CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A research is uncomplete without a theory. The theory is used to make the research reliably clear, which is discuss about some researches that have correlate with politeness strategies used in this research entitled "Donald Trump's Presidential Acceptance speech". First, the writer discusses about the previous studies related the study. After that, the writer explain the theories used in analyzing the data.

2.1. Previous Studies

This part will discuss about some related literatures, journal articles, scientific researches, and also related theses that have similarities, dissimilarity and also superiority that had been done with the previous research. There are five previous researches that the writer finds:

1. The research by Pangestuti (2015), in his thesis entitled "***Politeness Strategies Used by Deddy Corbusier in Interviewing Entertainer and Non-Entertainer in 'Hitam Putih' Talk Show***" concluded the result that there were 16 (sixteen) strategies used by Deddy Corbusier in interviewing entertainer and non-entertainer in 'Hitam Putih'. There were 6 (six) differences among of Daddy Corbusier's strategies on interviewing entertainer and non-entertainer. The reason Daddy Corbusier for choosing the strategies were realized about the profit of each politeness strategies he chose and the distance between him and his guess, his dominance, and the quality of main situation he emphasized.

2. The research by Sari (2013), in her thesis entitled "***Politeness Strategies Used in the Exclusive Interview between Putra Nababan and Barack Obama, March 10, 2010 on RCTI***" concluded the result that in that interview between Putra Nababan and Barrack Obama, there were four politeness strategies they used. There were 86 (eighty six) utterances which consists of 39 (thirty nine) utterances used by Putra Nababan and 47

(forty-seven) utterances used by Barrack Obama. There were 29 (twenty nine) Bald on record strategies: 12 utterances by Putra Nababan, and 7 utterances by Barrack Obama, 25 Positives strategies; 9 Utterances by Putra Nababan and 16 Utterances by Barrack Obama, 31 Negative Politeness Strategies; 17 utterances by Putra Nababan and 14 utterances by Barrack Obama, and 1 Off record strategy used by Putra Nababan. From the analysis the researcher found out that Putra Nababan used Negative Politeness more than other strategies, because Barrack Obama's status and occupation is higher than him, so Putra Nababan used this strategy to keep his politeness in speaking and the hearer will feel respected. And then, the factors influencing the use of the strategies by Putra Nababan and Barack Obama are occupation, social status and formality.

3. A thesis by Hasmi (2013), entitled **"*A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Reflectec in Nanny Mcphee Movie*"** revealed that the result showed there are two important points. First, there are four types of politeness strategies employed by the main characters in *Nanny McPhee* movie when they have the conversation with the children: Bald-on record strategy (31 out of 104), Positive politeness strategy (46), Negative politeness strategy (15), and Off-record strategy (12). Positive politeness strategy has the highest frequency among other strategies since the dialogues are among family members who have a close relationship and know each other very well. Second, in realizing those politeness strategies, the main characters utilized their own sub-strategies: Bald-on record is realized by showing disagreement (5 out of 104), giving suggestion/advice (4), requesting (4), warning/threatening (11), and using imperative form (7); Positive politeness by claiming common ground (25), conveying that S and H are cooperators (17), and fulfilling H's wants for some X (4); Negative politeness by being indirect (2), not presuming/assuming (3), not coercing H (4), communicating S's want to not impinge on H (4), and redressing other wants of H's (2); and Off-record by inviting conversational implicature (8) and being vague or ambiguous (4). Among

all sub strategies, claiming common ground is the most frequent strategy as the main characters need to share common ground with the children. This is close similar to the writer study because the object of analysis

4. A Journal by Winerta (2012), with a title "*An Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Requesting Used in Real Human and Non-Human Conversation on 'Avatar' Movie"* . The researcher concluded that the used of politeness strategies in a (request) found between human and human characters, that was 54, 88%. In the other hand, 'negative politeness' was the strategies most used by the characters, that were 32, 93%. The researcher concluded that politeness strategies in a request found in the character between human and human, and so negative politeness. The result explored that in that fiction movie the strategies of politeness most used by the character between human and human. The researcher concluded that almost all of the characters in 'AVATAR' used negative politeness when asking or make a request.

