

**THESIS**

**THE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES  
BETWEEN BRITISH AND BUGINESE BONE:  
A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

Written and Submitted by

**SUNNURAINI**

**F022192005**



**POST GRADUATE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDIES  
FACULTY OF CULTURAL SCIENCES  
HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY  
MAKASSAR**

**2022**

**THE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES  
BETWEEN BRITISH AND BUGINESE BONE:  
A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

**Thesis**

**As a partial fulfillment of the requirements of Magister Degree**

**English Language Studies  
Faculty of Cultural Sciences**

**Written by**

**SUNNURAINI**

**F022192005**

**Post Graduate Program**

**Hasanuddin University**

**Makassar**

**2022**

THESIS

**THE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES BETWEEN  
BRITISH AND BUGINESE BONE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

Written and Submitted by

**SUNNURAINI**

Register Number: F022192005

Has been defended in front of the thesis examination committee

On April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Approved by:

Head of  
The Supervisory Committee



Prof. Dr. Abdul Hakim Yassi, Dipl.  
TESL, M.A

Member of  
The Supervisory Committee



Dra. Nasmilah, M.Hum., Ph.D.

The Head of English Language  
Studies Program



Dr. Harlinah Sahib, M.Hum.



The Dean of Faculty  
Cultural Sciences

Prof. Dr. Akin Duli, M.A.

## A STATEMENT OF THESIS AUTHENTICITY

The undersigned:

Name : Sunnuraini

Register Number : F022192005

Study Program : English Language Studies

Hereby declare that this thesis was the result of my own work. If it is proven that some part of this thesis is the work of others, I am willing to accept any sanctions for my dishonesty.

Makassar, 26<sup>th</sup> January 2022

The Researcher



Sunnuraini

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*Alhamdulillah rabbil' alamin.* All praise to the Almighty and the Most Merciful, Allah *Subhanahuwata'ala*, the God of all mankind, the Creator of the world, the Lord of the universe, Who always give me mercies and blessings in my live, without which I would never have finished this thesis. *Sholawat* and *salam* are devoted to Muhammad *Shallallahu'alaihiwasallam*, the Prophet and the messenger of God, his family, his friends, and all of the people who always follow him.

This thesis is submitted as the final requirement in accomplishing master degree at English Language Study, Hasanuddin University. In arranging this thesis, a lot of people have provided motivation, advice, and support for the writer. In this valuable chance, the writer intended to express the gratitude and appreciation to all of them:

1. The writer would like to deliver her deepest gratitude to her beloved parents, **Mukhlis Tahir** and **Satiya** for all the prayers, motivation, support, love, and care. Special thanks are also dedicated to her brother, **Edhy Parawansyah** and **Jalaluddin** for all the fight, advice, and protection.
2. The highest appreciation to the Dean of Faculty of Cultural Sciences Hasanuddin University, **Prof. Dr. Akin Duli, M.A.** Head of the English Language Studies Department. **Dr. Harlinah Sahib, M.Hum** and all of the lecturers and staffs in English Language Studies Department.

3. The writer expresses her deep appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Abdul Hakim Yassi, Dipl. TESL.MA** and **Dra. Nasmilah, M.Hum.,Ph.D** as the writer's first and second consultant for their priceless help valuable knowledge, time, guidance, and patient, so that the writer could write her thesis.
4. The writer expresses her deep gratitude to **Dr. Harlinah Sahib, M.Hum, Dra. Herawaty, M.Hum., M.A.,Ph.D** and **Dr. Sukmawaty, M.Hum** as the writer's examiners for their valuable comments, suggestions, corrections during examinations as well as their help during the process of this thesis compilation.
5. The writer also deliver the biggest thank to **all lecturers of English Language Study Hasanuddin University** who has given the writer valuable knowledge so that she could write her thesis;
6. The last, the writer also dedicated her special thanks to **all friends in English Language Studies** especially in linguistics major 2019/2 always being together in achieving dreams.

Writing this thesis would have been impossible without their assistance. The writer realize that this thesis is far from being perfect. Thus, any suggestions and criticism related to this thesis are indeed needed to improve this writing.

Makassar, 26<sup>th</sup> January 2022

Sunnuraini

## ABSTRACT

**SUNNURAINI.** *The Analysis of Politeness Strategies between British and Buginese Bone: A Comparative Study* (Supervised by Abdul Hakim Yassi and Nasmilah).

This research aims to investigate the politeness strategies used by British and Buginese Bone in daily interaction, and to find out the difference between British and Buginese Bone in several situations.

The research used the qualitative descriptive approach. English data were obtained through English movies, while Buginese data were obtained through recording and note taking the resident's utterances.

The research result shows that British are using fourth types of politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson. They are Bald on record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness, and Off-record. While, Buginese utterances are using five types of politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson. They are Bald on record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness, Off-record and Do not do FTA. The strategies of bald on-record and positive politeness are mostly applied by British than Buginese Bone. While, the strategies of negative politeness and off-record are applied by both of them almost equally, but in term of apologizing British tends to be explicit while Buginese Bone tends to be more implicit by using rhetorical sentences. Furthermore, Do not do FTA strategy only obtained in the situation of Buginese Bone. It is caused by the difficulty of recognizing the situation when a person chooses to remain silent rather than express his needs.

