CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURES, CONCEPT, AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Review of Literatures

This part is one of the important things in this study. In review of literatures, the discussion is divided into thesis review which consisting of three undergraduate theses which is related to this study and international journal review that talk and relate to this study.

The under graduated thesis has close relevant with this study was analyzed by the student of English Department named by Fatkhiurozi, Anang, 2008 in his graduated thesis entitled Politeness strategies used by Mia and her Grandma in “Princess Diaries” film. This study concerned with address terms, which is considered as being polite or not. This research was designed by using sociolinguistics approach and analyzed inductively through observation. This study was implying the theory of the Scollon and Scollon’s (1983, 1995) theory of politeness and the film Princess Diaries by Whitney Houston and Garry Marshall was used as his data source.

The conclusion about this study, it is found out that both Mia and her Grandma used two kinds of strategies based on Scollon and Scollon’s concept of politeness, which are involvement and independent strategies. It is also conclude that the factors influenced the use of address terms in the movie “Princess Diaries” express if the speaker is polite and respect the hearer. The use of first name in addressing someone indicates the quality and familiarity.

Another study which is considered to have relation with this study is in the form of undergraduate thesis which carried by Purnomo, Wiwit Aji in 2009 under the title “The Differences of Politeness Strategies Used by Male and Female Characters of Friends TV Series”. Friends, the television series by David Crane and Martha Kauffman was used as data
source in her study. She concerned to the main objective of her study which is to investigate the differences of politeness strategies used by main male and female characters of Friends TV Series.

As the result, choose gender communication is chosen since men and women have different perceptions about what the function of language is. In her thesis applied the concept of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) and the data were collected by descriptive qualitative.

The last study which is also has close relation with the topic of this study of politeness strategies is accomplished Fitriani, Yuli (2007) entitled *Politeness Strategies in John Grisham’s Novel “The Client”*. This paper concerned to the applied of the four types of politeness strategies and proposed the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) and this study presents the data in the forms of words or utterances rather than numbers which rely very much on the rich narrative description.

The writer concluded that other form of literary works such as poetry and drama can be used in purpose of enriching discourse studies. It is also concluded that the study of politeness involves language other than English; so, it can broaden the knowledge in applying linguistics aspects in various languages.

The review of the journal which has correlation to drama analysis is also important and necessary to support the writing in a scientific study. One of them is in The Journal of English Language Teaching Volume 1/1 (2008), one of the articles under the title of “*Politeness Principles in Cross-Culture Communication*”. In this article the author said different people hold different views about politeness. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) “politeness involves us showing an awareness of other people’s face wants, and face refers to our public self-image. There are two aspects of this self image which are positive face and negative face. In this case,
sometimes what Chinese people considered to be polite may not be true according to western culture and the analysis of the author attempts to shed light on some of important difference on politeness between Chinese and western culture.

The other article by Locher and Watts in an online journal entitled “Politeness Theory and Relation Work” describe how briefly revisit politeness research influenced by Brown and Levinson (1987). This paper investigates politeness cannot just be equated with FTA-mitigation because politeness is discursive concept. This reduces politeness to a much smaller part of face work than was assumed until the present, and it allows for interpretations that consider behavior to merely appropriate and neither polite nor impolite.

From the explanation above, it can be said that this study has different discussion from the previous studies. Firstly, this study mentions kinds of negative politeness strategies which are used by Sybil Branson in her directive utterances in Downtown Abbey’s Television Series. Secondly, this study also analyzes about the factors that influence the choice of strategies used by Sybil Branson in Downtown Abbey’s Television Series. And the last but not least, this writing also describe the context which is used to support the negative politeness strategies by Sybil Branson.

2.2 Concepts

Concepts are different from theoretical framework. Concepts explain the title of this study which consist of concept of politeness and concept of face threatening acts. This part aimed to give clear explanation about the title to the reader.

2.2.1 Concept of Politeness
According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategies are developed to save the hearer’s face. Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that “self-esteem” in public or in private situations. Their notions of ‘face is derived from that of Goffman (1967) and the English folk term, which is related to notions of being embarrassed or humiliated, or ‘losing face’. Brown and Levinson stated that there are two types of face in an interaction which are negative face and positive face. Negative face is the want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his action can be unimpeded by others. Positive face is the want of every member that his or her wants to be desirable to at least some others.

