CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE, CONCEPTS,
AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Review of Literature

This chapter concerns with the review of undergraduate theses and journal related to the topic of this writing. Reading undergraduate theses and journals is important to see how others made their analysis on this thesis. Three papers and an International journal with same topic were already reviewed.

The first undergraduate thesis is “The Politeness Maxims Found in the Drama “Pygmalion” by Bernard Show”. This thesis was written by Arnita (2010). This study has two problems, they are: what types of politeness maxim are used by the characters and why they are applied by the characters in the drama “Pygmalion”. Her research focused on describing the maxims of politeness in the drama and explaining the reason why the politeness maxims are applied by the characters. The theory applied in her research is theory of Politeness Principles proposed by Leech which was written in his book Principle of Pragmatics (1983). The result is all of Leech’s Maxims can be found in the dialogue between the characters and the agreement maxim is applied most in the drama.

Pratiwi (2009) discussed about maxims application and context of situation at Blueline ISP helpdesk-operation field. Her thesis analyzed the form of language used in Helpdesk-operation interaction and relation to the maxims
application and also the context of situation in field work. In her study, she applied theory of maxims based on Griece which divided the politeness maxim into four, they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. Through her research, she concluded that these maxim supported are by the context of situation for instance from the educational background of participants which help to get a clearer understanding between speaker and hearer.

Another related thesis is “Griece’s Maxims in Interview between Oprah Winfrey and the Cast of Eclipse Movie” written by Putri (2011). Her study discussed about conversation in Oprah Winfrey Talk Show between Oprah and the Eclipse movie’s casts. The research has aims to investigate the flouting maxims, to analyze the reason why it occurs in the interview and to analyze the maxim application in the interview. This thesis used four main theories, they are theory of conversation, theory of conversational maxims, flouting maxims, and conversational implicature. She used theory of politeness maxim by Griece. The result of her study shows that Griece’s Conversational Maxim are mostly flouted during the questions about private matters.

Those three studies are very inspiring on this writing. The first thesis reviewed is related to this study as the Leech’s Maxim used to analyze the movie. The first and the third theses are about the reason why the maxims are applied that closely related to the second problem in this present study.

Besides, there is also an on-line International journal entitled “Politeness Principles in Barrack Obama’s Interview” written by Elisabeth (2014). It
discusses about the types of politeness principles. The theory that she applied is the Politeness Principles by Leech (1983). And she found that the most dominant type of politeness principles was agreement maxim which means that Obama tried to minimize disagreement between self and others and maximize agreement between self and others.

2.2 Concept

This basic concept is viewed as an operational definition which followed to describe the scope of research object. Basic concept is also intended to give coherent on some ideas that have relation with this research. There are some basic concepts that have close relation with this study. They are respectively presented below:

2.2.1 Concept of Politeness

The concept is based on the ideas of some politeness studies. There are some arguments and definitions about politeness as parts of linguistics research. Leech (1983:83) said that politeness is a form of behavior, which aimed at the establishments and maintenance of comity, i.e. the ability of participant in a socio-communicative interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony.

According to Holmes (1992:296) politeness is defined as taking account of feelings of other. This does not mean that we must always be polite, for we may be quite impolite to other occasion. Brown and Levinson also created the concept of politeness in 1978. They said that politeness is defined as a redressive action taken to counter-balance the disruptive effect of face-threatening acts (FTAs).
They explain politeness by deriving it from more fundamental notion of what to be a human being, being rational and having face wants.

According to Leech, politeness is divided into two, positive politeness and negative politeness. Positive Politeness exists in maximizing the politeness of polite illocutions (Leech, 1983:84). Positive politeness utterances are used as 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 purposes of the interaction as somehow similar. Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer’s positive face. Some strategies of positive politeness include statements of friendship, solidarity, and compliments.

Negative politeness exists in minimizing the impoliteness of impolite illocutions (Leech, 1983:84). Negative politeness is oriented mainly toward partially satisfying the hearers negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer. These strategies presume that the speaker will be imposing on the listener and there is a higher potential for embarrassment that in bald on record strategies and positive politeness strategies.

2.2.2 Concept of Maxim

In his book, “Principle of Pragmatics”, Leech proposed six maxims that determined politeness. It is well known as Leech’s Politeness Maxim, there are Tact Maxim, Generosity Maxim, Approbation Maxim, Modesty Maxim, Agreement Maxim, Sympathy Maxim.

