

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents theories that related to the research. They consist of Sociolinguistics, Social Factors, Sociolinguistic Aspects of Politeness, Discourse, Contextual Feature and Politeness.

2.1 Sociolinguistics

Language and society have major correlation in Sociolinguistics. Holmes states in Wardhaugh (2006. 11) that “the sociolinguist’s aim is to move towards a theory which provides a motivated account of the way language is used in a community, and of the choices people make when they use language”. It is supported by Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams (2003: 432) that languages have been changed continually yet these changes happen gradually. The languages can be from of one geographic region or in social group then spread slowly to others. In addition, Spolsky (2010: 3) also stated that sociolinguistics is study of the relation between language and society, between language use and social structures which language users live in. It means language and society have relationship in building communication. The way that society communicate will be different in concept and behavior with another place for they have their own social structure in every place. This relates with the Wardhaugh’s statement (Ibid: 10) about language and society that “One is that social structure may either influence or determine linguistic structure and/or behavior”. People may remark someone’s behavior whom they are talking with in particular ways, especially in the same group or place.

Somehow, these conceptual mainstreams of sociolinguistics above are in language and society which can be valued in sociolinguistic aspects. They mean people can determine the social structure on how to give and respond when they communicate each other which are called social factors, such as boss-worker, teacher-student, and parents-children and so on. We are not only able to know when we must stop, talk and give praise to another but also know how to respect the addressee's (listener) face and apologize to her/him. The only way to get good interaction is able to comprehend the situation and class they are talking with, and what the right thing to say or do. The social factors can be known below.

2.2 Social Factors

Social factor is the way how people use the language choice to observe whom they are talking with and where they are interacting. The used language can be known from social class, gender, age. Wardhaugh claims (Ibid: 147) that "to draw such conclusions, we have to be able to correlate the variants in some way to quantifiable factors in society, e.g., social-class membership, gender, age, ethnicity, and so on". That statement is supported by Holmes (2013: 8), he stated that social factors have some relationship. The first relates to language users and participants, the second relates to its uses and the social setting and function of the interaction. He said that the factors can be known "who is talking to whom". It means people must realize the social class in social life, such as husband-wife, boss-worker and teacher-student, in order to be able to filter the appropriate language they will use.

Those factors can cause people to use the politeness in interaction. The inherent purpose will be obtained when they recognize the relationship between

the speakers and listeners because they have different dimension in social life. It is also strengthened by Holmes' own theory in four types of social factors as below:

- a. A *social distance* scale concerned with participant relationships
- b. A *status* scale concerned with participant relationships
- c. A *formality* scale relating to the setting or type of interaction
- d. Two *functional* scales relating to the purposes or topic of interaction

Holmes (2013: 9)

People use one set of forms in some contexts while they will use different forms in others. This is because of different social dimension with listener that can impact the utterance of language choice. For instance, John as student will call *sir/miss* to a stranger while he calls listener's name with his friend in other occasion. From this example, people can evaluate John's situation at the time, he has different a status distance with his interlocutor hence he respects him/her by calling the appropriate expression '*sir/miss*'. Meanwhile, he has the same social status with his friend, so friend's name is more suitable for him rather than *sir/miss*.

It is supported by Yule (1996: 59) that we must look at various factors which relate to social distance and closeness. While Watt, Ide and Ehlich (2005: 4) state that "The social-norm view posits that there are standards of behavior in any society and in any age according to which speaker is deemed to have spoken politely or not". By those theories, people have level distinction in social life which cause the language that they produce. For in society there are many dimensions that will account for social factors in language choice. Therefore, the aspect of social life can influence the politeness in communication.

2.3 Sociolinguistic Aspects of Politeness

Generally, people will communicate the appropriate utterance whom they are talking with. The appropriate language can be different with other place and

ethnic, such as Javanese and Maduranese. Both of them have own social structures in communication. Somehow, people tend to use politeness to achieve the goal of communication. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 74) there are three sociological variables in politeness strategy. They are:

1. the 'social distance' (D) of S and H (a symmetric relation)
2. the relative 'power' (P) of S and H (an asymmetric relation)
3. the absolute 'ranking' (R) of impositions in the particular culture.

