

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

In conducting the research, the writer explains the theory that coherent with the research problem. The writer used the theory to be easily understanding about the problem in this analysis.

A. Definition of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is an aspect of language study which focuses on the users of language - how humans in societies use their language in communication. Its development as an aspect of linguistics began in the early sixties and seventies when linguists began to shift their focus from the dogmatic approach of Chomsky and his followers as evidenced in the works of scholars. Pragmatics seek to investigate such issues that are ignored in syntax, semantics and phonology. Any answer to what meaning is needs to be derived, or reconstructed, from the actions of language-users that are situated and embodied in particular contexts, such as cultural, historical, social, perspectival and recollective ones. Pragmatics, on the other hand, is basically concerned with how people use language within a context, in real-life situation with the utterance as its unit of analysis. In pragmatics, we study how factors such as time, place and social relationship between speakers affect the ways in which language is used to perform different function. Thus, to J.L. Austin (1955) language is action, and much of the interactions between humans are based on verbal action like when we request, promise, swear, apologize, etc. A key distinction in methodology and

approach in pragmatics is that it uses utterance (real life/actual) to draw or attribute meaning through the social force.

Morris quoted in Schmitt (2002:75) defines pragmatics as the science of the relation of sign to their interpreters; Pragmatic does not necessarily approach language as a system per se, but is concerned with language from the perspective of the interrelationship between language form, message and user. It is, therefore, the task of pragmatics, to study meaning that linguistic expressions receive in use, to explain how participants in a dialogue grasp the meaning of words and phrases in context.

Grice (1975:89) formulated the co-operative principle in pragmatics which is effected through certain maxims a communicator is presumed to abide by such as truthfulness, informativeness, relevance and style. The methodology for doing pragmatics centers on using the social context of an utterance to assign meaning far and beyond just linguistic content. It places value on extra linguistic features such as tone, gestures, pitch, etc to attribute meaning. Because pragmatics does that, it brings to bear such elements as politeness, communicative principle, speech acts, face, implication, etc. Meaning here is perceived by the users of language from what context determines. For example, someone with a friend walk pass a restaurant, and the friend remarks that he has not eaten in hours. Far and beyond the semantic and syntactic meaning of that statement, here, the utterance means that they go into the restaurant and eat. So, unless the conversational partner understands the pragmatics

force in the situation, there may be misunderstanding. Saeed (2007:17) clearly puts it about pragmatics thus:

If in an investigation explicit reference is made to the speaker, or, to put it in more general term, to the user of a language, then we assign it to the field of pragmatics. (Whether in this case reference to design a is made or not make no different for this classification).

Pragmatics covers a wide range of scope to include such aspects as deixis-meaning that which points to something in general, or in its narrow sense the contextual meaning of pronouns or in a broader sense, what a speaker means by a particular utterance in a given context. It also considers the logical meaning of a sentence or the meanings that are logically connected or entailed by a sentence-presupposition. Pragmatics posits that by an utterance, a speaker not only says something but performs an act of informing, explaining, arguing, appreciating, stating, etc. A study that evolves into performatives, a hypothesis of Speech Acts which holds that a speech event embodies three acts: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary (Austin and Searle quoted in Mey, 2003). Also on the pragmatic investigation is implicature: referring to an indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance derived from context that is not present from its conventional use. The success of communication is hinted on the communicative and cooperative principles that assume that communication is made possible because interlocutors cooperate in the conversation by contributing to an ongoing discourse, (Grice quoted in Leech 1983). Every interaction chooses to respect or disrespect how their fellow interaction

feel by their words (preserve a positive face or negative face - a tendency imbedded in the politeness principle Leech (1983).

B. Definition of Politeness

Politeness is expressed in varying ways. Generally speaking, politeness, as put by Johnstone (2008:145), is “the ways in which speakers adapt (or fail to adapt) to the fact that their interlocutors, actual or imagined, have social needs like their own”. It is also “by being polite, we conserve our integrity as interlocutors while being considerate of partners’ faces politeness is a strategy for conversational cooperation with least cost and maximum benefit to all interlocutors” Mey (2003:76). Still speaking about politeness, Leech (1991:79) identifies politeness as a principle in which people in the talk exchange are expected to minimize impolite beliefs and maximize polite beliefs. This means, according to Stephen and Kurt-Michael (1999:206) that people must try to accept others the way they are, and avoid offending them, and help them preserve their face.