5. A journal article by Elmianvari and Kheirabadi (2013), entitled "*The Study of EFL Students' Requests Based on Politeness Theory"* This research was carried out to see if the politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978) was applicable to data elicited from EFL students attending a language institute in Iran. Students were asked to email their teacher as a class activity and make a request in an appropriate and polite form. Different viewpoints regarding the status of request in politeness perspective and also student-teacher relation in language classrooms in Iran were discussed. Based on Holtgravesand Yang's (1992) coding scheme, email requests were analyzed and the result showed that apart from a few emails almost all the requests could be considered as polite and just two of them located somewhere in the middle of scale of politeness. Since the analysis was not an absolute objective one, the researcher concluded that most of the students expressed their requests in a polite, formal and indirect way through long sentences as an attempt to save the negative face.

From those previous studies above, the most similar study belongs to Hasmi who also observes politeness strategies. However, in that study, he chose the object on one movie called *Nanny Mcphee* which is have one object of analysis. In this study, the writer also takes one object of analyzing the data. That is a video about Donald Trump's speech at his presidential acceptance which makes it different from the previous studies. In addition, in the study that use movie called *Nanny Mcphee* uses object from the base of imagination and this study uses object from base reality content. The novelty of this study is the writer uses Donald Trump's character as the recent fame hot issue in the USA in the year of 2016, so the writer take advantage of the news growing so that the study find interesting enough for the readers. The similarities among this research and other previous research are they have the same purpose to analyze the types of politeness strategies uses and to find out the reason for choosing the strategies.

2.2. Theoretical Review

This part discusses about the theories which are relevant for this study. It is divided into seven minor points: language and interaction, pragmatics, politeness, politeness strategies, characteristics of politeness, 'Face', and the factors affecting the choice of the strategies. In Language and Interaction, the writer uses the theory from James Paul Gee (2005 & 2011), Janet Holmes (2013) and Jenny Thomas (1995). In Pragmatics the writer uses the theory by George Yule (1996) and Jenny Thomas (1995). In characteristics of politeness the writer uses Geoffrey Leech (2014) theory. In Politeness, the writer uses Joan Cutting (2008) and George Yule (1996). In the 'Face', Politeness strategies, and the factors affecting the choice of the strategies the writer uses the theory by Brown and Levinson (1978).

2.2.1. Language and Interaction

According to Gee (2005: 1), explained that many people think the eminent aim of language is to "communicate information". However,

language provides a great many functions about giving and getting information. Furthermore, Gee (2005: 1) explained that the primary function of human language following two closely related function: First, to support the performance of social activities. Second, it's to support social identities and to support human affiliation within cultures, social groups, and institution. Those two function are connected between cultures, social groups, institutions shape social activities and identities.

Gee (2011: 42) claimed that academic disciplines tend to use varieties of language that are more arcane and complex then everyday language. In our everyday lives, even when we are conveying information to someone, we are also trying to do other things as well. Not only we do use language to do many different things, but many utterances are often meant simultaneously to carry out in more than one action. Because language is used for different function and not just to convey information, it is always useful to ask of any communication: What is the speaker trying to DO and not just what is the speaker trying to SAY? Human use language to carry out various sorts of action, and informing someone else is only one sort of action that we do through language.

According to Holmes (2013: 25-26), there are four influential domains of language choice in multilingual community. They are:

1. The social distance

   This domain is about how well do people know each other, the social distance between the participants, about are they stranger, friends, or brothers/sisters, for instance.

2. The status relationship

   The typical role relationship is affectively influential to this domain, such as teacher and pupil, doctor and patient, soldier and civilian, priest and parishioner, and official with citizen. Even tough, the first role is the more popular domain the way people acting as a teacher, as a parent or as a costumer in the market place is also important.

3. The dimension of formality

In this dimension, formality is the famous domain to differentiate and the reason people selecting language to communicate.

4. The function or goal of the interaction

It is about what is the language being used for, is the speaker asking a favor or giving orders to someone?

Richards and Schmidt (2010: 619-620) explained about the usage of language that people usually use in their speaking and writing. The sense of usage is closely related to PERFORMANCE, and can be studied by the analysis of specimens of AUTHENTIC language and by experiments of various kinds.

People use language for interacting, and in the linguistic study we have to interpret the utterance spoken by the speaker. It is reflecting in the definition of pragmatics that focusses on the process of interpretation from the point of view of the hearer. In Interaction pragmatics as meaning shows that meaning is not a certain word produced by the speaker or the hearer alone. It's a dynamic process, engaging the meaning negotiation between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social, and linguistic) and the meaning potential of an utterance (Thomas, 1995:22).