It is supported by Meyerhoff's statement (2006: 87)

“We consider how great a **power** difference there is between the speaker and the addressee; we consider how great the **social distance** is between the speaker and the addressee; and we evaluate the **cost of the imposition** (I have modified their terminology very slightly here)”.

From those theories, the researcher reveals that the sociolinguistic aspects of politeness are caused by power, social distance and ranking of imposition. By those aspects People can use both positive and negative politeness in the same time depend on their aim and social life with the listener. The researcher will explain the sociolinguistic aspects of politeness as follow:

2.3.1 Power

Brown and Levinson (1987: 77) said that an asymmetric social dimension of relative power is called power. Their theories are strengthened by Mayerhoff (2006: 87) he says that “We generally put more effort into being polite to people who are in positions of greater social power than we are”. In other hand, Holmes (2013: 281) indicates that one of the sociolinguistic aspects is because of power.

“Women not only use less direct forms of directive, they typically also receive less direct forms in many contexts. Relative power or status and social distance clearly influence the form of directives”

Holmes's statement above emphasizes the politeness of women in social life. The social aspects can be forms of gender, power and social distance. Even

his statement deals with gender, but it still can be correlated with power generally in the end of his statement. It means power has important role in producing the appropriate utterance they communicate. It will give tremendous impact when people don't recognize each status in social life. So that, the politeness will occur when the speaker and listener realize the social status or power each other for they have different social dimension or power in social life.

However, people will tend to use positive or negative politeness whom they are talking with. For instance, a student as speaker will use negative politeness if s/he talks with her/his teacher for the teacher has power than the student. In contrary, if a teacher as speaker tries to communicate with her/his student, the teacher absolutely will utilize the positive politeness. Therefore, power is one of the sociolinguistic aspects on politeness.

2.3.2 Social Distance

Brown and Levinson (1987: 76) tell "social distance is a symmetric social dimension of similarity/difference within which S and H stand for the purpose of this act". This relates with Paltridge's statement (2006:74) that social distance might be considered because of the closeness or distance between speaker and listener. Their statements relate with Mayerhoff's statement (2006: 87)

The social distance between speakers has a tremendous impact on how they speak to each other. We are generally more polite to people who we don't know very well, and we generally feel we can be more abrupt with people who are close friends.

Their theories above deal with politeness that is mostly used because of social distance each other. People utilize positive politeness in their utterances when they recognize the listener well. The positive politeness is used because they see the positive face of listener. They consider that the listener is someone who has

same group with them (speakers) so they use positive politeness as social distance in sociolinguistic aspects. The researcher's argument is supported by Yule (1996: 61) that a person's positive face can be accepted or liked by others to be treated as a member of the same group. It can be emphasized by Watts, Ide and Enlich (2005: 8) that the social distance between the speaker and the hearer, which they further qualify as the degree of familiarity and solidarity they share.

In other hand, people could realize the difference of social distance in social life will obtain the negative politeness in communication. The negative politeness can be evaluate from the distance of speaker and listener. The speaker will use negative politeness for they do not know each other. The listener does not want to disturb by any person. However, the speaker will see the negative face of listener in interaction. According to Yule (*Ibid*: 61) negative face is someone who needs to be independent, have freedom or does not want to impose by others. It is strengthened Mayerhoff (*Ibid*: 85) that "Positive face is the want of every member that their wants be desirable to at least some others".

From those theories can be classified that people can use positive and negative politeness in social distance based on how close or distance they are. So that they will get the aim in their communication.