Lakoff (1975:64) sees politeness as those forms of behaviour which have been “developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction “, thus indirectly claiming politeness universality .He also speaks about appropriateness saying: “to be polite is saying the socially correct thing”. Similarly Leech (1983:104) defines politeness as those forms of behaviour which are aimed at the establishment and maintenance of comity, i.e, the ability of participants to engage in interaction in a comfortable and harmonious atmosphere.

According to dictionary (2011) politeness is defined as “showing good manners towards others” or as being “refined or cultured”. However, in the field of linguistics the concept of politeness is much more complex. Politeness is culturally determined. Different speech communities emphasize different functions, and express particular functions differently Holmes (2008:270). Speaking politeness involves taking account of the feelings of others. A polite person makes others feel comfortable. Being linguistically polite involves speaking people appropriately in the light of their relationship. Also need to understand the social values of a society in order to speak politely Holmes (2008:281).

Politeness allows people to perform many inter-personally sensitive actions in a nonthreatening or less threatening manner. Politeness is described as a social norm, or a set of prescriptive social “rules”. Politeness is defined as using communicative strategies to create and maintain social harmony. This can be done in various ways: being contextually appropriate, following social and cultural norms and being socially.

Based on explanation above, politeness is utterance that make people feel good and convenient to communicate each other. It can to reduce the distance of the speakers.

1. Considerable Items Related to Politeness

To achieve the goal of politeness, should consider it from the following aspects:

- a. Considering the social background of the communicator.

The social background of the communicator is one of factors that influencing in communication. Different social background is different style in speaking. So, it should be known.

- b. According to the communicative circumstances.

Communication is a very complicated process. In formal occasions, people usually use formal expressions to show politeness, especially between the new people that recently known. While in informal states, people usually to be casual to show intimacy even if it is in the very moment they meet. And that doesn't mean impoliteness.

- c. In situations of social distance or closeness, showing awareness for another person's face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference. Showing the equivalent awareness when the other is socially close is often described in terms of friendliness, camaraderie, or solidarity." Huang (2008:2-3).

In writer's opinion, expression of language is the determiner in interaction. The way to express language is considered in interaction. It considers social background, communicative circumstance, and situation of social distance or closeness like explanation above.

2. Cultural Differences

Different culture causes different views of values, which affects the criteria of politeness and leads to differences in various aspects Huang (2008:3-4)

a. Ways to greet each other's and farewells

The westerners often greet others with a cheerful "Hello!" or something like "How are you?" If they are talking with a stranger, they tend to talk about the weather as a way of greeting. The westerners often greet others with a cheerful "Hello!" or something like "How are you?" If they are talking with a stranger, they tend to talk about the weather as a way of greeting. But to Chinese people, they like to ask "Have you eaten?," "Where are you going?," "What brings you here?" or "What are you doing here?" All these would be considered as interferences to privacy for westerners.

b. Addressing terms

Social status is considered to show respect. It is in formal or informal address people who hold high social status with professions as: Professor Green, Chairman Johnson etc. But never address people with "teacher and manager". In informal occasions, even a professor or a chairman prefers himself to be called with given name to show intimacy to others.

c. Ways to praise others

The westerners like to praise the hostess or the host on their first visit, they consider that to be polite and natural. In most cases, the westerners prefer to be praised over their house, garden, car, wife, decorations and room arrangements etc. esp. something made on their own hands, but often not their children's beauty or intelligence is considered as leading the kids to be vanity. But, in Chinese used surprising tone to show he really liked something, this strategy works well in China.

d. Ways to express thanks

Express thank to the other people sometimes not to be excessive. Maybe for other people, their help is common thing. So that, just say thanks as much as required because for some people saying thanks that excessive disturbing them.