2.2.2. Pragmatics

According to Richards and Schmidt (2010: 449), pragmatics is the study of the use of language in communication, particularly the relationships between sentences and the contexts and situations in which they are used. Pragmatics includes the study of: a) how the interpretation and use of UTTERENCES depends on knowledge of the real world, b) how speakers use and understand SPEECH ACTS, c) how the structures of sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Sometimes, pragmatics contrasted with SEMANTICS, which deals with meaning without reference to the users and communicative functions of sentences.

Pragmatics is meaning in use or meaning in context (Thomas, 1995:1). Yule (1966: 3) explained that pragmatics is philosophical concept. There is something beyond the language that is pragmatics. Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). The analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by them-selves. It is the study of speaker meaning.

Some experts in the past twenty-five within pragmatics they had put their big interest into 'politeness' as an extent of a pragmatics sub-discipline theory (Thomas, 1995:149).

2.2.3. Politeness

In Pragmatics, when discussing about 'politeness', it is not about social rules of behavior such as letting people go first through a door, or using a napkin for wiping your mouth then using your back of your hand (Cutting, 2008: 43). Yule (1996: 60), has given his opinion that draw the conclusion about politeness as a fixed concept treatment within the idea of 'polite social behavior' or etiquette, deep in a culture. There are some different general principles within a particular culture for being polite in social interaction: such as being tactful, generous, modest, and sympathetic towards others. In conclusion at large, norms and principles existence have to be aware by participants in general.

2.2.4. Characteristics of Politeness

In Leech (2014: 4-8) point of view, there are eight characteristics of politeness. They are:

1. Politeness is a Choice

   It is where people can be non-polite because it is not obligatory. People normally will not behave politely unless there is a reason for them to be polite, they also can be impolite.

2. Kinds of *Gradation* of Polite and Impolite Behavior.

For example, the clapping and cheering moment when someone performing a show. It is a response signaling valuation or high appreciation of someone's performance, the louder or the more prolonged the clapping is, the greater the appreciation signaled and the more polite the response.

3. The Notice

Further, that there is a sense of what is normal, recognized by members of society, as to how polite to be for a particular occasion. If, after a thrilling and dexterous piece of playing, the violinist received only two perfunctory rounds of applause, lapsing into silence as soon as she left the platform, this would be felt to be less polite than normal.

4. Duration of Being Polite

It is depends on the situation. The duration of being polite can be seen in one condition for example, when we come in a football stadium. The footballer who scores a goal, instead of bowing meekly, is likely to execute some kind of war-dance, signaling his delight and self-congratulation. Instead of meekness, he shows exultation: "Wow! I am the greatest!" The crowds cheer him, but the cheers could have quickly changed to jeers and boos if he had committed a fatal error and deprived his team of victory. The difference between this and the concert is that the one occasion is almost a kind of ritualized warfare, whereas the other is not.

5. Reciprocals Asymmetry

For example: in polite behavior between two parties, A and B (in this case we will consider A to be the audience and B to be the soloist). Whatever is felt to be polite in A's behavior (in attributing high value to B) would be felt to convey the reverse of politeness if observed on the same occasion in B's behavior. A's behavior (clapping and cheering) in this case is meant to attribute high value to B and B's performance. B's behavior (bowing) is meant to attribute low value to B and B's performance. To give high value to the other party or to attribute low

value to oneself is felt to be polite; to do the opposite to give high value to oneself or low value to the other person is felt to be impolite.

6. Rather Bizarre Aspect of Politeness

The repetitive behavior which is can lesser or greater the degree of habituality. The reiterative ritual of the performer's entrances with renewed applause is one example. If we dig down to the foundations of this largely automatic ritual, we see a kind of battle of politeness taking place, where A and B take contradictory positions. The politeness of the audience is to prolong the applause; the politeness of the soloist manifests itself in being modest enough to acknowledge the applause with a humble posture and then to make a rapid exit as the applause dies down. But the audience, by continuing to applaud without any diminution, signals that it is not willing to let the soloist vanish from the scene like that. Hence, when the applause continues and the soloist at last returns to the stage, she enacts a ritual of yielding to the pressure of the audience. This may be repeated a number of times before the audience feels it has "given back enough value" to the performer and her performance.