2.3.3 Ranking of Imposition

This factor refers to ordering of impositions based on what they impinge to the listener. According to Holmes (2013: 285) "In other words, simply the cost of the request (what Brown and Levinson call 'the ranking of the imposition') can influence the kind of politeness strategies which are appropriate". It means it will give enormous impact to the listener based on what the speaker requests. It deals with Brown and Levinson's theory (1987: 77) that "R is a culturally and

situationally defined ranking of impositions by the degree to which they considered to interfere with an agent wants of self-determination or approval (his negative- and positive- face wants)”. This ranking of imposition has been emphasized by Mayerhoff (2006: 88) that politeness strategies can be indicated by the cost of imposition. Different request have different social weight. Mayerhoff names ranking of imposition with cost of imposition, but both of them have the same meaning. The researcher concludes that those theories absolutely deal with the politeness strategies for speaker imposes the listener by a request. The ranking of imposition can be positive and negative politeness based on the request of speaker to the listener.

The small ranking of imposition is asking the provision of time and major imposition is asking money. Mayerhoff (Ibid: 88) explains that

“Asking someone for the time is generally considered a minor imposition. As a consequence, you can ask complete strangers for the time and the politeness strategies we use pay relatively little attention to face wants, e.g., ‘Sorry, do you have the time?’ or even just ‘What’s the time?’ However, asking for money is generally considered a greater imposition, and usually you would only do this with someone you are fairly close to. And the more money you want to request, the better you will probably want to know them”.

It is supported by Watts (2003: 92) that asking the correct time constitutes an imposition and it is one of the conventionally normal ways to make the request. By these theories, the researcher summarizes that someone will use negative politeness to ask the correct time or to ask money for s/he will impose the listener condition and they absolutely do not know each other. The speaker values that the listener is someone who does not want to be imposed or disturbed by him. Therefore, the negative politeness is the way to reach the speaker’s aim.

On the other hand, ranking of imposition will be used by speaker with positive politeness if s/he knows the listener well, even if the speaker asks money as the greater imposition, such as Mayerhoff's statement above. For instance, Jack and John are classmate and they are best friend. Jack ask money to him with positive politeness such as "*John, I need money now. Do you have ten thousand?*" Jack's utterance will be different if he asks money to someone who does not know each other. Somehow, the sociolinguistic aspects that have been explained above will influence the speaker to conduct the politeness strategies. The researcher will explain more in the following section.

2.4 Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is study of language and context which are implied into social life in the world. According to McCarthy (1991: 5) Language and context which is used are concerned in the study of Discourse analysis. Gee (2005: 97) also stated that language absolutely constructs and describes the situation or context in which it is used. It means that discourse analysis focuses on the language that is produced by speaker and listener and the context that consist of spoken or written which is usually used in society. The researcher argues that both language and context have important role in communication. The communication can be form of written or spoken. People who use the language in spoken have different style in written. Concerning with the spoken, the language usage is applied in other act, move, exchange and transaction McCarthy (*ibid*: 22). On the other hand, written relates with grammatical feature and cohesion. Grammatical feature is some sentences when people create it based on the topic and times by using tenses and well-formed utterances. Cohesion is on how to create surface link in the paragraph

between sentence and clause, and between each paragraph in the whole text (McCarthy. Ibid: 25).

From those explanations, the researcher will only focus on spoken, for the data is in the form of conversation between Lomov-Chubukov and Lomov-Natalia. The researcher uses exchange which consist of IRF (initiation, response and follow-up) from Sinclair and Brazil in McCarthy (Ibid: 16) they said that exchange is a communication which consist of initiation, response and follow-up. It means the researcher takes some dialogues which consist of two participants in order that he will know the rhythm of the conversation. By exchange, the researcher will get easier to analyzes the data in Anton Chekhov's The Proposal because a reader will understand the topic and setting in the dialogue. In other hand, the researcher clarifies that the IRF itself will not be analyzed in this data. It is only as instrument to unite some dialogues to be exchange.

2.5 Contextual feature

In this research, the researcher clarifies that contextual feature is some parts or factors that are involved in communication. Based on Hymes in Brown and Yule (1983: 38) that contextual feature has nine parts that are utilized in communication. Those are participants, topic, setting, channel, code, message form, event, key and purpose. In addition, Holmes (2013: 9) said that context or setting can be grouped into following components:

- a. *The participants:*
 - 1) Who is speaking and
 - 2) Who are they speaking to?
- b. *The setting or social context of the interaction:* where are they speaking?
- c. *The topic:* what is being talked about?
- d. *The function:* why are they speaking?