1. Tact Maxim: minimize cost to other; maximize benefit to other.
2. Generosity Maxim: minimize benefit to self; maximize cost to self.

3. Approbation Maxim: minimize dispraise of other; maximize praise of other.


5. Agreement Maxim: minimize disagreement between self and other; maximize agreement between self and other.

6. Sympathy Maxim: minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other.

2.2.3 Concept of Face

Face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in an interaction (Brown and Levinson, 1978:66). When the conversation done, the speaker and the hearer should pay cooperate in maintaining each other’s face. Face has become the main focus in politeness theories since it is a matter fact that some acts intrinsically act threatening to someone’s face. Brown and Levinson (1987), building on Lakoff’s work on politeness notion of face, identity two aspects of politeness as negative face and positive face.

a. Negative Face

Negative face is the basic to claim to territories, personal preserve, and rights to non-distraction- i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition (Brown and Levinson, 1978:66).
b. Positive Face

The positive face is the need to be accepted, even liked, by others, to be treated as a member of the same group, and to know that his or her want are shared by others. Positive face correspond to deference and camaraderie: “The desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of”, Brown and Levinson (1987:61). According to Holmes (1995:256) positive face is as polite as showing interest, admiration, or common grounds with her/him.

2.2.4 Concept of Conversation

Conversation is more than merely the exchange of information because when people take part in conversation, they bring the conversational process into sharing assumptions and expectations about what conversation is, how conversation develops, and the sort of contribution they are each expected to make (Richards & Schmidt, 1983:119). Conversation involves two or more people but the distribution of taking the participants is not merely random.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The discussion deals with the theoretical aspects that have relevance to the topic of this study. The major theory used in this writing is based on the theory of Maxims Proposed by Leech on his book *Principle of Pragmatic* (1983) and supported by other theories related to this study. Leech proposed six maxims well known as Leech’s Politeness Maxim.
2.3.1 Politeness Maxim

Politeness is concerned with a relationship between two participants may called ‘self’ and ‘other’. In conversation, ‘self’ identified by speaker (S) and ‘other’ identified with hearer (H). Leech theory of politeness maxim is applied in this writing. Geoffrey Leech proposed six maxims that determine politeness. Leech said maxims vary from culture to culture, meaning, what may considered as a polite in one culture, may be strange or downright rude in another country. Maxim is a usually pithy and familiar statement expressing a principle generally accepted wise or true. And also means part of the best explanation of polite behavior. The first four maxims go in pairs because they deal with bipolar scales: the cost-benefit and praise-dispraise scale. The two other maxims deal with unipolar scales: the scale of agreement and sympathy. (Leech, 1983:132) He was list six maxims:

2.3.1.1 The Tact Maxim

The tact maxim states that minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other and maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other. This part is suitable with Brown and Levinson’s negative politeness strategy of minimizing the imposition and the second part reflects the positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer’s interest, wants, and needs.

Example:

*Could I interrupt you for a second?*

*If I could just clarify this then.*
From example above, this example explain that the Speaker who would like to request permission to the Hearer with politeness expression and clarify what the Speaker wanted to the Hearer. The speaker uses the word “could I” for maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other.

The degree of politeness of an illocution can be measured by different scales:

a. Cost-benefit scales: indicates coat and benefit proposition to hearer. (benefit to hearer = greater politeness; cost to hearer = less politeness).

b. Indirectness scales: indicates degree of politeness on the basis of evaluating the same propositional content under increasingly indirect kinds of illocution (higher politeness = greater politeness).

Taken from Principle of Pragmatics by Leech (1983:107), the tact maxim applies to Searle’s directive and commissive categories of illocutions, which refer, in their propositional content X, to some action to be performed, respectively, by the H or the S. This action may be called A, and may be evaluated in terms of what S assumes to be its cost or benefit to S or H. on this basis, X may be placed on a cost-benefit scale, as in the examples:
COST-BENEFIT SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost to H</th>
<th>Less polite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Peel these potatoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hand me the newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sit down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Look at that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enjoy your holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have another sandwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit to H</th>
<th>More polite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At some rather intermediate point on this scale (depending on the context) the relevant value become ‘benefit to H rather than ‘cost to H’; but clearly, if the imperative mood is kept constant there is a general increase in politeness (other factors being equal between [1] and [6]. (Leech, 1983:107-108). Another way of obtaining a scale of politeness is to keep the same propositional content X. (example: X = ‘You will peel these potatoes’) and to increase the degree of politeness by using a more and more indirect kind of illocution.
INDIRECTNESS SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirectness</th>
<th>Less polite</th>
<th>More polite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Answer the phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I want you to answer the phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Will you answer the phone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Can you answer the phone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Would you mind answering the phone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Could you possibly answer the phone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect illocutions tend to be more polite because they increase the degree of optionality and because the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its force tends to be.