**Keywords:** Politeness Strategies, Comparative, British, Buginese Bone.

## ABSTRAK

**SUNNURAINI.** *Analisis Strategi Kesopanan antara Orang Inggris dan Orang Bugis Bone: Studi Perbandingan* (Dibimbing oleh Abdul Hakim Yassi dan Nasmilah).

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui strategi kesantunan yang digunakan oleh orang Inggris dan orang Bugis Bone dalam interaksi sehari-hari, dan untuk mengetahui perbedaan antara orang Inggris dan orang Bugis Bone dalam beberapa situasi.

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif. Data bahasa Inggris diperoleh melalui film berbahasa Inggris, sedangkan data bahasa Bugis diperoleh melalui perekaman dan pencatatan ucapan-ucapan penduduk.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa orang Inggris menggunakan keempat jenis strategi kesantunan oleh Brown dan Levinson. Mereka adalah Bald on record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness, dan Off record. Sedangkan tuturan Bugis menggunakan lima jenis strategi kesantunan yang dikemukakan oleh Brown dan Levinson. Mereka adalah Bald on record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness, Off record dan Do not do FTA. Strategi Bald on-record dan Positive politeness lebih banyak diterapkan oleh orang Inggris dari pada orang Bugis Bone. Sementara strategi Negative politeness dan Off-record diterapkan oleh keduanya hampir sama, namun dalam hal meminta maaf Inggris cenderung eksplisit sedangkan Bugis Bone cenderung lebih implisit dengan menggunakan kalimat retorika. Selanjutnya, strategi Do not do FTA hanya didapatkan pada situasi Bugis Bone. Hal ini disebabkan oleh sulitnya mengenali situasi ketika seseorang memilih untuk tetap diam dari pada mengungkapkan kebutuhannya.

**Kata kunci:** Strategi Kesopanan, Komparatif, Inggris, Bugis Bone.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE.....	i
SUBMISSION PAGE.....	ii
APPROVAL SHEET.....	iii
A STATEMENT OF THESIS AUTHENTICITY.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
ABSTRAK.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
<b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION</b>	
A. Background of Research .....	1
B. Identification of Problem .....	4
C. Research Question.....	4
D. Objective of Study .....	5
E. Scope of Problem .....	5
F. Significances of Study.....	5
<b>CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b>	
A. Previous Studies.....	7
B. Theoretical Background.....	9
1. Linguistics.....	9
2. Pragmatics.....	10
3. Politeness.....	11
4. Cultures.....	34

5. British.....	35
6. Buginese Bone.....	36
C. Conceptual Framework.....	38
<b>CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	
A. Type of Research.....	39
B. Form, Context and Source of the Data.....	39
C. Method of Collecting Data.....	40
D. Method of Data Analysis.....	40
<b>CHAPTER IV RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION</b>	
A. Research Finding.....	41
B. Discussion.....	89
<b>CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS</b>	
A. Conclusion.....	139
B. Suggestions.....	141
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>142</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Strategy 1 Bald on Record.....	41
Table 2: Strategy 2 Positive Politeness.....	45
Table 3: Strategy 3 Negative Politeness.....	56
Table 4: Strategy 4 Off-record.....	79
Table 5: Strategy 5 Do not do FTA.....	88

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Background of the study

Language is an orderly sound system created by human agreement. Language functions as a tool of communication used to interact between people and also to convey intentions either orally or in writing. Akwanya (2009:1) stated that language is understood as the property of human kind in two ways, as a possession and as a characteristic feature.

The use of language in communication is a part of pragmatics study. According to Griffiths (2006:6) pragmatics is the study of utterance meaning. While, Yule (1996:4) stated that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by speakers (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Thus, pragmatics is referring to the language meaning in some utterances when people communicated each other which suitability to a particular situation, context and interpretation of users.

One of important aspect of pragmatics competence is politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987:41) stated that politeness is prototypically exhibited in conversation and other kinds of face to face interchange, and so other approaches to discourse analysis, using the different kinds of text (predominantly narrative) have contributed less our theme. 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. There are two kinds of faces, positive face which is the desire of one self-image or personality to be appreciated from others and negative face as the basic claim to the territories, personal preserves or rights to non-distraction. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson in Watts (2003:86) said that the aim of politeness strategy is to minimize Face Threatening act (FTA). Face Threatening act (FTA) is something represented by a speaker as a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self image. On the other hand, Face Saving Act (FSA) is speaker's saying in order to lessen a possible threat or to maintain a good self image. A face saving act which is concerned with the person's positive face will tend to show solidarity, emphasize that both speakers want the same thing and that they have a common goal. Moreover, a face saving act which is oriented to the person's negative face will tend to show deference, emphasize the importance of the other's time or concern, even include an apology for the imposition and interruption.

The knowledge of politeness has an influential role in the social interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987:60) categorized politeness strategy types into: Bald on record (The speaker wants to communicate content directly and to the point without any ambiguity), Positive Politeness (The speaker wants to treating as member of group or friend), Negative Politeness (The people wants to maintain claims of

territory and self determination), Off-record (The speaker wants to treat imposition as so great with do not talk directly and make the ambiguity meaning, and Do not do FTA (The speaker avoids offending hearer at all with this particular FTA and of course the speaker fails to achieve his desired communication). Bald on record and Positive politeness are refer to Positive face while Off-record, Negative face and Do not do FTA are refer to Negative face.