To sum up, people who are the user of language must recognize the participant they are talking with, the social context or setting, topic, function and others in order that they will construct the appropriate language in communication. Yet, in this case the researcher will only need three components to analyze the research. They are the participants, setting, and topic.

2.5.1 Participants

The first contextual feature is participant. Hymes in Brown and Yule (1983: 38) argued that the participants can be form of addressor which means someone who produce the utterance can be speaker or writer. Addressee can be identified as the hearer or reader who is the recipient of the utterance. From those explanation, the researcher clarifies that there are three participants in Anton Chekhov's The Proposal. They are Stepan Stepanovitch Chubukov, Natalya Stepanovna and Ivan Vassilevitch Lomov. And the researcher will only analyze from one participant's utterance named Lomov as the main character.

2.5.2 Topic

According to Hymes in Brown and Yule (Ibid: 38) topic is what is being talked about. It is related with Holmes's statement (2013: 9) above with the same statement. From those theories, topic is a theme in communication. People will select the topic based on the participants want, and it will change with another topic if they need to inform other discussion. For instance. Michel asks metaphor to his teacher while his friend asks global warming to his teacher. From the examples, they have two topics. The first topic is 'metaphor' and the second topic is 'global warming'. This also happens to Lomov as the main participant when he communicates with Chubukov and Natalia.

2.5.3 Setting or Social Context

Hymes in Brown and Yule (Ibid: 38) said that setting is where the event occurs in place and time, and in terms of physical correlation of the interactions with respect, gesture and facial expression. Gee (2011: 6) also states that “we will define “context” this way: Context includes the physical setting in which the communication takes place and everything in it; the bodies, eye gaze, gestures, and movements of those present”. Those theories infer that setting talks about when and where the event occurs. It mean it only relates with the time and place which are supporting with gesture or body movement. For instance, the participant will appoint where the event take place, such as ‘here’ ‘there’ and so on.

2.6 Politeness.

As the researcher explained above, language and society have relation in social life. So people as the user of language must be able to learn and socialize the way how to use appropriate utterances in communication. Based on Holmes (2013: 285) Politeness is something that can contribute to social harmony and avoiding social conflict. Watts (2003: 9) gives addition that

“Politeness is not something we are born with, but something we have to learn and be socialized into, and no generation has been short of teachers and handbooks on etiquette and ‘correct behavior’ to help us acquire polite skill”.

Those are supported by Mayerhoff’s statement (2006: 86) he said that we are going to explore the benefit of distinguishing between the politeness that we use among friends and with people we are less familiar with. It means that the way they communicate will give a great impact to their purpose if they are able to pay attention to the listener. Hence, Politeness is an appropriate utterance of human behavior to the listener to achieve the effective aim in interaction. Somehow,

people should know how to use an accurate language for close friend and stranger. So the aim of communication will still exist in different situation with the politeness. Those theories are emphasized by Watts' statement (2003: 9) that politeness has two concept. The first is politeness1. It is a socio-psychological concept that talks about polite behavior in social rules, such as respecting the old or speaking with the lower voice. The second is politeness2 which relates linguistic and scientific concept. It talks about polite language which has a value within an overall theory of social interaction, such as greeting and good conversation. The researcher only identifies the second politeness from Watts' theories, because politeness2 has the same way with the data which is being analyzed by the researcher. The politeness2 talks about on how the speaker use appropriate language in communication in order the goal of communication can be reached. The speaker will use some politeness strategies in communication because s/he feels that every person has different social factors which consist of power, social distance and rating of imposition. Therefore, people need to know the some politeness strategies in social life so that they will not hurt listener's feeling and get aim communication eventually.