2.2.2 Face Threatening Acts

Brown and Levinson argued, Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) are acts that infringe on the hearers need to maintain his or her self esteem. This is about to threaten someone’s with positive or negative face, but it is still need to minimize it by applying politeness strategies that are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-the-record as suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987). FTAs that threaten the negative face of the hearer include advice, requests, offers and compliments. FTAs that threaten the positive face of the hearer include disagreements, disapproval and contradictions.

Positive politeness strategies include exaggerating interest, using in group identity markers, avoiding disagreement, and assert common ground. Negative politeness include being reluctant, apologizing for the impingement and sing passive voice. The negative and positive face wants occur to some degree at the same time. Both of them want to create a paradox in which “both aspects of face must be protected simultaneously in any communication” (Scollon & Scollon, 1995).
2.3 Theoretical Framework

A theoretical framework guides the research, determining what things will be measured, and what statistical relationship will be look for. Theoretical frameworks are obviously critical in deductive, theory-testing sorts of studies. In those kinds of studies, the theoretical framework must be very specific and well-thought out. As mentioned before, this research deals with the use of politeness strategies in directive utterances. It is necessary to consider the context of the situation to help the classification of the utterances. In this writing, there are some theories that will be applied to analyze the data. Theory which is used as main theory is the theory which is proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

2.3.1 Politeness Strategies

Politeness theory is the theory that accounts for the redressing of the affronts to face posed by face-threatening acts to addresses. First formulated in 1987 by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, politeness theory has expanded the perception of politeness. The goal of politeness is to make all of the parties relaxed and comfortable with one another. Being polite therefore consists of attempting to save face for another.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:91) there are four types of politeness strategies, they are: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record- indirect strategies.

2.3.1.1 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:

Type 1: Non-minimization of the face threat

Type 2: FTA-oriented bald on record usage

A. Type 1: Non-minimization of the face threat

Type 1 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.

1. 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 decrease the communicated urgency. For examples:

(1) HURRY!!!

(2) Listen to me!

2. 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:

(1) Here, a cup of tea for you…

(2) Wait, she wants you to consider it…

3. Strategy 3 metaphrical 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:

(1) Pardon me.

4. **Strategy 4: case of channel noise**

   The theory of 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:

   (1) Come here now!

5. **Strategy 5: task oriented/paradigmatic form of instruction**

   In this kind of interaction, face redress will be irrelevant, it is also quoted by Brown Levinson (1987:97). Example:

   (1) Before your very eyes.

6. **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. Here are the examples:

   (1) A. Absolutely, my lord.

   B. Send me the report, Suti.
7. **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. Examples:

   (1) Watch out! The cliff is very steep.

   (2) Thank you for your kindness.

8. **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:

   (1) 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.

   1. **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:

      (1) Good evening.

   2. **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. Example:

      (1) See you when I see you.
3. **Strategy 3**: Offers, used when speaker insist that hearer may impose on speaker’s negative face based on the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:100). For the examples:

   (1) Take this!

   (2) Go away!

2.3.1.2 Positive Politeness

The positive politeness strategy is usually seen in groups of friends, or where people in the given social situation know each other quite well. Positive politeness strategies are used to minimize the threat to hearer’s positive face regarding to Brown and Levinson (1987:101). It is usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer’s need to be respected.

1. **Strategy 1: Notice, attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods)**

   Brown and Levinson (1987:103) suggest that S should take notice from the aspect of H’s condition. For examples:

   (1) What a terrible dishes it is! who is the chef?

   (2) Jesus Christ, you have a new tattoo!

2. **Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)**

   Quoted in the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:104) stated this strategy used and done with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodic. For English, the expression like for sure, really, exactly, and absolutely. Example

   (1) How cute your baby is!

3. **Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H**
The way S communicates with H is by shares some of his wants to intensify the interest of his own (S’s) contribution to the conversation by making a good story, it is stated in Brown and Levinson (1987:106). Here is the example:

(1) I was on my way home from works, then my boyfriend called me. He sound terrified, I thought something happen to him, He wanted me to come to his place as soon as possible. And do you know what? He actually waited to give me a surprise for my birthday.