There are two sides of Tact Maxim, negative side and positive side. The negative side of Tact Maxim is “Minimize the cost to H”. And the positive side is “Maximize the benefit to H”. The second is less important, but is a natural corollary of the first. For examples, that in proposing some action beneficial to H, S should be bias the illocution towards a positive outcome, by restricting H’s opportunity of saying ‘No’. Thus an imperative, which in effect does not allow H to say ‘No’ is (in an informal context) a positively polite way of making an offer: Help yourself; Have another sandwich; and so on. The positive bias can even be increased by the persuasive emphasis of: Do have another sandwich!; You MUST have another sandwich!. In this case, the more indirect forms of Will you have another sandwich? If anything less polite than the most direct form: Would you
mind having another sandwich? The reason for this reversal or polite strategies in impositives an commisives is fairly obvious, and has to do with the asymmetry of politeness: what must be expressed strongly by one participant as a ‘polite belief’ must be played own equally by the other participant as an ’impolite belief’. So, increasing the positive politeness of an offer means anticipating and counteracting the negative politeness of the recipient. (Leech, 1983:109-110)

2.3.1.2 The Generosity Maxim

This maxim states minimize the expression of benefit to self and maximize the expression of cost to self. Unlike the tact maxim, the generosity maxim focuses on the speaker, and says that others should be put first instead of the self.

Example:

You relax and let me do the dishes

You must come and have dinner with us

The utterance “You relax and let me do the dishes” showed that he speaker more concern with other people than himself. And also the utterance “You must come and have a dinner with us” describes the speaker generosity in treating the other people. The examples above showed the concept of Generosity Maxim that minimize the expression of beliefs that express benefit to self; maximize the expression of beliefs that imply cost to self.

The hypothesis that the Generosity Maxim is less powerful than the Tact Maxim is supported by the observation that an impositive can be softened, and
thereby made more polite by omission of reference to the cost to H. (Leech, 183: 133-134).

2.3.1.3 The Approbation Maxim

This maxim states minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other, maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other. In its more important negative aspect, this maxim says avoid saying unpleasant things about other, and more particularly, about H. hence whereas a compliment like “What a marvellous meal you cooked!” is highly valued according to the Approbation Maxim, “What an awful meal you cooked!” is not. Similarly, it is acceptably polite to say (referring to the performance of a musician):

   A: Her performance was outstanding!

   B: Yes, wasn’t it!

But suppose that B is the performer:

   A: Your performance was outstanding!

   B: Yes, wasn’t it!

In this case, B falls foul of the Modesty Maxim. Since dispraise of H or of a third party is impolite, it is understandable that, as in the case of the Tact Maxim, various strategies of indirectness are employed in order to mitigate the effect of criticism:
A: *Her performance was magnificent, wasn’t it!*

B: *Was it?*

Assuming that both A and B listened to the performance, B’s reply is evasive an implicates an unfavourable opinion. By questioning A’s statement, B implicates that he is not sure whether A’s judgement is correct. The impolite implicature derives from the unlikelihood that B’s question is simply a request for information, and from the fact that if B had been able, sincerely, to agree with A, would (by the PP) have done so. (Leech, 1983:135)

The operation of this maxim is fairly obvious: all thing being equal, we prefer to praise others and if we cannot do that, to sidestep the issue, to give some sort of minimal response (possible through the use euphemisms or to remain silent). The first part of maxim avoids disagreement; the second part is to make other people feel good by showing solidarity.

Example:

*I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. Your performance was amazing!*

The utterance “*I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. Your performance was amazing!*” showed that the speaker admire the hearer. The Speaker gives praise with polite language as a form of appreciation to someone else.
2.3.1.4 The Modesty Maxim

This maxim states minimize the expression of praise of self, maximize the expression of dispraise of self.

