**CHAPTER II**

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

* 1. **Language and Community**

 **2.2.1 Language and Communication**.

Language is means of communication among individuals. It is known to be the only aspect that differentiates humankind from animals (Bloomfield in Fikri, 2005:10). It is a system of sounds which is structured and used to communicate people’s feelings, intentions, purposes, etc to the others. It is a special characteristic of human or can also be regarded as one of human criteria, because only human beings speak a language. Nevertheless, the ability to speak a language should be developed in a social group.

Language is an arbitrary sound or sequence of speech sounds used in particular area Carrol as quoted by Ramelan (1992: 10):

“language is an arbitrary of speech sounds or sequence of speech sounds which is used in interpersonal communication by an aggregation of human beings, and which rather exhaustively catalogs things, and events in the human environment.”

Communication is the most basic way to exchange information’s to other people. Communication itself is very essential to society, because we cannot live alone in this world. We need interaction to others, and it could be done by communication. Devito (cited in Setya 1991: 7) mentioned four major purposes of human communication. The first purpose is containing self discovery or personal discovery. In this point, Devito explained that people will learn about himself and others during communication. The second purpose is to establish a close relationship with others. The third is to persuade. Through communication, he believes that people can change other attitude and behavior. The last purpose is to entertain or to play. He included telling story as the example of the purposes.

The relation to this written, language and communication theory will be used to discover the way people in community arrange their pattern of communication regarding to the existing of language variation and speech style in that community.

* + 1. **Communication and Language Variation**

A group of people who live together in a community and speak certain system of language is called language community (Anwar, 1990:31). Commonly, the members of language community use more than one language variation depending on social stratification, social relationship or status level among members of the community. The result of this situation cause someone chose different word or different speech style that refers to the something or situation.

In everyday interaction, people sometime talk about the same things in different way to different people. A few things should be considered before keep talking to the certain people in the real condition. Sometime we need to look at the age or the status in the society of the addressee. Then we can determine the type of communication that we should use such as dialect, speech style etc.

According to Holmes (1992: 12), there are four factors that affect the language choice or variation. The first factor is relationship of the participant in interaction. In this factor the young people will tell his/her feeling differently to his /her friend of the same age and to older people. He will feel more relax when they talk to his friends than to older people. As the result, they will choose appropriate words and the appropriate way to communicate with them. Obviously, they will choose more polite when they speak to older people. The second factor is status of participant in an interaction. The status refers to the person position in society, whether they are upper or middle class, superior or subordinate. This factor will influence the people in using the language. Generally, lower class of people will address the upper class more polite to show the respect. The third is setting and the type of information. This factor applies in formal or non formal communication. In formal setting, the participants use formal language or formal style in addressing one another when they get interaction. For instance, in formal forum a friend use formal language which is grammatically and address his close friend “sir or Mr.” This form is not occurring when both of them involved in informal situation. The last is purpose and the topic of interaction. Purpose and topic of interaction also influence the way of communication. E.g if the purpose of your communication is to ask someone lend you money, you should consider about the hearer negative face.

* 1. **Request**

Request is a type of speech act where the speaker demands from the hearer to perform an act for the benefit of the speaker at the willing of the hearer. This act can be verbal or non-verbal. It belongs to the directive type of speech act (Reiter, 2000). A request is composed of two parts, namely, head act and modifiers. Head act is the main utterance which conveys complete request and can stand by itself without any modifiers in order to convey request. The head act is followed or preceded by modifiers that mitigate the impact of the request on the addressee (Reiter in Azimah and Yahya, 2001)

In addition, Mazarita stated that request is the situation when the speaker wants the hearer to commit to some future action. According to Leech & Svartvik (1975: 147) request is “to ask your hearer whether he is willing or able to do something”. All the same, Van Dijk (2000: 38) proposed that speech acts have to be regulated by some conditions known as appropriateness. As explained by Schiffrin (1994), Searle elaborated these conditions, commonly known as felicity conditions for a request to be valid. First, the propositional content is the future action of the hearer. Second, the preparatory condition is that the Hearer is able to perform the action and that the speaker knows that the hearer is able to perform the action. Third, the sincerity condition is that the Speaker wants the hearer to perform the action. Finally, the essential condition is the attempt to get the hearer to do an action.

Therefore, what he is pointing out is that questions are one specific type of requests. The point is that in order to classify any chunk of speaking discourse as a question, it is necessary to see the particular conditions that are required to obtain valid questions.