4. **Strategy 4: Use in group identity markers**

The theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:107) stated that address forms used to convey such in-group membership include generic names and terms of address like *mate*, *buddy*, *dude*, *pal*, *darling*, *dear*, *honey*, *babe*, *mom*, *dad*, *bro*, *sissy*, *guys*. This is some examples:

(1) Should we have some dinner, sweetheart?

(2) Sissy, where are you?

5. **Strategy 5: Seek agreement**

Brown and Levinson (1987:112) explained that S allows to stress his agreement with H and therefore to satisfy H’s desire to be right or to be corroborated in his opinions. It can be done by repeating part or all of what the preceding S has said.

(1) That lady is gorgeous, isn’t she?

(2) A. I will be graduate on August.

B. Wow great, you are a Cum-laude!

6. **Strategy 6: Avoid Disagreement**
Brown and Levinson (1987:113) divide into four. First is *Taken Agreement*, which means that in order to hide avoid or hide disagreement S pretends to agree by twisting his utterance. Example

(1) A. Is it new?
   
   B. Yes, it is new-new like a newlywed.

Secondly is *Pseudo Agreement* which is this strategy found in using then as a conclusion to a line of reasoning carried out cooperatively with the addressee. This is the example:

(2) Well, sure then.

The third one is *White Lies*, where S confronted with the necessity to state an opinion, wants to lie rather than damage H’s positive face.
(3) I think I cannot make it, I’ve got something else to do.

Fourth, the last one, *Hedging Opinion* which is may S choose to be vague about his or her own opinion, so as not to be seen to disagree. For example:

(4) I doubt it, I guess he will not having that recommendation.

7. **Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert common ground**

This strategy describes gossip, small talk is the value of S;s spending time and effort on being with H, as mark of friendship. As the result, the four techniques for reducing the distance between S’s and H’s point of view are: First one is *Personal center switch*, this is where S speaks as if hearer (H) were speaker (S). Example:

(1) A. I hate this hair color, babe.

    B. Yes, I know Darling. Let’s change it tomorrow.

Second is *Time switch*, which is a tense shift from past to present to increase the immediately and therefore the interest of a story

(2) And Camilla says to Nikko, “Oh my Dear God” and Pascal says …

Third is *Place switch*, it is used where proximal is used rather than distal demonstration to increase involvement empathy such as this and there. For example:

(3) Come! You need to be inside and stay warm.

    The fourth one is *Avoidance of adjustment* of reports to H’s point of view where S is trying to stress common ground that he or she shares with H, in which H’s point of view is his, or is his H’s’.

8. **Strategy 8: Joke**

Joke is pointed out by Brown and Levinson (1987:124) to stress shared background knowledge and values. Example:
9. **Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose S’s knowledge of and concern H’s wants**

   H’s wants and willingness are applied in this strategy to fit one’s own wants in with them by using negative question, is a way to indicates that S and H are cooperators and to put pressure on H to cooperate with S, it is describe by Brown and Levinson (1987:125).

   (1) Well, I need to go to Ubud at 10 o’clock, so, should I leave now?

10. **Strategy 10: Offer, promise**

    In the theory on Brown and Levinson (1987:125), it is explained that S may claim that whatever H wants, S wants for him and will help to obtain in order to redress the potential treat of some FTA’s. For example:

    (1) I will call you back soon.

11. **Strategy 11: Be optimistic**

    This kind of strategy works by minimizing size of the face threat. Implying that it is nothing to ask or that the cooperation between S and H means that such small things will be taken for granted, according to the Brown and Levinson (1987:126) theory. Example:

    (1) He will drop you here, wouldn’t he?

12. **Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity**

    Regarding to the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:127), this kind of strategy using an inclusive “we” form, when S means “you” or “me”. “Let’s” also function as “we”. For the example:

    (1) Let’s go to the beach.
13. **Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons**

Brown and Levinson (1987:128) explained the use of this strategy where S gives reasons as to know why he wants what he wants. They add “I can help you or “You can help me” and assuming cooperation, a way of showing help is needed. Here is an example:

(1) Why don’t you send me some money?