In politeness strategies, Brown and Levinson (1987) propose four types their book. They are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record. Yet the researcher only relates and analyzes the politeness which consists of positive and negative politeness. By positive and negative politeness, these parts talk about how these theories are used in this research. The researcher analyzes the Lomov's utterance as the main character in Anton Chekhov's *The Proposal*. From Lomov's utterances, the researcher will reveal what kind of politeness is used by him toward Chubukov and Natalia. So the data can be proved that politeness

strategies, especially in positive and negative politeness, are very useful for people (especially Lomov in this research) to achieve the goal and information they are talking about.

2.6.1 Positive Politeness

Mayerhoff (2006: 84) stated from Brown and Levinson's theory that "positive politeness is the strategies that avert the insult by highlighting friendliness". It is supported by Brown and Levinson (1987: 101) they state that "Positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants (or the actions/acquisition/values resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable". Those relate with Wardhaugh's statement (2006. 277) that positive politeness leads to achieve solidarity or same group in communication through friendship, compliment and informal language. As like their explanations, positive politeness is constructed when both speaker and listener want to reach the solidarity in communication, or they are in the same group in social life. However the speaker conducts the positive politeness based on the face of listener.

Furthermore, the speaker must recognize the listener's face when s/he communicates with the listener. Face in this case is defined as public self-image or dignity. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) "face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction". It is also emphasized by Yule (1996: 61) that face means the public self-image of a person. It can be emotional and social sense of self that every person recognizes him/her. From their theories, the researcher infers that the speaker is supposed to maintain the face of listener. Face means a confession from other people not to be embarrassed, humiliated or losing face.

When the speaker uses positive politeness, s/he absolutely considers the Positive face of listener. Positive face is a sign that both speaker and listener have the same wants or the same level in social life. Brown and Levinson argue that “positive face is the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” (Ibid: 62). Yule (Ibid: 62) also emphasizes that “positive face is something that needs to be accepted, even liked, by others, to be treated as a member of the same group, and to know that their wants are recognized by others”. From those theories, the researcher underlines that positive politeness can be used when the speaker sees positive face of the listener. The speaker realizes that s/he knows the relationship with the listener as solidarity and has same wants in communication. Somehow, language usage appears the closeness of speaker to the listener for the speaker considers and looks at the listener’s positive face.

2.6.1.1 Face-threatening act

The speaker uses face-threatening act (FTA) to the listener if s/he knows the listener well. According to Yule (Ibid: 61) “a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual’s expectations regarding self-image”. It is strengthened by Paltridge (1988:77) that face-threatening acts are some acts which threaten a person face. But another hand, Brown and Levinson (1987: 70) states that “the FTA doesn’t mean a negative evaluation in general of H’s face”. From those theories, face-threatening act (FTA) means that speaker shows an action (threat) to the listener in communication. A threat is defined as an action that does not hurt listener’s feeling or disturb listener’s condition. It cannot be called negative behavior for listener, such as Brown and Levinson’s statement above. Thereby, the speaker considers that both of speaker and listener have the same group, friend, knowing each other with the same solidarity or same wants, because the threat from

the speaker who has known well to the listener is not the real threat. Therefore s/he cannot be called impolite behavior. On the contrary, it will be serious or real threat if the speaker is not the same level with the listener. For instance, John is Michel's classmate. They are close-friend. He names Michel with bad or silly name, such as mouse, devil or cong (in madurase nick-name). Those names will not be threat for Michel, for he has known John well. Another hand, those will be the real threat for Michel if he is not the same group with John.

By FTA, speaker can filter three appropriate aspects of social life in communication. When the speaker uses positive politeness, s/he surely knows the measurement between them in social factors. The speaker sees the positive face from the listener. It means the speaker feels that s/he has same power with the listener, has closeness with the listener or s/he imposes the listener for s/he has known well. The speaker uses FTA to obtain the aim of conversation for both speaker and listener are the same group. Therefore, the speaker threatens the listener because of some reasons above.