3. Politeness and Culture Values

a. Considerations of privacy

Privacy is regarded more important value in English-speaking culture. Different people hold different views about what privacy is. Speakers of English, should they be asked all such questions; age, marriage, family, occupation and even incomes that, would feel their interlocutor is rudeness encroaching upon their privacy. In Chinese culture they are being polite by showing concern for other people, and

asking all those questions will help shorten the social distance between themselves and their interlocutors.

b. Considerations of individualism

Individualism is considered of great value in English-speaking countries, it is closely related with the history and the culture. It usually refers to the freedom, right and independency of an individual. It is regarded that the actions showing respect to individualism as polite ones Chinese people add food into a guest's plate constantly to show enthusiasm; oblige others to accept gifts to show sincerity, etc. They are all considered to be polite in Chinese culture but the opposite in western culture. Westerners with a strong notion think that there is something wrong with someone who fails to demonstrate individualism.

c. Considerations of taboos

Taboos are the words that are closely bounded to cultures. Most of the items mentioned above may be looked on as taboos in daily conversations. Take the item mentioned in 'Considerations of Privacy' "age" as an example, in western countries, woman's age is a taboo in daily conversations, woman ask you questions like "How old are you?" during chatting and in western countries the aged people do not like the young people to call them as "old man", they like "senior man" or "senior citizen" better. It means they are old. In Chinese

traditional culture, there also have some taboos. For example, in the Spring Festival, people forbid to say some words such as “broken” and “death”. They are afraid that these words may take away their whole-year fortune Huang (2008:4-5).

Based on the definition and the aspects of politeness above, the writer concludes that politeness is showing a good manner in communication and using language style by considering all aspects in communication such as, social background of the hearer, the culture of the hearer, and the culture value. Because, different social background, culture and culture value in communication is mostly different perception about politeness. So, politeness expression is depended on the culture perception.

C. Theory of Politeness

There are many theories that study about politeness. It indicates that politeness is important to learn. According Robin Lakoff (1975) politeness is an important aspect of interaction that needs to be studied. Lakoff’s theory of politeness suggests that people follow a certain set of rules when they interact with each other, which prevent interaction from breaking down.

1. Be clear (based on Grice’s Cooperative Principle Maxims)

To give information to someone or to speak to other people, try to speak clearly and to the point of the conversation purpose. There are three principle maxims:

- a. *Maxim of Quantity*: state as much information as is needed in the conversation but not more.
- b. *Maxim of Quality*: only say what you believe to be true based on your own knowledge and evidence.
- c. *Maxim of Relations* (be relevant): speaking should be suitable with the topic of conversation.
- d. *Maxim of Manner*: be concise, avoid confusing, ambiguous statements.

2. Be polite

To speak politely, there three basic that should considered:

- a. Don't impose: avoid underestimate someone. Make someone feel down.
- b. Give options: it is not force someone to agree about something. But, let someone to choose agree or disagree.
- c. Make others feel good: use nice words, praising and encourage someone.

According to Brown and Levinson there are two kinds of face, which reflect two different desires present in every interaction. Negative face (desire to express one's ideas without resistance) Positive Face (desire to have one's contributions approved of)

There are four potential face-threatening acts, proposed by Brown and Levinson, as follows (Theory of Politeness .n.d)

- a. Acts which threaten the audience's negative face: ordering, advising, threatening, warning.
- b. Acts which threaten the audience's positive face: complaining, criticizing, disagreeing, raising taboo topics.
- c. Acts which threaten speaker's negative face: accepting an offer, accepting thanks, promising unwillingly.
- d. Acts which threaten speaker's positive face: apologizing, accepting compliments and confessing.

Leech's theory of politeness establishes five scales, which are used for determining how the maxims should be used and balanced.

- a. The Cost-Benefit Scale on which is estimated the cost or benefit of the proposed action, A to s or h. For example, an offer (e.g. *Sit down, please.*) brings more benefit to the addressee than a request does (e.g. *Wash the dishes, please.*)
- b. The Optionality Scale on which illocutions are ordered according to the amount of choice which s allows to h. A request in the imperative (e.g. *Help me!*) gives addressee a smaller amount of choice than the same request formulated as question (e.g. *Could you help me, please?*)
- c. The Indirectness Scale on which, from s' point of view, illocutions are measured with respect to the length of the path (in terms of means-end analysis) connecting the illocutionary act to illocutionary goal. For

example, an interpretation of *Close the window, please* is easier than a request formulated *I am cold*.