7. The "Something" of Value

It is fairly central to politeness that it involves the passing of some kind of transaction of value between the speaker and the other party. For example, in thanking, we thank someone FOR something; in requesting, we make a request FOR something; in making an offer or invitation, we offer something to the addressee. The "something" referred to here is something of value (either material or abstract) that is supposed to pass from one person to the other. Traditionally, in linguistics, the study of politeness has centered on certain kinds of speech act, all of which involve such a transaction. People that have already mentioned thanks, requests, and invitations, but there are also compliments, congratulations, condolences, apologies, offers, advice, and the like. Often the typical responses to these speech acts are also polite, but in an opposite way to

the speech act itself. (Again, reciprocal asymmetry is at work.) For example, the response to a thank-you is often to deny A owes a debt to B: "Not at all," "It was nothing," "No problem," "Don't mention it."

8. The tendency to preserve a balance of value between the participants A and B.

This is particularly clear in the cases of thanks and apologies, two speech acts that may be described as remedial, because they seek to rectify the sense of debt that one participant has to the other. In one case, thanking, the sense of debt arises from an act of kindness of the other party; in the other case, apology, it arises from the offense committed by the speaker, who tries to repay the debt in words. This metaphor of "repaying" "debt," deriving from commerce and finance, can be fruitfully extended to other speech acts, where social value passing from one participant to another ultimately, though not necessarily immediately, is felt to require recompense. Going back to the concert-hall scenario, the skilled performance of the violinist "requires" immediate homage in the form of applause. If the applause continues past two or three entrances and exits by the performer, an imbalance arises between the value of the performance and the value of the applause, and so an encore (a further payment by the performer) is felt to be appropriate.

2.2.5. Face

According to Putz (2008: 131), he explained in his book that *face* as metaphor was made popular, at least in Western scientific thought, by the sociologist Erving Goffman. The performance of L2 learners of German in argumentative discourse tasks through face as well as through another one of Goffman's concepts, *frames.* Yule (1996: 61) explained that within people every day social interaction, they generally behave as if their expectations concerning their public self-image, or their **face wants**, will be respected. If a person says something that shows a threat to another person's expectations concerning self-image, it is described as a **face threatening**

act. Even though, if people given the possibility that some action might be interpreted as a threat to another's face, the person can say something to mitigate the possible threat. This is called a **face saving act.**

For example, there was a young neighbor playing his music very loud at late night scene and an older couple is trying to sleep:

Husband   : I'm going to tell him to stop that awful noise right now! (This statement proposes a face threatening act)

Wife   : Perhaps you could just ask him if he is going to stop soon because it's getting a bit late and people need to sleep. (This statement proposes a face saving act).

Based on Thomas (1995: 168) cited in Brown and Levinson (1967 revised 1968), The most influential theory of politeness is the concept of 'face'. The term 'face' in the sense of 'repetition' or 'good name' had been first used in English in 1876 as a translation of the Chinese term 'diu lian' in the phrase 'Arrangements by which China has lost face'. Since then it had been used widely in phrases such as 'losing face', 'saving face'. According to Thomas (1995: 169), within politeness theory 'face' is best understood as every individual's feeling of self-worth or self-image: this image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others. Face has two aspects: 'positive' and 'negative'.

a) **Positive Face:** An individual's positive face is reflected in his or her desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others.

b) **Negative Face**: An individual's negative face is reflected in the desire not to be impeded or put upon, to have the freedom to act as one chooses.

For example,

2.2.6. Politeness Strategies

As the word 'strategy' give impression to the speaker volition rather than norms or rules. Thus, the terms marked in volitional aspects of politeness. Compared to the 'formal forms', the speaker may choose from a wider range of possibilities (2008: 42). According to Brown and Levinson

(1978: 92), there are four famous strategies in politeness: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record:

1. **Bald on Record**

   This is a direct speech acts: such utterances tend to contain the imperative with no mitigating devices, for example:

   'This door-handle's falling off. Fix it' or 'give that note to me'

   This example leave the hearers little option but do as they are told or be seen as uncooperative (Cutting, 2002: 44). In another example according to Yule (1996: 63), the most direct approach, using imperative forms and directly address the other as means of expressing the need of the speaker is known as **bald on record**, such as:

   a. Give me a pen

   b. Lend me your pen } Bald on record .