2.6.1.2 Positive Politeness Strategies

In this case, positive politeness strategies indicate speaker's effort to get more intimacy with the listener while delivering the face threatening acts (FTA). There are 3 major types in positive politeness strategies which consists of 15 strategies according to Brown and Levinson's book (1987). The researcher only took the some strategies dealing with the data from Anton Chekov entitled The Proposal. Those strategies will be explained below:

- 1) Claim common ground

It has 8 strategies for action which reduce listener's disappointment in listener positive face. Yet, the researcher only took four strategies in claim common ground. These strategies are:

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

For this strategy, speaker expresses his interest with the intonation or stress to the listener to decrease the listener's disappointment. For example:

‘What a fantastic garden you have’

2. **Strategy 3:** *Intensify interest to H*

Another positive politeness to communicate with listener is to intensify speaker's wants by making good story, then the speaker inserts the parenthetical expression. For example:

‘Last night, my mom invited me to the office, **you know** it was the first time for me to go to my mom's office’

3. **Strategy 5:** *Seek agreement*

In this strategy, speaker finds the possible agreement with listener by repeating a part of listener's utterance. As like in the following dialogue:

‘A : I did not join the meeting last night because I was fired’

‘B : My goodness, fired!’

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

This strategy, the speaker makes the same perception with the listener. So that they have the same assumption in that topic. For example:

‘A : My grand-father hospitalizes, I really love him’

‘B : Yes dear, I know what you feel now’

2) Convey that S and H are cooperators

In this case, both speaker and listener are in a cooperation in relevant activity. They have the same goal in some domain, so that speaker can redress listener's positive face. And this case has 6 strategies in positive politeness. The researcher took three strategies. The strategies can be known as follow:

1. **Strategy 10:** *Offer, promises*

In this strategy, speaker often uses in everyday conversation to the listener. For example:

‘Look, I will visit your home tonight’

2. **Strategy 11:** *Be optimistic*

Showing optimistic is one of the positive politeness in this strategy. For example:

‘Look, I am sure you will not mind if I borrow your book’

3. **Strategy 13:** *Give (or ask for) reasons*

In this strategy, the speaker may give reason or ask reason to the listener in communication, so that both of them have the right way to give or get new information. For example:

‘A : I cannot go to tourism place in Malang tomorrow’

B : Why don't you borrow money to me for your trip?’

From those strategies in positive politeness, the researcher took seven strategies used by Lomov toward Chubukov and Natalia in Anton Chekov's *The Proposal* in positive politeness and those strategies will be analyzed in the chapter 4.

2.6.2 Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is an action that decrease the disturbance of their impositions by respecting the listener. The way to respect the listener is to lessen the possible threat. According to Holmes (2013: 285) “Negative politeness pays people respect and avoid intruding on them”. Such as Wardhaugh says that,

“Negative politeness leads to deference, apologizing, indirectness, and formality in language use: we adopt a variety of strategies so as to avoid any threats to the face others are presenting to us”.
(2006. 277)

Brown and Levinson (1987: 129) also recommend that the addressee’s negative face is one of redressive action in negative politeness; his face to have his freedom of action is not interfered and his attention is unimpeded. From those theories, speaker tends to avoid a threat to the listener in which inserts the appropriate language, apologizing, etc. the reason is because listener as addressee has freedom and action not to be imposed by another.

Since the listener has freedom not to be imposed and unimpeded, so negative politeness absolutely relates with listener’s negative face. It can be proved from Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) that “negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction”. This theory has correlation with Mayerhoff’s statement (2006: 85) “Negative face is the want of every competent adult member of a community that their actions be unimpeded by others”. In addition, Yule (1996: 61) also strengthens that negative face is a listener that needs to be independent, to have freedom of action and not to be unimpeded by others. Those theories can be concluded that listener has right and freedom not to be imposed by speaker. The speaker must utilize the appropriate language in communication in order the listener feels free and nothing disturbance from the

speaker. Therefore, the way speaker respects the listener's negative face is the speaker mostly begins with the apologies, question tag, giving option, passive word and praise or deference, such as the researcher's explanation in negative politeness strategies in the next discussion.