In social interaction politeness strategy and face must takes place. It could be influenced by several things, one of them is culture. As Brown and Levinson (1987:61) said that the contents of face will differ in different culture. Culture is the characteristic and knowledge of a particular group of people, encompassing language, religion, cuisine, social habits, music and arts that can influencing the way when they utter the language. Moreover, it should be different in each place because every place has their own culture. This case also applies to English which distinguishes British, American and Australian in speaking English. Moreover, Indonesia has 34 provinces with several districts in each province. One of them is South Sulawesi which has variety of languages such as, Buginese, Makassarese, Mandarese, and torajanese. In Buginese language, there are also many kinds of it with their own different vocabularies and dialects such as Buginese Bone, Buginese Pinrang, Buginese Pangkep, Buginese Mandar, Buginese Soppeng, Buginese Wajo and so on. Because of many kinds

of both languages, this research comes with case boundaries to be more specific. This research only focuses on two different languages; British English and Buginese Bone language examined based on the theory of Brown and Levinson.

Since the research about politeness is interesting feature to analyze, then it makes the writer in this research very antusiast to do this research entitled *The Analysis of Politeness Strategies between British and Buginese Bone: A Comparative Study*.

## **B. Identification of The Problem**

Based on the background of the study above, the writer investigates the following problems:

1. There are some politeness strategies used by British in daily interaction.
2. There are some politeness strategies used by Buginese Bone in daily interaction.
3. There are several cases that differentiate British and Buginese Bone in daily interaction.

## **C. Research Question**

1. What are the types of politeness strategies used by British in daily interaction?
2. What are the types of politeness strategies used by Buginese Bone in daily interaction?

3. How is the difference between British and Buginese Bone in daily interaction?

#### **D. Objectives of The Study**

1. To investigate the politeness strategies used by British in daily interaction.
2. To investigate the politeness strategies used by Buginese Bone in daily interaction.
3. To find out the difference between British and Buginese Bone in daily interaction.

#### **E. Scope of The Problem**

The study deals with the politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson in British and Buginese Bone especially in Ulaweng sub-district in daily interaction which consist of bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record, do not do FTA. In analyzing both languages, the writer applied comparative study between both languages as they belong to different language families.

#### **F. Significances of Study**

The result of this study will hopefully give valuable contributions, generally to all readers, other writers, lecturers, and especially for students of English Learning Studies in Hasanuddin University of Makassar. The detail targets of contribution are as follows:

1. Theoretically; the research can enrich and serve as an addition reference to other researchers in politeness strategy, especially in the utterances of British and Buginese Bone.
2. Practically; the research findings will help to avoid misunderstanding between interlocutors of British and Buginese Bone in communication because of two different cultures.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter consists of previous study, theoretical background and conceptual framework. The previous study shows a brief explanation of several studies related to linguistics one by other researchers. The theoretical background describes the definition of Linguistics, Pragmatics, Politeness, Cultures, Buginese, and British. Then, conceptual framework shows the concept of the research as the highlight. This study refers to Politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson.

#### **A. Previous Studies**

The writer reviews some of researches that are related to politeness strategies. For completing this research, the writer found out some of references which might be helping this research. Based on this part, the writer would like to present various term and thesis that relative and helpful to this analysis. The previous studies are as follows:

Rezki Fatimah. (2021). The title of her research was *“Ideology and Politeness Strategies used by American People and Buginese with Special Reference to Bone”*. In her study, she focused on identify the ideology and politeness strategies used by American People and Buginese Bone.

The difference between the research above with this research is lies on the object and case. Rezki Fatimah chose American and Buginese Bone as the objects of her research while the writer chose

British and Buginese Bone to investigate. The result of this study is the ideology of expectation can influence the politeness strategies. The American tend to use positive face or direct language although they have an expectation to other people while Buginese Bone tend to use negative face or indirect language in expecting something to the other because they more hierarchy in their life.

Fifi Rahmawati (2017). The title of her research was "*The Face Threatening Act and Politeness Strategy in Different Gender on Beauty and the Beast Movie*". In her research, she focused on Beauty and the Beast movie as an object.

Unlike the previous study above, the writer of this research choose British and Buginese Bone as the object of the research. While, the scope of problem between this research and the previous study is little bit similar. This research investigates the types of politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson in the utterance of British and Buginese Bone. While, the previous study above investigated the FTA and politeness strategy used by the characters on the movie based on their gender.

The result of this research that the characters in the movie used Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Bald on Record and Off record. Gaston as the presentation of man used more Negative face and Belle as the presentation of woman used more Positive Face on her utterance.

## **B. Theoretical Background**

In this section, the writer would explain some definition and theories related to the topic. These theories will be used to guide the writer to expand and enrich the study "*The Analysis of Politeness Strategies between British and Buginese Bone: A Comparative Study*".

The theoretical frameworks are as follows:

### **1. Linguistics**

Language is a system of sound and convey meaning in it. Human language that unique characteristic has been interest throughout history. The field to study about the human language is Linguistics field. As stated by Meyer (2009:2), The study of language is conducted within the field of linguistics. The scientific study of human language is called linguistics (Fromkim, Victoria A et al. 2000:3).