   These forms may followed by expressions like 'please' and 'would you?' which serve to soften the demand and they are called as **mitigating devices**.

   According to Brown and Levinson (1978:94-98), this bald on record consists of two strategies: a) Strategy 1: Cases of non-minimization of the face threat, and b) Strategy 2: Cases of FTA-oriented Bald-on-record usage.

1.1. Strategy 1: Cases of Non-Minimization of the Face Threat

It is used when both S (Speaker) and H (Hearer) mutually aware of how important to make their needs delivered in a maximum efficiency manner. So that no 'face' redress is necessary. In the case of importunate situation or desperation, redress would actually decrease the communicated urgency. For example:

a. *Help!* (compare the non-urgent *'Please help me, if you would be so kind'*)

b. *Watch out!*

c. *Your pants are on fire!*

d. *Give me just one more week!* (to pay the rent), Brown and Levinson (1978:95-96).

1.2. Strategy 2: Cases of FTA Oriented Bald On Record Usage

This strategy is oriented to face. Usually, it is used in 1) welcoming (or post-greetings), where speaker insists that hearer may impose on his negative face, for example: *Come in, it is okay. I'm not busy*, in 2) farewells, where speaker insists that hearer may transgress on his positive face by talking his leave, for example: *Okay, I'm stay here, you go*, in 3) offers, where speaker insists that hearer may impose on speaker's face, for example: *Leave it to me (I'll do it),* Brown and Levinson (1978:98-99).

2. Positive Politeness

Based on Brown and Levinson (1978:101-129), positive politeness is used to satisfying the desire of the hearer or respect the hearer's expectation. According to Yule (1996: 64), a positive politeness strategies is oriented the speaker or requester to the general direction, and even friendship. In Brown and Levinson (1978: 102), showed that positive politeness contains fifteen strategies as followed:

Positive Politeness		
Do FTA on Record plus redress to: H wants [S wants H's wants]		
1. Claim 'Common Ground':		1. Notice, attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods)
	1.1. Convey 'X is admirable, interesting'	2. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)
		3. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)
	1.2. Claim in-group membership with H	4. Use in-group identity markers
	1.3. Claim Common : point of view, opinions, attitudes, knowledge, empathy.	5. Seek agreement 6. Avoid disagreement 7. Presuppose/ raise/ assert

			common ground 8. Joke
2. Convey that S and H are cooperators	**2.1.** Indicate S knows H's wants and is taking them into account		9. Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants.
	2.2. Claim reflexivity: If H wants (H has X) Then S wants (H has X) [and the opposite]		10. Offer, promise 11. Be optimistic 12. Include both S and H in the activity 13. Give (or ask for) reasons.
	2.3. Claim reciprocity		14. Assume or assert reciprocity
3. Fulfil H's wants (for some X)			15. Give gift to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

3. Negative Politeness

Based on Brown and Levinson (1978: 129-210), Negative politeness is redressing action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. It is the heart of respect behavior, just as positive politeness is the kernel of 'familiar' and 'joking' behavior. The main focus for using this strategy is to assume that speaker may be imposing by the hearer, and intruding on their space. Therefore, these automatically assume that there might be some social distance or awkwardness in the situation. According to Brown and Levinson, there are ten negative strategies as followed:

No.	Sub-Strategies	Description	Example
3.1.	**Be Direct**	Generally, Negative politeness combines both	-

		direct utterance and the action which is minimize imposition of FTA. To avoid the further imposition is by being indirect.	
	1. Be Conventionall y Indirect	In this strategy, the speaker need to modify the direct utterances with particular words and solved by compromise of conventional indirectness.	*a. Can you shut the door?* *b. I'm looking for a comb.*
3.2.	**Do Not Presume/ Assume:**	In this strategy, the speaker should carefully avoid presuming or assuming anything about hearer's desire and interest because it may impose hearer. S (Speaker) keeps the distance from the hearer.	
	2. Question, Hedge.	This strategy turned the H (Hearer) attention to hedges. It drives from the want not to presume and the want not to force.	*I'm* Pretty *sure I've read the book before.*
3.3.	**Do Not Force Hearer**	In negative politeness focused on keeping hearer's negative face. Then, the speaker forbid to force hearer too much.	