14. **Strategy 14: Assume on assert reciprocity**

It is claimed by Brown and Levinson (1987:129), that a reciprocal right between S and H is another strategy in order to declare the cooperation between S and H, therefore, to soften the FTA by negating the debt aspect and the face-threatening aspect of utterance act. Example:

(1) I will do anything if you do this favor for me

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

Based on the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:129) stated that S may satisfy H’s position face wants by giving gifts, not only true gifts but, there are also human relation wants such as the wants to be liked, admired, adore, cared about, and so on.

(1) My deepest condolence.

(2) Oh my god, you look so pretty.

2.3.1.3 **Negative Politeness**

Negative politeness is defined as a “redress action addressed to the addressee’s negative face: his wants to have his freedom of action unobstructed and his attention unrestricted”. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:130), negative politeness strategies are oriented towards the hearer’s negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer.
Negative politeness strategy also recognizes that the speaker is in some way forcing on them. Some of the sub-strategies from Brown and Levinson are:

1. **Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect**

   In Brown and Levinson (1987:132), it is known that there are two tensions that a speaker faced in this strategy are the desire to give H an “out” by being indirect and the desire to go on record. To solve this problem, the use of phrases and sentences that have contextually ambiguous meanings which are different from their literal meaning is very helpful. Here are some examples:

   (1) Can you check the menu?
   (2) I’m looking for my friend.

2. **Strategy 2: Question, hedge**

   Quoted in Brown and Levinson (1987:145) describe that this strategy consist of the way of make minimal assumption about H and this is the primary and fundamental method of disarming international threats.

   (1) Would you help me, please?
   (2) I don’t belong here.

3. **Strategy 3: Be pessimistic**

   This strategy was explained by the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:173) that gives redress to H’s negative face by indirectly expressing doubt that the conditions, for the appropriateness of S’s utterance. This is the example:

   (1) Will it be a piece of cake? Maybe if we can help each other to fix this problem.

4. **Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition, Rx**
By the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:176) it is mentioned that one way to defusing the FTA is by minimize the imposition of Rx which means Rx is indicated not in itself great and leaving distance and power as weighty factors. By doing this strategy, it will pays H deference. For example se some expressions: *a sip, a drop a little, a bit, a little bit.*

(1) I want to have a sip of champagne in the bar before I sit.

5. **Strategy 5: Give deference**

This strategy to satisfy H’s wants and to be treated as supervisor by giving him or her deference as described by Brown and Levinson (1987:178). For example:

(1) I guess I was such a fool for you but I enjoy being lied.

(2) Pardon me, madam, would you mind to close the door?

6. **Strategy 6: Apologize**

Regarding to Brown and Levinson (1987:187), this is stated that S can indicate his reluctance to impinge on H’s negative face and partially redress that impingement by apologizing. There are four ways to communicate regret, here as follows:

The first one is *Admit the impingement*, where S can simply admit that he or she is impinging on H’s face. Example:

(1) I know this is a coincidence, but…

Second is *Indicate reluctance* which is to show that his reluctance impinges on H, S can attempt by using hedges or by means of expressions.

(2) She didn’t want to call me, but…
Thirdly is *Give overwhelming* reason that S can claim that he or she has compelling reasons for doing the FTA, by implying that normally he or she would not dream of infringing H’s negative face. For example:

(3) I miss nobody else but you who will…

Fourth is *Beg forgiveness* that S may beg for forgiveness. Here is the example:

(4) Please, I beg you to forgive me, I will do anything you want if…

7. **Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H**

   To indicate that S does not want to impinge H is to phrase the FTA as if the agent were other than S. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:190), this strategy deals with avoidance of “I” and “You”. For examples:

   (1) See, she told him (performative)

   (2) They should bring that up (imperative)

8. **Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule**

   To dissociate S and H from the particular imposition in the FTA and hence a way communicating that S does not want to impinge but merely forced to by circumstances is to state the FTA as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation (Brown and Levinson, 1987:206).