Like any other branch of science, linguistics present with its own structure and component. Like a biologist studying the structure of cells, a linguist studies the structure of language: how speakers create meaning through combinations of sounds, words, and sentences that ultimately result in texts extended stretches of language (Meyer 2009:2). Fasold (2006:9) stated that Linguist approach language in the same way that astronomers approach the study of the universe or that anthropologist approach the study of human cultural systems.

Meyer (2009:2) said that linguistics is multidisciplinary, specialist in many disciplines bring their own expertise to the study of language.

Then, a linguist is a scientist who investigates human language in all its faces, its structure, its use, its history, its place in society (Fromkin et al, 2008:3). Thus, because linguistics is multidisciplinary makes linguist faces many matter of language.

In terms on it, Linguistics knowledge as represented in the speaker's mind is called a grammar. Linguistics theory is concerned with revealing the nature of the mental grammar which represents speakers' knowledge of their language (Fromkin et al, 2000:8). In linguistics, not referring to English only, the term grammatical aspect refers to the possibility of using special grammatical forms to express various meanings which have to do with how the speaker wants to represent the internal temporal structure of a situation (Declerck, 2006:28).

## **2. Pragmatics**

Pragmatics as a field of linguistic inquiry was initiated in the 1930s by Morris, Carnap, and Peirce, for whom syntax addressed the formal relations of signs to one another, semantics the relation of signs to what they denote, and pragmatics the relation of signs to their users and interpreters (Morris 1939 in Horn and Warn, 2006: XI). Pragmatics is the study of linguistic acts and the contexts in which they are performed (Stalnaker 1972:383 in Horn and Warn, 2006: XII). Thus, Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms which lies on the context and interpreters of the users.

Pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the condition of society (Mey, 2001:6). A pragmatic perspective will focus on the social factors that make a certain language use more or less acceptable (Mey, 2001:8). Yule (1996:4) stated that Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Levinson (1983:9) said that pragmatic is the study of just those aspect of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing of grammars. Griffiths (2006:6) also added that pragmatics is the study of utterance meaning.

In other word, pragmatics is referring to the language meaning in some utterances when people communicated each-others which suitability to a particular situation, context, grammar and interpreter.

### **3. Politeness Strategy**

The theory of politeness was established by Brown and Levinson in 1987. Brown and Levinson (1987:17) stated that politeness is how people behave in a way that attempts in considering of the feelings of their addresses. They also introduced the nation of face which is most influential theory on politeness. It contains Face Threatening Acts (FTA) and politeness strategy.

Politeness in an interaction can then be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face (Yule, 1996:60). Furthermore, Brown and Levinson in Watts (2003:86) said that the aim

of politeness strategy is to minimize FTA. Face means the public self-image of a person. It refers to emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize.

Politeness theory is the choices in employing a particular strategy depend upon the social situation in which the speech occurs. These social situations refer to who is the speaker, the hearer, in what situation, what is the relationship and what is the topic.

### **3.1. Concept of face**

Face means respect, self-image in the community. Brown and Levinson say that society is governed by two desires; positive face and negative face.

1. Positive Face refers to personality as well as desires that his own self-image is accepted and respected, even liked by others, to be treated as a member of the same group and to know that his or her wants are shared by others. The person's positive face will tend to show solidarity, emphasize that both speakers want the same thing, and that they have a common goal.
2. Negative Face includes the following aspects; the basic demands of the private property and personal space, need to be independent, right not to be disturbed, freedom of action and freedom from imposition. The person's negative face will tend to show deference, emphasize the importance of the other's time

or concerns, and even include an apology for the imposition or interruption.

### **3.2. Face Threatening Acts and Face Saving Acts**

Furthermore, Brown and Levinson in Watts (2003:86) said that the aim of politeness strategy is to minimize Face Threatening act (FTA). Face Threatening act (FTA) is something represented by a speaker as a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self image. FTA could threaten the face of both positive and negative, as in point (I). Positive FTA: an expression of disapproval, criticism, felt disgust, complaining, accusing, insulting, disagreeing, emotionally abusive, mentioning taboo topics, interrupting and uncooperative, etc. (II) Negative FTA: Command, request, suggest, remind, threaten, warn, offer, promise, express jealousy, admiration, hate, anger, passion, etc.

On the other hand, Face Saving Act (FSA) is speaker's saying in order to lessen a possible threat or to maintain a good self image. A face saving act which is concerned with the person's positive face will tend to show solidarity, emphasize that both speakers want the same thing and that they have a common goal. Moreover, a face saving act which is oriented to the person's negative face will tend to show deference, emphasize the importance of the other's time or concern, even include an apology for the imposition and interruption.

### 3.3. Politeness Strategies by Brown and Levinson

Politeness strategies are used to formulate messages in order to save the hearer's face when face-threatening acts are inevitable or desired. Brown and Levinson (1987: 60) outline politeness strategy types into five: Bald on-record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off-record and Do not do FTA.