- d. The Authority Scale on which is the ‘power’ of authority of one participant over another is determined. This, for example, means that a superior has more of a right to expect an inferior to fulfill his request than vice versa.
- e. The Social Distance Scale on which we ascertain the overall degree of respectfulness, which depends on relatively permanent factors of status, age, degree of intimacy, etc. but to some extent on the temporary role of one person relative to another. This means that a speaker can expect help from his friend rather than from a passer-by.

The cost-benefit scale corresponds to the tact maxim and generosity maxim, Leech (1983:107) claims that the tact maxim is “perhaps the most important kind of politeness in English speaking society”. Again, we see the asymmetry of politeness in general; what is a cost to the speaker is a benefit to the hearer and vice versa. To be tactful, we can also use the optionality scale, giving the hearer a choice by being indirect. The authority scale is crucial to determine the use of respectful pronouns in many European languages, the Czech language being one of them. In English there is no pronoun distinction, but we can use another language choice in order to show respect to the other party. The last but not least scale reflects on politeness as people

consider it in the everyday use of language. Obviously, we can differentiate speaking to family or friends from speaking to a stranger or our employer.

Leech also distinguishes between *relative politeness*, which is connected with a particular situation, and *absolute politeness*, which is inseparable from a certain Illocutionary Act. According to Leech, some Illocutionary Acts are inherently impolite (e.g. imperatives), and some are inherently polite (e.g. offers). In some speech acts (declarations, announcements, instructions etc.), politeness is partially irrelevant. Yet some (e.g. threats or accusations) have basically no bearing upon politeness insofar as the aim of the act is to cause damage to the hearer, Leech (1983: 83-84)

At this point, it is important to elaborate on the relationship between the two sets of sub-maxims of the two principles (cooperative and politeness). According to Leech, their relationship is complementary, and there is a tension between the two. Another paradox that arises from the relationship between politeness and cooperativeness is that the more polite you are, the less cooperative you are. Similarly, the violation of the Politeness Principle is usually caused by following one of the cooperative maxims – usually the maxim of quality. On the other hand, Richard Watts (2003) asserts that

Lakoff and Leech (and also Brown and Levinson) misunderstand Grice's model.

Marta Dynel (2009:24-32) also supports Watts in saying that the clash between the Politeness Principle and the Cooperative Principle derives from a misunderstanding. The Cooperative Principle should be understood as the interlocutors' rationality underlying a communicative exchange, and therefore the CP is a basic condition for any communication. Being polite is more of a social and moral rule, or a background assumption independent from the CP model. Another problem in Lakoff and Leech, according to Watts, is that they do not take into consideration that politeness behavior is in its substance egocentric. The speaker often uses politeness in order to achieve his/her goal. "(W)hereas on the surface politeness may appear to fulfill altruistic goals, it is nevertheless a mask to conceal the ego's true frame of mind." Watts (1992:46).

According to Leech, different situations call for different degrees of politeness. He outlines four main situations, which call for politeness.

- a. Competitive: the speech goal competes with the social goal. In this situation politeness is viewed as being negative. For example, giving an order.

- b. Convivial: the speech goal matches the social goal. In this situation politeness is viewed as being positive. For example, thanking someone.
- c. Collaborative: the speech goal is indifferent the social goal. For example making an announcement.
- d. Conflictive: the speech goal conflict with the goal social. For example, making an accusation.

According to Ellen politeness is not universal, but is shaped by culturally specific social norms. As a result politeness varies from culture to culture, from language to language and from dialect to dialect. According to Ellen, successful politeness is successful communication. Ellen's theory places more emphasis on the hearer's interpretation of what a speaker says and emphasizes the relationship between culture and politeness.