   (1) The guest will please to follow the evacuation notice by the government.

9. **Strategy 9: Nominalize**

   By Brown and Levinson (1987:207) it is meant to nominalized the subject in order to make sentence more formal. Example:

   (1) Your fashion show yesterday was incredibly fantastic.

10. **Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H**
This is reveals that by referring explicitly to the difficulty of Hs complying, S implicitly puts himself in debt to H for causing him the difficulty (Brown and Levinson, 1987:210).

(1) I really mean it…

2.3.1.4 Off Record

According to the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:216), it is mentioned that communicative act is done off record if it done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one clear communication intention to the act. If the speaker wants to do an FTA, but wants to avoid the responsibility for doing it, he can do it off-record and leave it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it.

1. **Strategy 1: Give hints**

   From the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:218) that if S says something that is not explicitly relevant, he or she invites H to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance. Example:

   (1) This fish is a little bit under-cooked (like to cook more)

   (2) What a day, it is very hot. I’m sweating (take off the jacket)

2. **Strategy 2: Give association clues**

   Based on Brown and Levinson (1987:219), in this case, association clues for indirect request are nothing but more remote hints of practical reasoning premises. For example:

   (1) Will you have this Caesar salad for lunch? They add some chicken or shrimp to the salad (order one and then we can share)

3. **Strategy 3: presuppose**
By Brown and Levinson (1987:222), if S says something to H with this kind of strategy, therefore many implicate a criticism. This is the example:

(1) At least I already let you know what will happen if you ignore him.

4. **Strategy 4: Understatements**

   This strategy was explained by Brown and Levinson (1987:222) and it is a way of getting implicates by saying less than is required. Typical ways of constructing understatements are to choose a point on a scalar predicate.

   (1) What do you think about my uniform?

   (2) It is ok.

5. **Strategy 5: Overstate**

   According to Brown and Levinson (1987:223), if S says more than necessary, he may do this by the inverse of the understatement principle by choosing appoint on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs. Here is the example:

   (1) Why are you always do this to me?

6. **Strategy 6: Use tautology**

   In the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:224) stated that by uttering a tautology, S encourages H to look for an informative interpretations of the non-informative utterance, such as an excuse, critics, and a complaint. Example:

   (1) Where is my drink! (complaint)

7. **Strategy 7: Use Contradictions**

   By the theory from Brown and Levinson (1987:226) it is described by stating two things that contradict each other, S makes it appear that cannot be telling the truth. He or she
encourages H to look for interpretation that reconciles the two contradictory propositions. For example:

(1) So, there is a laptop here and it is not here?

8. **Strategy 8: Be ironic**

   Brown and Levinson (1987:228) theory stated that by saying the opposite of what he or she means, S can indirectly express his or her intend meaning. Example:

   (1) Wow, your skin is so white (after one of the friend surprised and he look at the skin and it is very dark because of the sun tanning).

9. **Strategy 9: Use metaphor**

   From the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:216) it is mentioned that the use of metaphor is usually on record, but there is a possibility that exactly which of the connotation of metaphor S intends may be off record.

   (1) Dayu is like a rice (like in Indonesia, it is means the people which is clever but still humble).

10. **Strategy 10: Use rhetorical questions**

    To ask a question, based from the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:230), with no intention of obtaining an answer which is to break sincerity condition on question namely, that S wants H to provide him with the indicated information. Here is the example:

    (1) Just wondering why you come here?

11. **Strategy 11: Be ambiguous**

    Stretching the word ambiguity was to include the ambiguity between the literal meaning of an utterance and any of its possible implicatures (Brown and Levinson,
1987:231). It can be seen that every off record strategy essentially exploits in this wider sense. Example:

(1) Apsari arrived at the office dressed to kill (it could be a compliment or insult).

12. **Strategy 12: Be vague**

In this theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:232) stated that speaker may go off with an FTA by being vague about which the object of the FTA is or what the offence is. For example:

(1) Looks like my manager may go out for a run with her colleagues (vague understatement).
(2) I will go for a walk and some fresh air.

13. **Strategy 13: Over-generalize**

It is described by Brown and Levinson (1987:234), that rule installation may leave the object of FTA vaguely record; Hearer then has the choice to decide whether the general rule applies to him.