		Forcing basically threats hearer's negative face, because it indicates a strong imposition towards hearer. Besides, it breaks the rule of negative politeness.	
	3.Be Pessimistic	This strategy gives redress to hearer's negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of speaker's speech act obtain.	*Perhaps you'd care to help me.*
	4.Minimize the Imposition	The choice of a strategy encodes the perceived danger of the FTA.	*Could I have taste (slice) of that cake?*
	5.Give Deference	There are two ways to convey giving deference strategy. First, speaker tends to be humble by himself. Second, speaker treats hearer as superior. In this case, speaker realizes that he is not in the position where he can force the hearer. It is a kind of mutual respect among participants of speech.	*Excuse me, sir, but, would you mind if I close the window?* Brown and Levinson (1978:189)

3.4.	**Communicate Speaker's Desire not to interrupt on Hearer**	It is one way to satisfy hearer's negative face, speaker ought to be careful in representing the interruption towards hearer. It can be done by apologizing before doing interruption and making the agent of FTA is unclear.	
	6. Apologize	By apologizing for doing an FTA, the speaker can indicate his reluctance to impinge on H's negative face and thereby partially redress that impingement.	*I'm sure you must be very busy, b u t . . .* Brown and Levinson (1978: 188)
	7. Impersonalize S and H, avoid the pronoun 'I' and 'you'.	The basic concept of this strategy is avoiding reference to the person that involves in FTA. Speaker should avoid inclusive 'I' and 'you' in the conversation because it may indicate a little imposition.	"I ask you to do this for me" become "*Do this for me*". Brown and Levinson (1978: 190).
	8. State the FTA as a general rule.	Stating the FTA as general rule in the conversation is a safe way to minimize the imposition. Speaker can reveal the FTA as a	*"The United States expresses regrets over the occurrence of the incident."*

	social rule or obligation that has to be done by hearer. Then, speaker does not seem to impose hearer.	*"We don't sit on tables; we sit on chairs, Johnny."* Brown and Levinson (1978: 207).
9. Nominalize	The strategy of nominalize deals with the degree of formality. To conduct this strategy, speaker can replace or nominalize the subject, predicate, object or even complement to make the sentence gets more formal.	*"You performed well on the examinations and we were favorably"* impressed. Brown and Levinson (1978: 207).
10. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H (1978: 131).	In this strategy, speaker generally imposes heavily on hearer by going on record. The speaker can also claim a debt explicitly as a redress or feedback of the FTA.	*It wouldn't be any trouble; I have to go right by there anyway.* Brown and Levinson (1978: 210).

3. Off Record

Off Record is the strategy that is done with communicative act which is indirectly spoken by the speaker and interpreted in numerous ways of intention delivered. There are two ways to represent off record strategy: the first is to invite conversational implicature, and the second is to be vague or ambiguous Brown and Levinson (1978: 211).

3.1. Invite Conversational Implicature

The action of giving hints, association clue and also presupposition totally violate maxim of relevance because in this case speaker says something that irrelevant with the things that speaker intends to say. According to Brown and Levinson (1978: 213), there are fifteen off record strategies:

1. Gift Hints

    It is giving the speaker chance to say something that is not explicitly relevant, he invites hearer to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance. The basic mechanism here is a violation of the Maxim of Relevance.

    I.e. *This soup's a bit bland,* (Pass the salt). And *what a hot day!* (how about a drink?).

2. Give Association Clues

    A related kind of implicature triggered by relevance violations is provided by mentioning something associated with the act required of hearer, either by precedent in speaker-hearer's experience or by mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience. For example:

    "Oh God, I've got a headache again." and *Are you going to market tomorrow? There's a market tomorrow, I suppose.* (Give me a ride there).

3. Presuppose

    A third set of clues to speaker's intent is related in a different way to the Relevance maxim. An utterance can be almost wholly relevant in context, and yet violate the Relevance Maxim just at the level of presuppositions. For example: *"John's in the bathtub yet again"*. And *"It wasn't me that did it"*.

4. Understate

    Speaker understates what he actually wants to say. In the case of a criticism, speaker avoids the lower points of the scalar predicate,

such as: tall, nice, good, and in the case of a compliment, or admission, speaker avoids the upper points. For example:

A: *How do you like Josephine's new haircut?*

B: *It's pretty nice* or *it's OK* (I don't particularly like it).