#### a. Bald on-record

People can say thing literally or 'on record'. The actor wants to communicate content directly, to the point without any ambiguity. Brown and Levinson (1987:94-101) outline various cases in which one might use the bald on-record strategy, including:

##### 1). Cases of non-minimization of the face threat

##### - Great urgency or desperation

Where maximum efficiency is very important, and this mutually known to both speaker and hearer, no face redress is necessary. In case of great urgency or desperation, redress would actually decrease the communicated urgency (Brown and Levinson: 95-96) such as; *Help!, Watch Out!, Your pants are on fire!*<sup>77</sup>

##### - Use metaphorical urgency

Metaphorical urgency perhaps explains why orders and entreaties (or begging), which have inverted assumptions about the relative status of speaker and hearer, both seem to occur in many language with the same superficial syntax namely imperatives (Brown and Levinson, 1987:96) Such as; *Listen!, Hear me out!, Look the point is this...*

- **Channel noise**

Another motivation of bald on-record FTA is found in cases of channel noise, or where communication difficulties exert pressure to speak with maximum efficiency (Brown and Levinson, 1987:97). Several examples such as;

- Calling across a distance, *Come home right now!* Or talking on the telephone with a bad connection *I need another 1000 dollar.*
- Task-oriented, such as; *Lend me a hand here, Give me the nails.*
- Instruction and recipes, such as; *Open other end, Add three cups of flour and stir vigorously.*
- Non-redress, such as; *Bring me wine, Jeevas* or *In the future you must add the soda after the whisky.*

- **Sympathetic advice or warnings**

In doing FTA, speaker conveys that he does care about hearer (and therefore about hearer's positive face), so that no redress is required. Thus, sympathetic advice or warnings may be baldly on record (Brown and Levinson, 1987:98) such as; *Careful! He's dangerous man / Your slip is showing / Your wig is askew let me fix it for you / Your headlight are on!*

- **Granting permission**

Granting permission for something that hearer has requested may likewise be baldly on record (Brown and Levinson, 1987:98) such as; *Yes, you may go / Take care of yourself / Be good / Have fun / Enjoy.*

## 2). Case of FTA-oriented bald on-record usage

- **Pre-emptively inviting hearer to impinge on speaker's preserve**

For in certain circumstances it is reasonable for speaker to assume that hearer will be especially preoccupied with hearer's potential infringements of speaker's preserve. In these circumstances it is polite, in a broad sense, for speaker to alleviate hearer's anxieties by pre-emptively inviting hearer to impinge on speaker's preserve (Brown and Levinson, 1987:99). There are three areas where one would expect such pre-emptive invitations to occur in all languages.

- Welcoming (or post-greeting), where speaker insists that hearer may impose on his negative face. Such as; *Come in, Sit down.*
- Farewells, where speaker insists that hearer may transgress on his positive face by taking his leave. Such as; *Go.*
- Offers, where speaker insists that hearer may impose on speaker. Such as; *You must have some more cake / Don't bother i'll clean it up / Leave it to me / Wash your hand eat!*

#### **b. Positive Politeness**

It is oriented toward the positive face. Positive politeness is approach based it 'anoints' the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respects, speaker wants hearer's wants (e.g. by treating him as a member of an in group, a friend, a person whose wants and personality traits are known and liked). Brown and Levinson (1987: 101-129) outline various strategies which are indicated positive politeness strategy, including:

**Strategy 1: Notice attend to hearer (his interests, wants, needs, goods)**

Brown and Levinson (1987:103) stated that this output suggests that speaker should take notice of aspects of hearer's condition (noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, anything which

looks as though hearer would want speaker to notice and approve it) such as; *What a beautiful vase this is! / Where did it come from?/ You must so hungry its a long time since breakfast, how about some lunch?*

**Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer)**

This is often done with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodics, as well as with intensifying modifiers (Brown and Levinson, 1987:104) such as; *What a fantastic garden you have! / How absolutely incredible.*

**Strategy 3: Intensify interest to hearer**

Another way for speaker to communicate to hearer that he shares some of his wants is to intensify the interest of his own contributions to the conversation by making a good story (Brown and Levinson, 1987:106) such as; *I come down the stairs and what do you think i see?a huge mess all over the place, the phone's off the hook and clothes are scattered all over...*

**Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers**

By using any of the innumerable ways to convey in group membership, speaker can implicitly claim the common ground

with hearer that is carried by that definition of the group. These include in group usages of address forms, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis (Brown and Levinson, 1987:107) such as; *Mate, buddy, honey, mom, sister, cutie.*

### **Strategy 5: Seek agreement**

Another characteristic way of claiming common ground with hearer is to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with him. (Brown and Levinson, 1987:112) such as;

- Safe topics (*Isn't your new car a beautiful colour!*)
- Repetition (*A: John went to London this week, B: To London!*)

### **Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement**

- Token agreement (*A: can you hear me? B: Barely*)
- Pseudo-agreement (*I'll meet you in front of the theatre just before 8.0, then*)
- White lies (*Yes I do like your new hat!*)
- Hedging opinions (*I really sort of think.../ It's really beautiful in a way*)

### **Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert common ground**

- Gossip/ small talk, point of view operations, flip (*I really had a hard time learning to drive, you know*)
- Presupposition manipulations (*would you like drink?*).