However, differences overlap since this form-function correlate is not absolute. As proposed by Blum-Kulka, et al (1989) in her book Cross-Cultural Pragmatic, the formats of request are:

• Attention or Alerter: In general address terms to draw the hearer´s attention e.g. Maria,

• Head Act: the actual request e.g. Can you bring me the car keys?

• Supportive Move: before or after the head act, a phrase that indirectly modifies the illocutionary force of the request, by checking on availability, getting a precommitment from the hearer, a sweetener (expressing exaggerated admiration of the requesters ability to fulfils the request), a disarmer (indicating knowledge of a potential offence), and cost minimizer (indicating contemplation of the imposition of the hearer involved)

The felicity conditions that are applied for requests and the different moves that are required for them to be regarded as valid gives us a clear idea of what a native speaker has to work out before uttering this speech act.

* 1. **Politeness**

According to Brown and Levinson (Mahyuni 1987:29), politeness is one of the most important symbolic values to be socialized in our daily encounters as all cultures value politeness.

Lakof (1990: 39) defines politeness as:

“A system of interpersonal relation design to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange”

It indicates that maintaining a harmonious relation between participants is important during interaction. Lakof points out three maxims of communication, there are: “don’t impose”, “give option”, and make a feel good. By using these rules, will show a politeness in interaction is acceptable to the current phenomena. It different from Grice which is stated four maxims: quantity, quality, relation, manner. In these rule of communication Lakof tend to make a good relationship in interaction by respected other people. Otherwise, Grice maxims tend to reduce misunderstanding in interaction. However, the way people interact each other cannot be based on fixed rule. It will be better to combine all the maxims in communication.

* 1. **Politeness strategies**

In Brown and Levinson’s (1987) terms, requests are face-threatening acts (FTAS) which threaten the hearer’s negative face. According to Brown and Levinson, positive and negative face exists universally in human [culture](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture). In social interactions, face-threatening acts (FTAs) are at times inevitable based on the terms of the conversation. A face threatening act is an act that inherently damages the face of the [addressee](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Addressee) or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other. So those who perform a request need to reduce the level of imposition created by an act being requested in order to save the hearer’s face and, at the same time get their compliance with a request. Most of these acts are verbal, however, they can also be conveyed in the characteristics of speech (such as [tone](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tone_%28linguistics%29), [inflection](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inflection), etc) or in non-verbal forms of [communication](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communication). Here is where the notion of politeness comes into play (Suh, 1999).

Brown and Levinson’s work consists of their fundamental theory concerning the nature of ‘politeness’ and how it functions in interaction. In the theoretical part of their work, Brown and Levinson introduce the notion of ‘face’ in order to illustrate “politeness” in the broad sense. That is to say, all interactants have an interest in maintaining two types of ‘face’ during interaction: ‘positive face’ and ‘negative face’. Brown and Levinson define ‘positive face’ as the positive and consistent image people have of themselves, and their desire for approval. On the other hand, ‘negative face’ is “the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and rights to non distraction” (p. 61).

Utilizing the notion of ‘face’, ‘politeness’ is regarded as having a dual nature: ‘positive’ politeness and “negative” politeness. ‘Positive politeness’ is expressed by satisfying ‘positive face’ in two ways: 1) by indicating similarities amongst interactants; or 2) by expressing an appreciation of the interlocutor’s self-image. ‘Negative politeness’ can be expressed in two ways: 1) by saving the interlocutor’s ‘face’ (either ‘negative’ or ‘positive’) by mitigating face threatening acts such as advice-giving and disapproval; or 2) satisfying ‘negative face’ by indicating respect for the addressee’s right not to be imposed on. In short, ‘politeness’ is expressed not only to minimize FTAs, but also to satisfy the interactants’ face regardless of whether an FTA occurs or not.

Related to the politeness strategy Brown and Levinson sum up human politeness behavior in four strategies, which correspond to these examples: bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record-indirect strategy.

* *The bald on-record strategy.* Bald on-record strategies usually do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer’s face, although there are ways that bald on-record politeness can be used in trying to minimize FTAs implicitly.
* *The positive politeness* Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer’s positive face. They are used to make the hearer feel good about himself, his interests or possessions, and are most usually used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well. In addition to hedging and attempts to avoid conflict, some strategies of positive politeness include statements of friendship, solidarity, compliments, and the following examples from Brown and Levinsonstrategy shows you recognize that your hearer has a desire to be respected.

• Attend to H’s interests, needs, wants

You look sad. Can I do anything?

• Use solidarity in-group identity markers

Heh, mate, can you lend me a dollar?

• Be optimistic

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

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

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

• Offer or promise

If you wash the dishes, I’ll vacuum the floor.