Based on the theories, above, politeness is depended on the hearer of the speaker. The hearer perception of the speaker is determiner in conversation. The basic thing that speaker should do are be polite and be clear

when speaking to others. Speak politely is not imposing someone others. But, speak politely is making others feel better. Also, try to know how the rule of communication is needed to be polite.

D. Politeness Expression

In Offers and invitation have been studied across culture. Whereas English offers can take the form of a question, as in “Would you like to another beer?” or “ Would you like to go to the cinema with me?”, this form does not exist in Polish and Japanese invitations, as it is not good manners to ask what the addressee would like. Polish speaker tends to press a guest and makes direct suggestions, as in “ Perhaps we would go to the cinema?”, and Japanese hosts usually prefer to offer a little of all the dishes.

There have been many studies of requests and commands. In English, direct commands with imperatives can be rude if used indiscriminately. Choosing the right words and the right grammar can go a long way to removing some unpleasantness of the message speaker has to deliver Bentley (2004:13). The writer will present the way to be polite using the words:

1. Softeners

“I am afraid” is commonly referred to as a “softener”, a linguistic tool used to soften the tone of our content or convey politeness when we speak. Softeners often occur at the beginning of sentence to prepare us for bad news: I am afraid, so sorry, to be honest, unfortunately, with all respect.

Example:

- a. To be honest, I think we need to rethink our marketing strategy.
- b. With all respect, I don't agree with what you just said.

2. Modal Verb

Modal verb such as can, could, will, would, should, may or might are great for softening a request or giving a command:

Examples:

- a. "I want more time to finish this presentation" (impolite)
- b. "I could use more time to finish this presentation" (polite).

3. Rephrasing A Negative Sentence

Negative sentence can be rephrased in order to make them appear more positive. Our very first sentence can be made even more diplomatic in this way. Negative sentence that is formed with can not and will not make the speaker sound particularly negative and unhelpful and can often be rephrased with be able to, or a similar expression:

Examples:

- a. "I can not give you a better deal than that" (impolite)
- b. "I am not able to give you a better deal than that." (polite)

Similarly, affirmative sentence containing words with a negative meaning can be rephrased in order to soften the message and achieved a more indirect effect:

Examples:

- a. "I am unhappy with this agreement" (impolite)
- b. "I am not entirely happy with this agreement" (polite)

4. Qualifiers

Qualifiers are words used to modify other words and they increase or decrease the quality signified by those words. Such as a little, a bit, a little bit, slight, slightly, small, one or two, more, most, so, too, less, pretty, just, quiet, etc.

Examples:

- a. "We are having problems with the new product" (impolite)
- b. "We are having one or two problems with the new product"

5. Negative Question Forms

Another way to make the conversation more polite is by using negative questions when the speaker wants to make suggestion.

- a. "We should redesign the company logo!" (impolite)

This sound quite forceful, direct and the hearer probably want to avoid this when speaking to a superior or client. A more indirect version looks like this:

- b. “Should not we redesign the company logo?” (polite)

Here the speaker has taken a forceful sounding statement and turned it into an indirect suggestion by adding ‘not’ and changing the syntax to make it into a negative question. Typically, the speaker uses should not, would not, and could not to form this type of question.

6. Using the Past Continuous Tense

Another way to make a sentence less direct and more polite is to use the past continuous tense:

Examples:

- a. “I hope we can sign the contract today” (impolite)
 b. “I was hoping that we could sign the contract today” (polite)

Using the past continuous makes the sentence sound more hypothetical and tentative, and therefore less direct and is a great technique for injecting diplomacy and politeness into speaker’s English.

7. The Passive Voice

Finally, the passive voice is a great way to make speaker’s sentences sound more polite:

Examples:

- a. “You have broken my computer!” (impolite)

This active voice sentence is brutally direct and if the speaker’s aim is to avoid confrontation. Speaker might consider using the passive voice to lessen the emotional impact of the sentence:

b. “My computer has been broken!” (polite)

Here the speaker is removing the subject (you) from the sentence completely and focusing on the object (the computer) and the action. The effect here is to deemphasize personal responsibility for the action.