### **Strategy 8: Joke**

Brown and Levinson (1987:124) said that since jokes are based on mutual shared background knowledge and values, jokes may be used to stress that shared background or those shared values. Joking is a basic positive politeness technique for putting hearer at ease. such as; *How about lending me this old heap of junk?*

**Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose speaker's knowledge of and concern for hearer's wants**

One way to indicating that speaker and hearer are cooperators and thus potentially to put pressure on hearer to cooperate with speaker, is to assert or imply knowledge of hearer's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants in with them (Brown and Levinson, 1987:125). Such as; *Look, I know you want the car back by 5.0, so shouldn't i go to town now.*

**Strategy 10: Offer and promise**

In order to redress the potential threat of some FTA, speaker may choose to stress his cooperation with hearer in another way. Offers and promise are the natural outcome of choosing this strategy, even if they are false, they demonstrate speaker's good intentions in satisfying hearer's positive face wants (Brown and Levinson, 1987:125) such as; *I'll drop by sometime next week.*

**Strategy 11: Be optimistic**

Presumptuous or optimistic expression of FTA are one outcome of this strategy. Is for speaker to assume that hearer wants speaker's wants for speaker or (for speaker and hearer) and will help him to obtain them (Brown and Levinson, 1987:126). Such as; *You'll lend me your lawnmower for the weekend, won't you? / I've come to borrow a cup of flour.*

**Strategy 12: Include both speaker and hearer in the activity**

By using an inclusive 'we' form, when speaker really means 'you' or 'me', he can call upon the cooperative assumptions and thereby redress FTA (Brown and Levinson, 1987:127), such as: *Let's have a cookie, then. Or Let's stop for bite.*

**Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reason**

Another aspect of including hearer in the activity is for speaker to give reasons as to why he wants what he wants. By including hearer thus in his practical reasoning and assuming reflexivity. In other words, giving reasons is a way of implying (Brown and Levinson, 1987:128) such as; *Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend? / why don't we go to the seashore!*

**Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity**

The existence of cooperation between speaker and hearer may also be claimed or urged by giving evidence of reciprocal rights

or obligations obtaining between speaker and hearer (Brown and Levinson, 1987:129) such as; *I will do X for you if you do Y for me, or I did X for you last week so you do Y for me this week.*

**Strategy 15: Give gifts to hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)**

Speaker may satisfy hearer's positive face want by actually satisfying some of hearer's wants. Hence we have the classic positive politeness action of gift-giving, not only tangible gifts (which demonstrate that speaker knows some of hearer's wants and wants them to be fulfilled), but human relations want such as those illustrated in many of the outputs considered above - the wants to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, listened to, and so on (Brown and Levinson, 1987:129).

**c. Negative Politeness**

Negative politeness is directed towards the negative face of the hearer, to his/her basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination. It is characterized by self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of hearer's self-image, centring on his want to be unimpeded. Brown and Levinson (1987: 129-211) makes several strategies to show negative politeness which lies in following statements.

**Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect**

As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987:133), in fact, those that have a prepositional content identical with that of the act they indirectly perform may be syntactically marked so that they cannot have their literal meanings or direct illocutionary force. Such transformations sensitive to conveyed meanings include the insertion of sentence-internal *'please'*.

- *Could you please pass the salt?*

- *Are you by any chance able to post this letter for me?*

### **Strategy 2: Question, Hedge**

G. Lakoff (1972:213 in Brown and Levinson, 1987:145) reports R. Lakoff's observation that certain usages convey hedge performatives, that is they modify the force of a speech act.

- *I guess that Harry is coming, won't you open the door?*

R. Lakoff (1972, following Uyeno:1971 in Brown and Levinson, 1987:147) describes how the Japanese particle *ne* suspends the sincerity condition on assertions, the preparatory condition of coerciveness on orders, and the essential condition on questions operations that are syntactically done in English with tags or with expressions like *I wonder*.

- *It was amazing, wasn't it!*

- *I wonder if you know whether John went out.*

Using negative questions and tag questions are great ways to be more diplomatic when giving advice, offering a suggestion,

making a recommendation or expressing opinion. Holmes (1982, p.58) stated that the major function of type of tag question is to reduce the force of utterances which could be interpreted as threatening, critical or in any way disagreeable to the addressee.

### **Strategy 3: Be pessimistic**

This strategy gives redress to hearer's negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of speaker's speech act obtain (Brown and Levinson, 1987:173). Modals also can soften the language and increase the level of formality for politeness or clear signal of formality and politeness changing a sentence or a question. According to Tran (2014:139), different levels of politeness can be achieved through a variety of strategies in spoken communication with the use of syntactic structures or lexical devices such as modality markers (MMs).

- *Could/ would/ might you do x?*

### **Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition**

Brown and Levinson (1987:176) stated that one way to defusing the FTA is to indicate range the intrinsic seriousness of the imposition is not in itself great, leaving only distance and power

as possible weighty factors, so indirectly this may pay hearer deference.

- *I just want to ask you if you could lend me a little/single sit of paper.*
- *I just dropped by for a minute to ask if you...*

### **Strategy 5: Give deference**

Deference phenomena represent perhaps the most conspicuous intrusions of social factors into language structure, in the form of honorifics. By honorifics in an extended sense we understand direct grammatical encodings of relative social status between participants, or between participants and persons or things referred to in the communicative event (Brown and Levinson:1987:179)

- *We look forward very much to dining with you.*

### **Strategy 6: Apologize**

By apologizing for doing an FTA, the speaker can indicate his reluctance to impinge on Hearer's negative face and thereby partially redress that impingement (Brown and Levinson, 1987:187).