* *The negative politeness strategy* oriented towards the hearer’s negative face and emphasizes 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 awkwardness or embarrassment than in bald on record strategies and positive politeness strategies. Some other examples would be to say, “I don't want to bother you but...” or “I was wondering if...”
* *Off-record indirect strategies* take the prototype of indirect communication. Theoretically, the face-threatening act that is performed must be inferred. You are trying to avoid the direct Face Threatening Act of asking for a beer. Instead you would rather it be offered to you once your hearer sees that you want one.

However, it is not justifiable to choose the most polite strategy, “because that will imply the act which more face threatening than it actually is”( Fasold 1990: 162) therefore speaker must decided which strategy to use. This decision based on variables in degrees of politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) list three 'sociological variables' that speakers employ in choosing the degree of politeness to use and in calculating the amount of threat to their own face:

(i) The social distance of the speaker and hearer (D); for example: with a friend there is not a great social distance, however there is with a stranger.

(ii) The relative 'power' of the speaker over the hearer (P); for example a friend does not hold the same position of power as does a president

(iii) The absolute ranking of impositions in the particular culture (R). for example asking someone to borrow a quarter would not be as great an imposition as asking that person to borrow one hundred dollars.( Brown and Levinson 1987:79) (cited in Longscope.)

**2.7 The role of politeness and face**

Every time a speaker utters a request, he/she is requesting action from the hearer. But depending on their social roles and distance, (among other factors), the request will be different. The cause is that all human begins live in a society and lead social lives, so they try to preserve their (and the hearer´s) identity and respect. This concept is known as Face, defined by Yule (1996: 60) as “the public self-image of a person”; in fact, “the emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize.” The concept of Face forms part of a wider area, the area of Politeness, commonly described as “the means employed to show awareness of another person´s face” (Yule, 1996) cited in Mazarita (2009). Different types of awareness will lead to different types of requests. In general, for the purpose of succeeding, the speaker cooperates in order to maintain face.

According to Brown & Levinson (1987: 58), all people possess positive and negative face, taking for granted that this human being has rationality. The availability to our MP (model person) of a precisely definable mode of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends. In fact, positive face is defined as the necessity to be accepted by at least some others, whereas negative face is described as the desire to be independent, the desire that the action is unimpeded by others.

It is important to clarify that these particular concepts are also culture-specific, and that perhaps the Sasak Society views face differently from the British or American Society. However, there are some areas of common ground between two people initiating a speech act set. As a result, an act that is oriented to the person´s negative face will form part of Negative Politeness. Yet, if the act is concerned with this person´s positive face, that is called Positive Politeness. (Yule, 1996: 62).

According to Brown & Levinson (1987: 129), negative politeness is about minimizing a particular imposition of a face threatening act. Therefore, the speaker applies some strategies to achieve this:

The first choice for the speaker is to be direct and choose to be conventionally indirect.

e.g. Can you pass the sugar?

The second choice for the speaker is to avoid presumptions about the hearer and keeping ritual distance from the hearer. The speaker can opt for a hedge, defined by Brown & Levinson as a “particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set ” like in Pass the sugar, if you can.

A third possibility is to try not to coerce the hearer by being pessimistic (e.g. You couldn’t possibly pass the sugar, could you?) by indicating that the weight of the act is not so big, leaving only distance and power as probable swaying factors (e.g. I just want to ask you if you could pass the sugar) or by giving deference. This is sometimes attained, in many languages, by the use of honorifics, titles or the use of plural pronouns to singular addresses.

The last choice for the speaker is to communicate his own want of not impinging on the hearer. This can be accomplished by the use of four different strategies:

Apologizing:

I know you’re very busy, but could you please pass the sugar?

I’m sorry to bother you, could you please pass the sugar?

Impersonalizing the act: “It appears to me that the coffee needs more sugar.”

Distancing from the hearer by stating the act as a general social rule and by nominalizing the expression is become more removed from the situation.

Offering partial compensation for the face threat: “I´d be eternally grateful if you would pass the sugar”.

A final word needs to be clarified about the role of negative politeness. All the strategies uttered by speakers are influenced by three fctors: Power, Distance and Ranking of Imposition. Whereas social distance is a social dimension of similarity / difference within which speakers and Hearer stand for the purpose of an act; power is the degree to which the hearer can impose his own plans. The third factor, ranking of imposition, refers to the degree to which they are considered to interfere with an agent´s wants of self-determination or support.

As it can be observed, the role of politeness in the performance of speech acts, especially in requests, seems to be an important piece to complete the puzzle of successful communication. The following sections aims at presenting how non-native speakers of English or Sasak speaker deal with these factors.