E. English Communication

English is the official language of communication as well as the medium of instruction in upper primary, secondary school and tertiary institutions. Mastery of English is of academic, social and professional benefits. Proficiency in English cannot be underscored in the school setting since it makes the learning of other subjects easier, RoK (MoE, 2002).

Communication is a basic human activity. By communicating people can relate to each other, either individually or in groups in everyday life. The essence of communication is the process of inter-human statement. Communication can also be interpreted as forms of human interaction that influence each other and influence each other, intentionally or unintentionally. Not limited to the forms of communication using verbal language, but also facial expressions, painting, arts and technology.

Communication is a systematic effort to formulate explicitly the principles of information delivery as well as the formation of attitudes and opinions. This shows that communication involves the process of delivering a message, the formation of beliefs, attitudes, opinions and behavior of the public. Meanwhile, according to Wilbur Schramm a linguist, said

communication comes from the Latin word "communis", which means common or similar. So according to Schramm if communication with a party, then we express our ideas to obtain commons with other parties about a particular object.

Communication also be symbolic because it is not limited to words or language. It can always be done by the help of gestures and symbols or facial expressions. The symbols can be present with and without language. Our ability to symbolize and express makes the process of communication possible.

F. Gender

Gender is a term used as a categorical division of human into male and female. West and Zimmerman (1987), stated (in Eckert 2003:10) that gender is not something we are born with, and not something we *have*, but something we *do*. Gender as a term differs from 'sex' in being about socially expected characteristics rather than biology Goddard and Patterson (2000:1). Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003:12), stated that it is commonly argued that biological differences between males and females determined gender by causing enduring differences in capabilities and dispositions.

The different style of language between men and women is very interesting to study. As Rochefort issued (in Jespersen, 1922:237) that women had another language, which is different from the man language, and men have a great many expressions peculiar to them, which woman understand but

never produce themselves. For example, according to Jespersen, swearing is among the things women object to in language; where a man will say "*He told an infernal lie,*" a woman will rather say, "*He told a most dreadful fib.*" This situation then creates a misconception that stipulating the opinions of lots of people to the analysis of the relation between language and gender.

Janet Holmes (1994:1) says that women and men have different ways of talking and hence, of realizing and interpreting speech acts. She points out that women and men use language in a different way because they have different perceptions of what language is for. Whereas men use language as a tool to give and obtain information (referential function of language), women see language as a means of keeping in touch (affective or social function).

Cameron (1996) stated that women and men are categorically said to be different. Early research on language and gender stressed two dichotomies – female and male. As the first work on this topic, Robin Lakoff (1975) contained a debatable view that women's language is deficient due to their diffidence and powerlessness. We cannot deny the biological differences between women and men, but language does not necessary reflect this dichotomy.

There are ten features that considered as Women's Language listed by O'Barr and Atkins (in Coates, 1989:132) which are based on Robin Lakoff's characteristics of female language usage, such as:

- a. Use of hedges. *Hedges* are linguistic forms such as *I think, I'm sure, I guess, you know, kind of, sort of* and *perhaps* which express the speaker's certainty or uncertainty about the proposition under discussion. Lakoff (in Coates 1993: 116) claimed that women's speech contains more hedges and argued that this is because women 'are socialized to believe that asserting themselves strongly isn't nice or ladylike, or even feminine'.
- b. Use (Super) polite forms e.g. *would you mind..., would you please..., I'd really appreciate it if..., ...if you don't mind.*
- c. The use of tag question – where a statement is turned into a question by putting a tag on the end, as in “*the meeting is at eight o'clock, isn't it?*”

According to Lakoff, tag questions decrease the strength of assertions.

For example, compare the two sentences below:

- 1) The crisis in the Middle East is terrible, isn't it?
- 2) The crisis in the Middle East is terrible.