- Admit the impingement; *I'm sure you must be very busy, but.../ I know this is bore, but..., / I hope this isn't going to bother you too much.*

- Indicate reluctance; *I normally wouldn't ask you this, but..., / I have to impose, but..., / I don't want to bother you, but...*
- Give overwhelming reasons; *I can't understand a word of this language, do you know where the American Express office is?*
- Beg forgiveness; *Excuse me, but..., / Please forgive me if...*

### **Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H**

One way to indicating that speaker doesn't want to impinge on hearer is to phrase the FTA as if the agent were other than speaker or at least possibly not speaker or hearer alone. This results in a variety of ways of avoiding the pronouns 'I' and 'you' (Brown and Levinson, 1987:190).

- Performatives; *I ask you to do it for me / I tell you that it is so.*
- Imperatives; *You take that out!*
- Impersonal verbs; *It seems to me that.../ It would be desirable for me...*
- Passive and circumstantial voices; *It is regretted that... / it is expected.../ if it is possible...*
- Replacement of the pronouns 'I' and 'you' by indefinites; *One might think/ Someone I know finished the cookies/ Ok, you all let's get on with it.*
- Pluralization of the 'you' and 'I' pronouns; *We cannot accept responsibility/ We regret to inform you.../ We feel obliged to warn you that...*

- Reference term as 'I' avoidance; *But the President should not become involved in any part of this case.*
- Point of view distancing; *I have been wondering whether you could do me a little favor/ I was kind of interested in knowing if...*

### **Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule**

One way of dissociating S and H from the particular imposition in the FTA, and hence a way of communicating that speaker doesn't want to impinge but is merely forced to by circumstances is to state the FTA as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation (Brown and Levinson, 1987:206).

- *Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train.*
- *International regulations require that the fuselage be sprayed with DDT.*

### **Strategy 9: Nominalize**

Nominalizing or converting the subject can make sentence more formal. As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987:207), so as we nominalize the subject, so the sentence gets more formal.

- *You performed well on the examinations and we are favorably impressed.*

Become:

- *Your performing well on the examinations impressed us favorably.*

- *Your good performance on the examinations impressed us favorably.*

**Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebted H**

Speaker can redress an FTA by explicitly claiming his indebtedness to hearer, or by disclaiming any indebtedness of hearer (Brown and Levinson, 1987:210).

- *I'd be eternally grateful if you would...*

- *I'll never be able to repay you if you.*

**d. Off record**

Off-record threat imposition as so great with only raised 'off record', speaker don't talk directly, it only hint and make the communication ambiguous, so that the meaning is to some degree negotiable. Brown and Levinson (1987:211-227) highlight several strategies which pointing off-record.

**Strategy 1: Give hints**

If speaker says something that is not explicitly relevant, he invites hearer to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance (Brown and Levinson, 1987:213)

- *It's cool in here* (Shut the window)

- *I need some more nails to finish up this rabbit hutch* (Buy me some when you go to town).
- *This soup's a bit bland* (Pass the salt)

### **Strategy 2: Give association clues**

A related kind of implication triggered by relevance violations is provided by mentioning something associated with the act required of hearer, either by precedent in speaker hearer's experience or by mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience (Brown and Levinson, 1987:215).

- *Oh God, I've got a headache again.* (They both have an association between speaker having a headache and speaker wanting to borrow hearer's swimsuit in order to swim off his headache)
- *My house isn't very far away* (Please come to visit me)
- *Are you going to market tomorrow? There's market tomorrow I suppose* (Give me a ride there)

### **Strategy 3: Presuppose**

Presuppositions is when speaker presupposes what he has done before and therefore may implicate a criticism (Brown and Levinson, 1987:217)

- *I washed the car again today.*

- *John in the bathtub yet again.*

#### **Strategy 4: Understate**

Understatements are one way of generating implication by saying less than is required. Typical way of constructing understatement are to choose a point that actually describe the state of affairs, or to hedge a higher point which will implicate the lower actual state off affairs (Brown and Levinson, 1987:217-218).

- *A : What do you think of Harry?*
- *B : Nothing wrong with him* (I don't think he's very good)
- *A : How do you like Josephine' new cut?*
- *B : It's Pretty nice* (I don't particularly like it)

#### **Strategy 5: Overstate**

Overstate is if speaker says more than is necessary. He may do this by the inverse of understatement principle that is by exaggerating of choosing a point on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs (Brown and Levinson, 1987:219).

- *There were a million people in the Co-op tonight!* (it could convey an excuse for being late)
- *I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer* (it could convey an apology for not getting in touch)

#### **Strategy 6: Use tautologies**

It is when speaker utter patent and necessary truth. By uttering a tautology, speaker encourages hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance (Brown and Levinson, 1987:220).

- *War is war / Boys will be boys*

### **Strategy 7: Use contradictions**

Contradiction, by stating two things that contradict each other, speaker makes it appear that he cannot be telling the truth. He thus encourages hearer to look for an interpretation that reconciles the two contradictory proposition (Brown and Levinson, 1987:221).

- *A : Are you upset about that?*
- *B : Well I am and I'm not*

### **Strategy 8: Be ironic**

By saying the opposite of what he means, speaker can indirectly convey his intended meaning, if there are clues that his intended meaning is being conveyed indirectly (Brown and Levinson:221).

- *John's real genius.* (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row)
- *Lovely neighborhood, eh?* (in a slum)

### **Strategy 9: Use metaphors**

Metaphors are a further category of Quality violations, for metaphors are literally false. The use of metaphor is perhaps

usually on record, but there is a possibility that exactly which of the connotations of the metaphor speaker intends may be off record (Brown and Levinson, 1987:222).