Example:

*Oh, I’m so stupid – I didn’t make a note of our lecture! Did you?*

In example above, it describes the speaker try to be humble with polite language. In this case, the speaker minimized the expression of praise of self.

According to Leech (1983:136), the Modesty Maxim, like the other maxims of politeness, shows itself in asymmetries:

[1] A: They were so kind to us.   B: Yes, they were, weren’t they.
[2] A: You were so kind to us.   B: *Yes, I was, wasn’t I.
[5] Please accept this small gift as a token of our esteem.
[6] Please accept this large gift as a token of our esteem.

As [1] shows, it is felicitous to agree with another’s commendation except when it is a commendation of oneself. Similarly [3] shows how self-dispraise is regarded as quite begin, even when it is exaggerated for comic effect. In ‘Please accept this small gift as a token of our esteem’, the understatement of one’s generosity is shown to be quite normal and indeed, conventional, in contrast to the
exaggeration of one’s generosity. As [2] and [6] illustrate, to break the first submaxim of Modesty is to commit the social transgression of boasting.

2.3.1.5 The Agreement Maxim

This maxim states minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximize the expression of agreement between self and other. It is simply observed that they are much more direct in expressing agreement, rather than disagreement.

Example:

A: I don’t want my daughter to do this, I want her to do that.

B: Yes, but Ma’am, I thought we resolved this already on your last visit.

(Leech, 1986)

The example above shows disagreement expression from the hearer, but it seems that the hearer tries to avoid disagreement with the speaker with polite language. Although the hearer less agree with the speaker, he tries to minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other.

2.3.1.6 The Sympathy Maxim

This maxim states minimize antipathy between self and other, maximize sympathy between self and other. This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration and expressing condolences – all of which is in accordance with Brown and Levinson’s positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer’s interest, wants, and needs.
Example:

*I am sorry to hear about your father.*

(Leech, 1983)

This example expressed when someone showed sympathy to other people. This is a simple example to says condolences of someone to his friend’s father.

2.3.2 Context of Situation

The context of situation and social factor (participant, setting, and topic) are very influence to the characters to express the politeness because these are the basic components of why people not speak in same way all the time. No living language is simply one set of words which can be used the same way all the time. For example, a person who talks with his teacher in school has a different language compared when he talks with her friends. And it also happens when a person talks with his friends in a restaurant when break time compared when he talks in a meeting room. What this means is that there are many ways to say the same things depending on where you are, who you are, and how you feel.

Certain social factors have been relevant in accounting for the particular variety used. Some relate to the users of the language - the participant; others relate to its uses – the social setting and function of the interaction. Who is talking to whom (e.g. wife – husband, customer – shop keeper, boss – worker) is an important factor. The setting or social context (e.g. home, school, office) is generally a relevant factor to. The purpose of the interaction (informative, social) may be important. And in some cases the topic has proved an influence in
Based on Holmes (1992) someone express politeness based on:

1. Age

Age has an important extent in influencing the politeness expression, adult people address the young people with first name (FN) and adult people received title last name (TLN). It means that the younger speakers have to speak politely to the all older speaker (Holmes:1992). Age can be considered very influential on people’s languages. Age states that middle-aged people used different language to that of children and elderly people because the environment surrounding them. Since they are supposed to be in the center of society, to use more standard forms.

2. Gender

Gender is crucial factor to be taken into account when dealing with politeness phenomena. Women and men have a different ways of talking and hence of realizing and interpreting speech acts. Where men use language as tool to give and obtain information and women see language as means of keeping.

3. Kinship

Kinship term indicates blood relationship between the speaker and the hearer. according to Wardhaugh, kinship system is a system of describing how people in various parts of the word refer to brother, sister, father, mother, uncle, and son. Kinship relationship is the family relation which obligates them to respect the other.
4. Social Status

Social status as determined by occupation, education and wealth. Social status, social distance or solidarity, and the degree of formality of the interaction are relevant dimension in all societies in determining ways of speaking politely. Social status divided into three divisions, such as:

a. Low level is the all children learn first regardless of social class origin, and everyone uses it on some occasion, even close acquaintances.

b. Middle level is used by towns-dwellers who are not close friends, or by peasants addressing superiors.

c. Highest level is used among the old aristocrats or by anyone at the highest level of the society who wants to give the appearance of elegance.