Lakoff claims that women use sentence like a, which contains the tag question *isn't it*, more often than men, who are suppose to favour

- b.
- d. Speaking in italics, e.g. emphatic *so, quite* and *very*, intonation emphasis equivalent to underlining words in written language.
- e. 'Empty' adjectives, e.g. *divine, charming, cute, sweet, adorable.*

- f. Use hypercorrect grammar and pronunciation.
- g. Lack of a sense of humor, e.g. poor at telling jokes and often don't understand the punch line of jokes.
- h. Use direct quotations.
- i. Special vocabulary, e.g. a greater range of terms for colours than men use (examples: aquamarine, fuchsia, lavender, etc., instead of more basic terms such as blue or red).
- j. Use question intonation in declarative contexts: women make declarative statements into question by raising the pitch of their voice at the end of a statement, expressing uncertainty. For example, "*What school do you attend? Eton college?*"

As for the characteristics of men or male language, Frank and Anshen (1984) note that boys, "are permitted, even encouraged, to talk rough and cultivate a deep 'masculine' voice". It is socially acceptable for a man to be forward and direct his assertiveness to control the actions of others.

G. Existing Theories Concerning Language and Gender

1. Politeness and 'face'

Brown and Levinson have been amongst the leaders of linguistic politeness research for twenty years. Their 1987 study into politeness was concerned with the concept, as adapted from Goffman (1967), of face, the image that a speaker or hearer would like to maintain during the course of an interaction (Goffman 1967, cited in Bloomer, Griffiths & Merrison 2005:

113). Brown and Levinson claim that we acknowledge and show awareness of the face of the people we address when we enter into a social relationship, and believe that politeness is measured by the amount of verbal ‘work’ that goes into an interaction to lessen or eliminate potential threats, or face threatening acts (FTAs), to the face of the hearer Mills (2003:58). There are many ways in which a speaker can avoid FTAs in order to be polite. When a FTA is unavoidable, the speaker can lessen the threat to the hearer by respecting the hearer’s negative face or positive face. The negative face is concerned with the hearer’s need to be independent, free, and not imposed by the speaker, and is catered to by negative politeness. Threats to a hearer’s negative face can include orders, requests, suggestions and warnings, among others (Bloomer et al. 2005:113)

2. Politeness and gender

The relation between language, gender and politeness has been the interests of many sociolinguists. Lakoff (1973) is renowned for her works on language and gender. She called attention to the differences between the speech of men and women. Her claim inspired many scholars to do investigations in this field. Although the term gender refers to a male – female distinction, it is a social concept, discussed in the field of sociolinguistics. According to Segal (2004:3) “gender is taken to refer to a culturally based complex of norms, values and behaviors that a particular culture assigns to one biological sex or another.” Concerning the relation between gender and

politeness, many investigations have been done; amongst them are the works of Lakoff (1975), Brown and Levinson (1987) and Montgomery (1998).

According to Lakoff (1975), women's speech seems more polite than men's. He claimed that men are taught to speak more politely with women than with other men. Women's language style is characterized by the use of elements such as "hedges, tentativeness, tag questions which show indirectness, mitigation and hesitation" and male speech is characterized as "direct, forceful, confident using features such as direct, unmitigated statements and interpretation" (cited in Mills, p.165).

Montgomery (1998) also claimed that both male and female speakers use polite language when speaking to women. On the whole investigations show that females are often marked for using more polite structures than men. These beliefs have been challenged by some researchers. One of the opponents of such research and findings is Sara Mills. Mills (2003) believed that such judgments are just personal assessments. It seems that societies have changed and the relation between men and women is not the same as in the past.

There are women who speak roughly and rudely to men and vice versa. Mills (2003:202) argued that certain practices that are considered to be polite are in fact "stereotypically gendered" and not based on the truth. Many investigations on politeness and gender done on European countries show that women are more polite than men however, politeness strategies are different

in cultures so, it is better to be examined culturally. Every individual in a society is a complex of certain characteristics and experiences and often it is not easy to determine factors of language in behaviors.

Lakoff (1973) was one of the first linguists who has studied politeness and introduced it as one of the important aspect of interactions. According to Lakoff's (1973) theory of politeness, there are two rules of politeness which aim at minimizing conflict in an interaction.

- a. Be clear (based on Grice cooperative maxims)
- b. Be polite (do not impose, give options and make others feel good).