2.6.2.1 Face-saving act

In this case, the negative politeness above is because of the face-saving act (FSA) of speaker. The speaker prefers using FSA when s/he does not know each other or is not in the same group. The researcher defines the FSA is an act or utterance which avoids a potential threat to the listener's face. Speaker has desire to get his/her wants, but s/he has different distance with the listener and s/he looks the listener's negative face as freedom of action or imposition. So that s/he lessens and reduces his/her wants by apologizing or giving option to the listener.

According to Yule (1996: 61) that to face-saving act is saying something that can lessen the possible threat from speaker. It is supported by Brown and Levinson in their book (1987) as follows:

“Face-threatening act are redressed with apologize for interfering or transgressing, with linguistic and non-linguistic deference, with hedges on the illocutionary force of the act, with impersonalizing mechanism (such as passive) that distance S and H from the act, and with other softening mechanism that give the addressee an ‘out’, a face-saving line of escape, permitting him to feel that this response is not coerced”.
(1987: 70)

From Brown and Levinson's theory above, the researcher infers that Face-threatening act can be called face-saving act because it can be used by apologizing in communication and it has the same rate with Yule's theory by lessening the possible threat. It means that when speaker begins with the appropriate language and it does not hurt listener's feeling or impose the listener's freedom by

apologizing or softening the utterance is called face-saving act (FSA) Somehow, by using FSA, speaker mostly concerns the listener's negative face. The speaker uses FSA in negative politeness for s/he has level distinction with the listener. It can be caused by power, social distinction and rating of imposition.

Speaker will use FSA if listener has high social status or power than the speaker, both of them do not recognize each other or the speaker impose the listener while there is no relationship both of them. For instance, the way of speaker minimizes the imposition of asking someone to take out the rubbish by saying things such as 'It would be very kind of you to take out the bin', or 'I know it's a pain, but would you be so kind as to take out the rubbish? In this case, the speaker will indicate negative politeness to lessen the possible threat to the listener and acquire the aim of conversation. Therefore, the speaker considers FSA not to threat or impose the listener. There are many strategies in negative politeness. The researcher will explain them below.

2.6.2.2 Negative Politeness Strategies

In this research, the researcher divided negative politeness strategies from Brown and Levinson (1987). Negative Politeness has 5 types which contain 10 strategies. From those negative politeness strategies, the researcher only picked several strategies that were really appropriate with data in Anton Chekov's *The Proposal*. Somehow, all strategies would not be used by researcher if the strategies were not suitable with the research. Those strategies are;

1) Don't coerce H

This negative politeness gets speaker not to coerce the listener. This type has 3 strategies, but the researcher only took one strategy based on the data.

It is as follow:

1. **Strategy 5: Give deference**

There are two kinds of deference in this strategy. The first is speaker humbles and abases himself or he raise listener. Somehow, both of two kinds will show that listener has higher social status than speaker. For example:

‘would you mind if I talk with honoured Jack for a while,’

2) Communicative S’s want to not impinge on H

In this type, the speaker realizes that his wants to communicate will disturb to the listener. It has 2 strategies, yet the researcher took one strategy in this case as follow:

1. **Strategy 6: Apologize**

By apologizing, speaker’s reluctance can be indicated to impinge on listener’s negative face. There are many kinds of apologizing in this case, but research took one of the example in *Admit the impingement*.

For example:

‘Excuse me, may I ask you something?’

2.7 Review of Previous Research

There were some previous studies related to this research. The researcher took from Hardiyani (2011) said in her thesis entitled “The Analysis of Politeness Strategies Used by The Characters in The Film of Ugly Truth”. She analyzed that sociolinguistic aspects could be also used in bald on record and off record using maxim. Yet, the researcher only employs this research in two politeness which consists of positive and negative politeness

In the other side, the researcher also took from Lila “Politeness through Time and Across Cultures a Sociolinguistic Study” which can interpret that sociolinguistic aspects have many types in politeness strategy. They are social distance, power, socio-economical status and solidarity. In his research, it is very different from this research. The sociolinguistic aspect analyzed by researcher are power, social distance and power.