- *Harry's a real fish.* (He swims/drink like a fish)

### **Strategy 10: Use rhetorical questions**

To ask question with no intention of obtaining an answer is to break a sincerity condition on questions – namely, that speaker wants hearer to provide him with the indicated information (Brown and Levinson, 1987:223).

- *How was i to know...?* (I wasn't)
- *How many times do i have to tell you...?* (Too many)

### **Strategy 11: Be ambiguous**

Purposeful ambiguity may be achieved through metaphor, since it is not always clear exactly which of the connotations of a metaphor are intended to be invoked (Brown and Levinson, 1987:225). Stretching the term ambiguity to include the ambiguity between the literal meaning of an utterance and any of its possible implicatures.

- *John's a pretty smooth cookie.*

### **Strategy 12: Be vague**

Speaker may go off record with FTA by being vague about who the object of the FTA is, or what the offence is in criticisms (Brown and Levinson, 1987:226).

- *I'm going you know where.*

### **Strategy 13: Over-generalize**

Rule intentions may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record (Brown and Levinson. 1987:226).

- *Looks like someone may have had too much to drink.*
- *Mature people sometimes help to do the dishes.*

### **Strategy 14: Displace Hearer**

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

### **Strategy 15: Be incomplete, use ellipsis**

Elliptical utterances are legitimated by various conversational contexts in answers to questions (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 228)

- Well, if one leaves one's tea on the wobbly table....
- Well, I didn't see you....

#### **e. Do not do FTA**

Do not do FTA is happen when speaker avoid offending hearer at all with this particular FTA. Of course the speaker also fails to achieve his desired communication. The speaker only silent and not doing anything to express his wants.

## **4. Cultures**

Oswell (2006:5) stated that culture could refer to the environment in which bees, oysters, fish, silk, or bacteria might emerge and grow, but also to the growing itself, to the tending of the organisms, plants and animals, to their training and to their development. He (2006:5) also stated that culture refers to the close correlation between growth and government, in the sense that a parent governs the upbringing of their child. Thus, Culture is something built and growth in government or environment that people copying generation by generation then become like a habit for all of the people in that place.

According to Matthew (1960:47 in Oswell, 2006:6), the kingdom of God is within you; and culture, like manner, places human perfection in an internal condition, in the growth and predominance of our humanity proper, as distinguished from our animality. While, Williams (1983 in Storey 2012:15-16) suggested three broad definitions. First, culture can be used to refer to a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development. A second, use of the word 'culture' might be suggest 'a particular way of life', whether of people, a period or a group. A third, culture can be used to 'the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity. Then, Storey (2012:16) concluded the William suggested that the first meanings, culture referring to intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic factors, great philosophers, great artists, and great poets. The second meanings culture as particular way of life would allow us to speak of such

practices as the seaside holiday, the celebration of Christmas, and youth subcultures, as example of culture. These are usually referred to as *lived* cultures of practices. The third meaning, culture as signifying practices would allow us to speak of soap opera, pop music, and comics as example of culture. Thus, the meaning of culture is very wide. Culture is about spiritual (connection of human soul with god), intellectual (mind), aesthetic factors (creativity), the way of life (traditions, habits), and art (artistic activity in writing, voice and action)

## **5. British**

Norbury (2015:17) stated that all the peoples of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, including the indigenous English, Scots, Irish, and Welsh, those from former colonies, and many others who have made Britain their adopted country, are called 'British'. In addition to the indigenous cultures, Britain also has what could be called its "Empire" cultures principally from the Indian subcontinent (5.5 percent), together with Africa and the Caribbean (2.9 percent).

The English love nature and creativity, order and harmony, language, wit and dislike pomposity, having long removed themselves from any traditional culture of deference. They are naturally curious, they are tolerant and fair, modest, practical, resilient, and self-sufficient. They also love a good argument, confrontational debate rather than discussion, and cultivate fierce loyalties, epitomized in the tribal

support of local football clubs. They cherish their individuality ('my home is my castle') and celebrate idiosyncrasy, eccentricity, and the arcane (Norbury, 2015: 64-65).

## **6. Buginese**

According to Mattulada (2015), Buginese language becomes a communication tools for all cultural activities. This language used to spread religion, trading, farming, and literature. While, Rahmiati (2015:26) stated that Buginese language is one of the four major language group in South Sulawesi. The three of western of Austronesia languages are Makassarese, Mandarese, and Torajanese. Buginese speakers in South Sulawesi are Bone, Soppeng, Wajo, Sidrap, Barru, Sinjai, and Pare-Pare. While, in other area such as Bulukumba, Pangkep, Maros, they tend to speak both of Buginese and Makassarese.

According to Takko (2012: 28) The Buginese nation has principles of morality which serve as guidelines in their activities. This principle of morality is called 'ade' or habit. This custom contains and teaches the values of honesty, intelligence, decency, determination, effort and self-respect. There are also three concepts of Buginese Culture. They are Sipakatau, Sipakalebbi and Sipakainge. Sipakatau is respect each other or humanize the humans, Sipakalebbi means respect or appreciate each other, and sipakainge means remind each other.

According to Pelras (2006:5), Buginese known as an ethnic that has hard character and very respectability sometimes to maintain their honor, they dispose to do violence. But, behind their hard character, Buginese also known as friendly, respectful and faithful ethnic.

### C. Conceptual Framework