It is claimed that Lakoff's (1973) politeness model has a weak theoretical background. She did not give an explicit definition of politeness. Concerning the relation between politeness and gender, Lakoff (1973) aroused researchers' interests in the issue of language and sex. She called attention to the differences between the speech of men and women. Lakoff (2004) in a book named language and women's place, introduced many characteristics of women's speech including the claim that men are thought to speak more politely with women than with other men. Lakoff (2004) claimed that men's and women's talk is a socialization process. Society makes women to speak the way they do. There are some other theorists (Fraser & Nolen, 1990 Watts, 2003 Mills, 2003) who have introduced a new concept of politeness. Watts (2003) distinguished between what is polite and what is impolite, placing the two terms on a continuum, introducing a new concept named "politic behavior". Politic behavior is a

“linguistic behavior which is perceived to be appropriate to the social constraints of the ongoing interaction” Watts (2003:19). “The appropriate behavior is between polite and impolite behavior and it is called politic behavior” Watts (2003:30). Watts (2003) emphasized the contested nature of politeness norms in traditional models. He claimed that polite behavior differs from one person to the next and from one situation to the next. With regard to the polite behaviors of men and women, Mills (2003) challenged the idea that women are always more polite than men. She argued that although there are situations when women appear to be more polite than men, there are many occasions where women act as impolitely as men. According to Mills (2003), one cannot simply determine which items or strategies are polite or impolite. It is only participants in an interaction who can judge which strategy is polite or impolite.

Montgomery (1998) also believed that both male and female speakers use polite language when speaking to women. However, it is not clear whether or not there are the same in other cultures. The findings of Montgomery (1998) provide evidence for the relationship of politeness and gender in the south of the United States. Brown and Levinson (1987) also developed one of the important and influential theories of politeness. Many studies and investigations about politeness are based on Brown and Levinson’s (1987) model of politeness. The basic concept of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness is that politeness in any culture is established based on a limited number of universal phenomena. They claimed that the application of politeness strategies is

universal and they are not different across languages and cultures. Their claim of universality has received many criticisms; therefore, there is a need to investigate politeness strategies of men and women across different cultures. It is worth mentioning that despite considerable criticism against Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, the theory is still one of the most important and productive model of politeness in research. Geoffrey Leech (1983) introduced a model of politeness based on Grice's cooperative principles. Leech (1983) claimed that his model of politeness is not applicable to all cultures in equal measures. His theory of politeness lacks an explicit definition of politeness. Holmes (1995:5) defined politeness as "a behavior which actively expresses positive concern for others as well as non imposing distancing behavior". According to Holmes (1995) politeness is a distancing and solidarity building practice. Holmes approaches of politeness agrees with Brown and Levinson (1987) notion of face saving act. He believed that women tend to be more polite than men. According to Holmes (1995:6), "women are much more likely than men to express positive politeness or friendliness in the way they use language". In the area of politeness research, the impact of gender on the politeness behaviors of the speakers has attracted a large amount of attention.

Drawing on Brown and Levinson's work, Janet Holmes argues that in general women are more polite than men. Her empirical studies belong to the 'difference' model of women's language within feminist linguistics, influenced by Coates' (1996) and Tannen's (1991) work on co-operative and competitive

strategies. Thus, Holmes asserts that women are more polite than men, as they are more concerned with the affective rather than the referential aspect of utterances since 'politeness is an expression of concern for the feelings of others' Holmes (1995:4). Holmes states that she uses a broad definition of politeness, following Brown and Levinson, so that politeness refers to 'behaviour which actively expresses positive concern for others, as well as non-imposing distancing behaviour' Holmes (1995: 5).

Hang (2009) investigated politeness strategies among the same and the cross gender conversations among Hong Kong young generations. The aim was to find out the effect of gender on the politeness behaviors of men and women. The result showed that the gender of the listener is an important factor on the politeness strategies of the speakers and on the whole, women speak more politely to women than to men.

Hefner (1988) also explored the relation between the status of Javanese women and the politeness and formality of their speeches. The author claimed that speech patterns are related to some socio-structural variables: patterns of socialization, models of appropriate male and female linguistic behavior and men's and women's social rules. Hefner (1988) by considering these variables in the behaviors of Javanese women came to this conclusion that women speak more politely than men as an expression of their secondary status.