(1) If the window closed completely, it will be stuffy.

14. **Strategy 14: Displace H**

Regarding to the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:235), it is stated that speaker may use off record as to who the target for his FTA is or he or she may pretend to address the FTA to someone whom it would not threaten and hope that the target will see that FTA is aimed at him or her.

15. **Strategy 15: Be incomplete, use ellipsis**
Elliptical utterances are legitimated by various conversational contexts in answers to questions but they are also warranted in FTAs. By the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:237) it explained by leaving an FTA half undone, S can leave the implicate, just as rhetorical question.

(1) Well, just so you know…

2.3.2 Factors influencing the choice of strategies

Every person will have any special intention in doing anything whenever will give him some advantages. However, in doing FTA’s, there are some factors that can affect him to use the strategies that have been mentioned before. According to Brown and Levinson, theory of politeness (1987:71) There are two factors that can influence the choice of strategies.

2.3.2.1 The Intrinsic Payoffs: a priori consideration

In the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987:71) give the complete list of payoff for each strategies, as follows:

a) By doing on record, a speaker can potentially can get any of the following advantages: he or she can enlist public pressure against the addressee or in support by himself or herself, he or she get credit for outspokenness, avoiding the danger of being seen to be a manipulator, he or she can avoid the danger of being misunderstood, he or she can have an opportunity to pay back in face whatever he or she potentially takes away by the FTA. Example: “Show me that”.

b) By doing off record, speaker can profit in the following ways: he can get credit for being tactful, non-coercive, and he can responsibility for potentially face-damaging interpretation. He can give the addressee an opportunity to be seen to care for S (and thus he can test H’s feelings toward him). For example: (joking):
c) By doing positive politeness, a speaker can minimize a face threatening aspect of an act by assuring the addressee that S consider himself or herself to be ‘of the same kind’. That he or she likes and what he or she wants. Example: (attend to the hearer) “You must be exhausted, it is a really hard work for you. Let’s get some rest”

d) By doing negative politeness, a speaker can benefit in the following ways: he can pay respect and deference to the addressee in return for the FTA and can avoid incurring a future debt; he can maintain social distance and avoid the threat of advancing familiarity towards the addressee, for example: (Be indirect) “I want a glass of lychee martini” in this situation he or she hoping that he or she hoping that question should not be ask directly and the server do not have to come and ask for the order.

2.3.2.2 The Circumstances: sociological variables

Based on the theory of politeness strategy by Brown and Levinson (1987:74) there are three factors that can influence the choice of strategies. They are as follows:

a) The “social distance” (D) of S and H. D is a symmetric social dimension of similarity/difference within which S and H stand for the purpose of this act. In many cases, it is based on assessment of the frequency of interaction and the kinds of material on non-material goods exchanged between S and H parties representing S or H or for whom S and H are representative.

b) The “relative power” (P) of S and H. P is an asymmetric social dimension of relative power. That is, P (H,S) is the degree to which H can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation as the expense of S plans and self-evaluation.

c) The “absolute ranking” (R) of imposition in particular culture. R is culturally and conditionally defined ranking of imposition by the degree to which they are considered to
interfere with what agent’s wants of self-determination or of approval. Moreover, Brown and Levinson (1996) developed a theory on relationship between the intensity of threat to face and linguistically realized politeness. The intensity of threat to face is expressed by a weight (W) that is linked to the FTA (Renkema, 1993:14). They also give formula for weightness of FTA. Intensity of threat to face:

\[ W \text{(FTA)} = R + D \cdot P \]

\( W \) = The weight of the FTA
\( R \) = Rate of imposition
\( D(S, H) \) = Social distance between S and H
\( P(H, S) \) = Power distance as H has over S

Here are the examples:

(1) Pardon me, would it be all right if I go?

(2) Mind if I go?

The utterance (1) is usually said by a staff to his boss or supervisor, while in the same situation, the utterance (2) is might be used by the boss or supervisor to the staff. Both utterances show the intensity of the threat to face based on the social circumstances given by the explanation by Brown and Levinson (1996:82)