Holmes (1995) stated lower class people usually do not get enough education or just graduation from elementary school and junior high school. So they might not know how to used formal speech that is considered polite forms. On the other hand, there are some lower classes that can use the polite forms in addressing other people.

Dell Hymes (1974), as sociolinguist, proposed that competence consist not just a set of rules for formulating grammatically correct sentences, but also a knowledge of when to speak, what to talk with whom, and in what manner. He also proposed the mode of SPEAKING. SPEAKING is an abbreviation of Setting and Scene, Participants, Ends, Act sequences, Keys, Instrumentalities, Norms and Genre.
a. Setting and Scene

According to Hymes, setting refers to the time and place of a speech act and in general, to the physical circumstances (Hymes, 1974:55). Setting is one of the intrinsic elements in a movie. Setting also means a place where the characters of a movie have communication. The classroom and garden might be a setting of a movie. In the other hand, scene is the “psychological setting” or “cultural definition” of a movie, including characteristics such as range of formality and sense of play or seriousness (Hymes, 1974:55-56). Scene can be describe as a segment of story action. For example, a person in a meeting would be serious or relax can be called a scene.

Example:

RAY: Hi Mum

MUM: Hi. You’re late

RAY: Yeah, that bastard Sootbuckecket kept us in again

MUM: Nana’s here

RAY: Oh sorry, where is she?

(Holmes, 1992)

Ray’s description of his teacher would have been expressed differently if he had realized his grandmother could hear him. The way people talk is influenced by certain social factors, it matters who can hear us and where we are
talking, as well as how we are feeling. The same message may be expressed very differently to different people. (Holmes, 1992:1)

Setting also related into the styles of language in conversation. There are two kinds of language which usually used in daily life; they are formal and informal language. Hornby (1995:464) states that informal means not formal, relaxed and friendly. And if in formal situation normally some people use formal language when communicate with each other, while informal language is usually used in informal situation.

In daily conversation, people are not necessary to follow the rules of grammar as carefully as they are in a formal address or a business letter. If they used too much formal rules of grammar in a informal situation, they become across being unnatural. There is another function of formal language, not only to change status of someone but also to put a distance. The use of formal language also means that the relation between the speakers is not a close relation. The participant may be coming from different social status.

b. Participants

Participants are speaker and audience. Linguist will make distinctions within these categories; for example, the audience can be distinguished as addressed and other hearer. at the family reunion, an aunt might tell a story to the young female relatives, but males, although not addressed, might also hear the narrative. (Hymes, 1974:54-56) participant refer to the persons that who speak to whom. These are about the speaker and hearer, sender and receiver, or addresser
and addressee. The element of participants also includes the relationship and social dimension among them.

Participants also include who is speaking and who are they speaking to. People always greets friends and family in the different way from those who they did not know so well and from those who are in the superior relationship to them. The greeting that always used between people who know each other well is like: *morning sweetheart, hello love.* And when talk to the superiors, it is common to avoid names and use only a formal greeting, such as *good morning.* The particular forms you use may vary from those suggested, but the general patterns described here should apply. (Holmes, 1992:3)

Social class is linked to participants include and it determines the use of politeness. The term of social class is used here as a shorthand term for differences between people which are associated with difference in social prestige, wealth and education. Class divisions are based on such status differences. Status refers to the deference or respect people give someone or do not give them as the case may be – and status generally derives in Western society from the material resources a person can command, though there are other sources too. (Holmes, 1992:149)

c. Ends

Ends refer to goal, purposes and outcomes of the speech acts. Hymes also refers to the conventionally recognized and expected effects or outcomes of an exchange as well as the personal goals that the participants expected to
accomplish in speech act. In other words, it can be explained as: why are they speaking? They aunt may tell a story about the grandmother to entertain the audience, teach the young women and honour the grandmother. (Hymes, 1974:56-57)

Example:

MRS. PETTERSON: Hi Angie.

ANGIE: Yes, Mom.

MRS. PETTERSON: Have you got your breakfast?

ANGIE: Yes, I have

In example above, shows that there is an affection expression between Mrs. Petterson to her daughter, Angie. She describe her attention to Angie.

d. Act Sequence

Act sequence is the form and order of the event. Act sequence refers to the message form and content. That means how the speaker used the words and the relationship of what is said to the actual topic at the moment in which the conversation takes place. Thus, this aspect can give the description of what the speaker means by his utterance.

e. Key

Key is the clues that establish the “tone, manner or spirit” of the speech act. It means the way used by the participants of the exchange in performing speech acts whether it is mocking, sarcastic and precise, etc. the key of speech can
also be marked non-verbally by certain kinds of behavior gesture, posture or even deportment (Hymes, 1974:57).

