha (2014) found that by attempting to avoid imposition from the speaker, the risk of face-threat to the hearer is reduced. These strategies presume that the speaker will be imposing on the listener. Additionally, there is a higher potential for awkwardness or embarrassment than in bald on record strategies and positive politeness strategies. Negative face is the desire to remain autonomous so the speaker is more apt to include an out for the listener through distancing styles like apologies or indirect speech. Eva Ogiermann (2009) proposed that the use of negative politeness strategies assumes a direct relationship between indirectness and politeness. Examples from Brown and Levinson include:

- Be indirecty

*Would you know where Oxford Street is?*

- Use hedges or questions

*Perhaps, he might have taken it, maybe.*

*Could you please pass the rice?*

- Be pessimistic

*You couldn't find your way to lending me a thousand dollars, could you?*

*So I suppose some help is out of the question, then?*

- Minimize the imposition

*It's not too much out of your way, just a couple of blocks.*

- Use obviating structures, like nominalizations, passives, or statements of general rules

*I hope offense will not be taken.*

*Visitors sign the ledger.*

*Spitting will not be tolerated.*

- Apologetic

*I'm sorry; it's a lot to ask, but can you lend me a thousand dollars?*

- Use plural pronouns

*We regret to inform you.*

Favor seeking, or a speaker asking the hearer for a favor, is a common example of negative politeness strategies in use. Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy (1994) proposed that held observes three main stages in favor-seeking: the preparatory phase, the focal phase, and the final phase:

1. The preparatory phase is when the favor-seeking is preceded by elaborate precautions against loss of face to both sides. It often involves signals of openings and markers to be used to clarify the situation (e.g. 'You see,' or 'so,'). The request is often softened, made less direct, and imposing (e.g. past continuous 'I was wondering'; informal tag 'What d'you reckon?'). The speaker must also reduce his own self-importance in the matter and exaggerate the hearer's (down-scaling compliments).
2. The focal stage is subdivided into elements such as asker's reasons or constraints (e.g. 'I've tried everywhere but can't get one'), the other's face (e.g. 'You're the only person I can turn to'), and more.
3. The third stage is the final stage which consists of anticipatory thanks, promises, and compliments (e.g. 'I knew you would say yes. You're an angel.').

McCarthy and Carter provide an example of Negative Politeness using the following dialogue from the Australian television soap opera, "Neighbours":

*Clarrie: So I said to him, forget your books for one night, throw a party next weekend.*

*Helen: A party at number 30! What will Dorothy say about that?*

*Clarrie: Well, what she doesn't know won't hurt her. Of course, I'll be keeping my eye on things, and (SIGNAL OF OPENING) that brings me to my next problem. (EXPLAIN PROBLEM) You see, these young people, they don't want an old codger like me poking my nose in, so I'll make myself scarce, but I still need to be closer to hand, you see. So, (ASK FAVOR) I was wondering, would it be all right if I came over here on the night? What d'you reckon?*

*Helen: Oh, Clarrie, I...*

*Clarrie: Oh (MINIMIZATION) I'd be no bother. (REINFORCE EXPLANATION) It'd mean a heck of a lot to those kids.*

*Helen: All right.*

*Clarrie: (THANK WITH BOOST) I knew you'd say yes. You're an angel, Helen.*

*Helen: Ha! (laughs)*

All of this is done in attempt to avoid imposition on the hearer. Negative politeness is concerned with proceeding towards a goal in the smoothest way and with sensitivity to one's interlocutors. In English, deference ('Excuse me, sir, could you please close the window') is associated with the avoidance or downplaying of an imposition; the more we feel we might be imposing, the more deferential we might be. It is clearly a strategy for negative politeness and the redressing of a threat to negative face, through actions such as favor-seeking.

#### **d. Off-Record (Indirect)**

The final politeness strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is the indirect strategy; this strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing. For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say "wow, it's getting cold in here" insinuating that it would be nice if the listener would get up and turn up the thermostat without directly asking the listener to do so. This strategy relies heavily on pragmatics to convey the intended meaning while still utilizing the semantic meaning as a way to avoid losing face (choice of strategies).

### **E. Sociological Variables**

Geoffrey Leech (1983) said that three sociological factors affect the choice of politeness strategies and the seriousness of the face

threatening action, social distance between speaker and listener, the power difference between the speaker and listener, and the seriousness of the face threat.

**a. Social Distance Between Parties (Symmetric Relation)**

Distinguishes kin or friend from a stranger with whom you may have the same social status, but who is still separate because of social distance. Different acts may be seen as face-threatening or non-face threatening depending on the social distance between speaker and listener.

*Example:* We may use less elaborate positive strategies or we may choose to use positive rather than negative politeness when speaking with family rather than a stranger.

**b. Power Relations Between Parties (Asymmetric Relation)**

We are inclined to speak to our social equals differently than those whose status is higher or lower than our own in a given situation.

*Example:* If a professor is working in her office and people are being very loud and disruptive in the next room, she will go over there and tell them to be quiet but the way she does it will differ depending on who it is. If they are students she will use the bald on-record strategy to make sure there is no confusion in what she is asking, saying: "Stop talking so loud!".

But if they are colleagues she will claim common ground with them using the positive politeness strategy or frame an indirect request for them to stop talking, saying: "I'm working on a lecture and it's really hard to concentrate with all this noise." Additionally if they are really high status directors of the department she may end up saying nothing at all or apologize for interrupting them, refraining from the face-threatening act.

### **c. The Absolute Ranking Of The Threat Of The Face-Threatening Act**

Some impositions are considered more serious than others. Highly imposing acts like requests demand more redress to mitigate their increased threat level.

Overall the formula for the weight of a face-threatening act is:

$$\text{Weight} = \text{Social distance (speaker, hearer)} + \text{power difference (speaker, hearer)} + \text{rank of imposition}$$

### **F. The Previous Relevant Studies**

There are some studies that also investigate strategies in performing Face Threatening Act (FTA). Three of them reviewed as follows.

**a. *Strategies in Performing Face Threatening Acts in The “Star Truck” Movie***

The first study is conducted by Lathifatuz Zahro' in 2017 which is entitled *Strategies in Performing Face Threatening Acts in The “Star Truck” Movie*. In this research, she focuses on the conversational strategies in performing Face Threatening Act (FTA) in the movie. This is the same as the recent research the researcher will be conducted which puts the same focus, and in the same sources that is movie, but different expression of languages.

**b. *Politeness Strategies performed by Lectures in Proposal Seminars in English Study Program Faculty of Cultural Studies at Brawijaya University***

The second research is conducted by Andita Wulandari (2014) which is entitled *Politeness Strategies performed by Lectures in Proposal Seminars in English Study Program Faculty of Cultural Studies at Brawijaya University*. She conducted the research which focuses on *by Lectures' utterances in Proposal Seminars* in performing Face Threatening Act (FTA) and politeness strategy which *Lectures' utterances in Proposal Seminars* as the source of the data. This research is more complicated than the recent study because the researcher conducted the research in natural source in daily life than in a movie. Besides, the research more various than the recent research which just on a movie.



***c. Face Threatening Acts in Wayang Golek***

The last research is conducted by Ramdan Sukmawan (2015) which is entitled *Face Threatening Acts in Wayang Golek*. He was interested in taking that traditional play as the data source because he would find various examples of FTA in the dialogues belong. This research is the same focus as the recent research. The recent researcher will conduct about performing Face Threatening Act (FTA) and the politeness strategies.