5. Overstate

Speaker exaggerates or chooses a point on a scale, which is higher that the real situation. For example: *Why are you always smoking?* (Conveying Criticism)

6. Use Tautologies

By uttering a tautology, speaker encourages hearer to look for an informative understanding of the non-informative utterance. For example: *"War is war."* Or *"Boys will be boys"*.

7. Use Contradiction

This strategy uses by stating two things that contradict each other, speaker shows that he cannot be telling the truth and encourages hearer to look for an interpretation that reconciles the two contradictory things. For example:

A: *Are you upset about that?*

B: *Well, I am and I am not.*

8. Be Ironic

This used by saying the opposite of what he means, speaker can indirectly express intended meaning. For example:

Beautiful weather isn't it! (This aimed to the postman that drenched in rainstorm).

9. Use Metaphors

Metaphors are a further category of Quality violations, for metaphors are literally false. The use of metaphor is perhaps usually on record, but there is possibility that exactly which of the connotations of the metaphor S intends may be off record. For example: *Harry's a real fish.* (He swims like a fish).

10. Use rhetorical Question

This strategy is the chance for the speaker asks a question with no intention of obtaining an answer; it may be used to do FTA. For example: *How many times I have to tell you . . . ?* (Too many)

3.2. To be Vague or Ambiguous

In this strategy, S may choose to go off record by being vague or ambiguous.

11. Be Ambiguous

The speaker achieves a purposeful ambiguity through metaphor. For example: *John's pretty smooth cookie.*

12. Be Vague

The Speaker goes off record with an FTA by being vague about who the object of the FTA is, or what the offence is. For example: *Perhaps someone did something naughty* (vague under-statement).

13. Over-Generalize

Speaker utters a rule instantiation which may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record. Hearer then has the choice of deciding whether the general rule applies to him. For example: *"He who laughs last laughs longest".*

14. Displace H (hearer)

"Speaker goes off record as to whom the target for his FTA is, or he may pretend to address the FTA to someone whom it wouldn't threaten and hope the real target will see that the FTA is meant at him" (Brown and Levinson, 1987:226).

15. Be incomplete, use ellipsis

Speaker purposely does not finish his utterance and leave an FTA half undone, thus leaves the implicature 'hanging in the air', just as with rhetorical questions. For example:

Well, I didn't see you ...

Well, if one's leaves one's tea on the wobbly table... Brown and Levinson (1978: 227).

2.2.7. Factors Affecting the Choice of the Strategy

There are two factors affecting the choice of the strategy according to Brown and Levinson (1978: 71) as followed:

2.2.7.1 The Payoffs: A Priori Considerations

Payoff is kind of priority consideration. By going on record, it means the speaker enable to consider the advantages that he get by using each strategy. For example: if the speaker used on record, he can hones and direct answer and also avoids any misunderstanding. In other hand, if the speaker uses off record, he might lessen the risk of threatening hearer's face, avoid the responsibility of giving a threat and he does not appear to force hearer. If speaker uses positive politeness, hearer might feel that speaker approves and appreciates him. Speaker could also satisfy the hearer's positive face. In addition, if speaker uses negative politeness, hearer feels that speaker pays respect and give deference to him. He could also satisfy hearer's negative face.

2.2.7.2 The Circumstance: Sociological Variables

According to Brown and Levinson (1978:74-83), the circumstances deal with sociological variables belonging to:

1. The social distance (D) [a symmetric relation]
2. Between speaker and hearer, the relative power (P) of speaker and hearer [an asymmetric relation]
3. The absolute ranking of imposition (Rx).

These variables are used for estimating the importance of the FTA given by the speaker. Distance deals with the frequency of interaction between speaker and hearer. It relates to their closeness. Moreover, power deals with the domination of the superior over subordinate. Power value does not always refer to individual, but it also refers to role-sets. For

instance: Manager/employee. In addition, ranking of imposition deals with the degree of interruption given in the FTA. Furthermore, seeing from independent variable, P, D, R (Power, Distance, Relation) are not seen only by relevant factors, but it also seen from status, authority, occupation, ethnic, identity, friendship, and situational factors. Then, in this case, if the distance between speaker and hearer is great or it means that they are not close and the power of hearer over speaker is great and the ranking of imposition is also great, then, the speaker must lessen the imposition. In this case, if speaker gives great imposition over hearer, then, it might threat hearer's 'face' a lot.