Example:

RADAR: Hi Angela, do you like to go to the party tonight in Jase?

ANGELA: I’m sorry, I can’t. My mother didn’t allow me to go out tonight. She asked me to stay at home.

RADAR: Don’t worry, you will save with me.

In this conversation, Radar might try to be polite when asked Angela to go out with him with soft tone and good manner.

f. Instrumentalities

Instrumentalities are forms and styles of speech. It refers to the means of communication used in performing the speech act. It includes the channel employed during the speech act and the forms of speech language, dialect, etc. the channels of speech act can be differentiated from verbal, non-verbal and physical channel.

g. Norms

Based on Hymes (1974), norms are social rules governing the event and the participants’ actions and reaction. In a playful story by the aunt, the norms might allow many audience interruptions and collaboration, or possibly those interruptions might be limited to participation by older females. A serious, formal story by the aunt might call for attention to her and no interruptions as norms.
Norms means to specific properties attached to speaking interpretation of norms within cultural belief system. Norms of interaction and interpretation are varied according to the participants' social status and also affecting the politeness expression in conversation.

Example:

JOSH: Hi Selena, you look beautiful in that white dress!

SELENA: Thank you, Josh.

JOSH: My pleasure honey.

In conversation above, Selena has good interpretation when Josh gives praise to her dress. Selena’s response will be different if she has a negative interpretation about Josh expression like the example as follow.

Example:

JOSH: Hi Selena, you look beautiful in that white dress!

SELENA: So you mean if I am not beautiful without this dress?

Conversation above means the norms of interpretation and reaction are different according to the point of view of the participants. Norms also related into the cultural systems of the participants.

h. Genre

Genre refers to the textual categories in the utterances or the topic of conversations. For example teachers, prayers, students, family, novels, etc. they are all marked in specific ways in contrast to casual speech. Genre is kind of
speech act or speech event. The scope discussion of genre itself is usually limited about the culture art and particularly literature. In studies of genre, the concept of genre not compared to originality.

2.3.3 Theory of Conversation

The theory is from Richards and Schmidt in their book *Language and Communication* (1983). He said that conversation is regarded as an activity which is directed to social goals. Speakers and hearers are seen to share assumption about the goals and processes of conversation which enable them to interact with each other and interpret conversation as an ongoing, developing, and related succession of utterances.

A successful conversation includes mutually interesting connections between the speakers or things that the speakers know. For this to happen, those who engage in conversation must find a topic on which they both can relate to in some sense. Those who engage in conversation naturally tend to relate the other speakers’ statements to themselves. They may insert some aspects of their lives into their replies in order to relate to the other speaker’s opinions or points of conversation. For example:

A: Where did you buy that shirt?

B: And he shouldn’t say it anyway because that’s what he does.

(Richards & Schmidt, 1983:120)

This example cannot be considered as conversation because B’s sentence cannot be linked to A’s question. One of the assumptions in conversation is that A
asks a question, whatever B says will somehow be interpretable as constituting an
answer to A’s question. In this case, this does not appear to have taken place and
the resulting exchange is interpretable. If someone is faced with a reply such as
above, he/she will repeat the question to make sure the other party has clearly
understood it, or ask the other party to repeat their utterance to see if he/she has
understood it properly.

However, conversation is more loosely anchored to the world that other
kinds of utterances. Moreover, in everyday terms we often orient to conversation
as a kind of event, as when we report, “I had an interesting conversation with Ted
today.” For example (Richards & Schmidt, 1983:119):

1. A: Hi

   B: Hi

2. A: You ready to order?

   B: What’s your soup and sandwich?

   A: Uh, it’s a corned beef sald sandwich and uh beef noodle soup, I think.

   B: No, I’ll take a club sandwich. And coffee.

   A: OK.

   In both (1) and (2) what is spoken may be treated as conversational, but
neither exchange constitutes a conversation in the more restricted sense, though
(1) might have led to one and (2) might conceivably have incorporated one.
And also based on Levinson (1983:284) said that the present conversation may be taken to be that familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which generally occurs outside specific institutional setting like religious services, law courts, classrooms and the like.