

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Review of Related Theories

In this section, the writer presents the theories on politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Furthermore, the writer discusses the supporting theory, which is sociological variables that influence politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

2.1.1 Face Saving

As cited in Brown and Levinson (1987), Goffman (1967) mentions that Face is taken from English folk terms, and Goffman (1967) connects the term 'face' to humiliation and embarrassment. Later, Goffman's 'face' term is referring to 'losing face.' Therefore, the face is defined as "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 61). It is also explained that 'face' is vulnerable. Therefore, in order to have an appropriate interaction, people need to pay attention to other people's faces.

There are two faces, negative and positive faces. Every face has different wants. Brown and Levinson (1987) emphasize that It is essential to know the wants of every face. Brown and Levinson (1987) define the wants of the faces as:

Negative face: "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others" (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 62).

Positive face: "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 62).

To simplify, a negative face wants to be free and not to be imposed. Meanwhile, the positive face wants to be accepted by others. In order to avoid face damage, people need a politeness strategy to minimize the Face-Threatening act.

2.1.2 Politeness Strategies

According to Yule (1996, p. 60), politeness can be defined as a way of expressing concern for another person's Face. Therefore, one of several factors that the speaker must consider when communicating is the hearer's or speaker's face. As mentioned by Brown and Levinson (1987), the face is a strongly connected aspect that must be seen in the interaction that can be maintained or managed to lose. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that a face-threatening act is one that relates with the speaker's or the hearer's wants for the speaker's or the hearer's face. To avoid face-threatening acts,

Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest four politeness strategies which are Bald on record strategy, Positive politeness strategy, Negative politeness strategy, and Off-record strategy.

2.1.2.1 Bald on record

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), a bald on record strategy is the one where the speaker is expected to state the speech that he/she wants the hearer to hear directly without considering to avoid the face-threatening acts to the listener's Face. The strategy's main goal is to deliver the main purpose of a conversation without trying to minimize or save the listener's face or self-image. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the reason for using this approach is that the S (speaker) values coherency over satisfying H's (Hearer) face.

2.1.2.2 Positive Politeness

Positive politeness is also a politeness strategy suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987) which focused on the hearer's positive face. Positive politeness is a strategy used to balance the hearer's face by presenting that the wants of the speaker are the same as the wants of the hearer. It is observed in a group of individuals who want to reduce the space between them after expressing a strong desire which the hearer wants to be treated respectfully. Brown and Levinson (1987) mention 15 sub-strategies of positive politeness.

Strategy 1: Notice, attend to H

In this strategy, Brown Levinson (1987) stated that the speaker must take notice of the hearer's actions, such as appearance, possession, and others that are related to the hearer. Compliments can also be used to implement this strategy. The following expression is an example of this strategy.

“What a beautiful vase this is! Where did it come from?” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 103)

In the utterance above, the speaker shows that he or she notices that the hearer has a new vase by saying “What a beautiful vase this is!” Actually, the intention of the speaker is to ask the hearer where did he or she buy it. However, the speaker, at first, chooses to compliment the hearer's new vase to satisfy Hearer's positive-face wants and to minimize the face-threatening act.

Strategy 2: Exaggerate

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), This strategy encourages the speaker to use exaggerated expressions. These exaggerations or empathic utterances might take the shape of

intonation, stress, and other aspects. Exaggerated expressions are employed when the speaker delivers his or her feelings to the hearer by excitement, approval, or sympathy. For example,

“What a fantastic garden you have!” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 104)

The speaker puts exaggerated stress and intonation in the sentence. By saying that expression, the speaker implies that he or she is amazed by H’s beautiful garden. Thus, the H positive face will be satisfied.

Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H

Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 106) stated that another way for S to communicate to H is that he shares some of his wants is to intensify the interest of his own (S’s) contributions to the conversation, by making a good story. However, this strategy is where the speaker shares that he/she has an exact purpose with the hearer by raising the hearer’s interest in the conversation. The speaker can increase the listener’s Interest by leading a topic with an intriguing introduction and a clear explanation. The following example is an example of this strategy.

“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 . . .” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 106)

In the example above, the speaker tries to make the hearer give interest towards the speaker by telling a story. Thus, the speaker has satisfied the hearer’s positive face because the speaker succeeds in making the hearer feel like the participant in that conversation by delivering “What do you think I see?”

Strategy 4: Use in-group Identity Markers

Brown and Levinson (1987) mentioned that this approach causes the speaker to say some phrases that suggest a relationship between him/her and the hearer. These expressions can consist of addressing, in-group language or dialect, jargon, slang, contraction, ellipsis, or contraction. For example,

“Here mate, I was keeping that seat for a friend of mine...” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 108).

The speaker uses the phrase ‘here mate’ as a sign of group identity. He/she considers minimizing the relative power and status difference between the hearer. Thus, the face-threatening act is redressed and the hearer’s positive face is satisfied.

Strategy 5: Seeking Agreement

Brown and Levinson (1987) found that seeking agreement is also classified as a positive politeness strategy since it implies that the speaker is seeking to satisfy the hearer’s want to be

acceptable in his or her view. The speaker may join on safe subjects such as the climate, celebrity gossip, or athletic events. Furthermore, the agreement can be reached by repeating any or all of the speaker's last speech. The following expression is an example of this strategy.

A: "I had a flat tyre on the way home."

B: "Oh God, a flat tyre!" (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 113).

The hearer's positive face is saved by the speaker since he or she delivers an agreement about the flat tyre by repeating the utterance. Repetition is used to stress emotional agreement with the utterance.

Strategy 6: Avoiding Disagreement

As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy suggests that the speaker maintains the hearer's positive-face wants by avoiding confrontation, even if the speaker indeed disagrees with the hearer. The speaker can avoid disagreement by seeming to agree with the hearer (token agreement), lying with the good purpose (white lie), being vague with the view (hedging opinion), or, as is usual in English, delivering the word and as a tendentious indicator.

A: "That's where you live, Florida?"

B: "That's where I was born." (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 114).

The example shows that the speaker disagrees with the hearer but he/she pretends to agree with the hearer. The speaker tries to avoid disagreement by answering the question even though it is a wrong answer. By delivering that statement, the speaker has saved the positive face of the hearer.

Strategy 7: Presuppose/ Raise/ Assert Common Ground

In this strategy, Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that Positive politeness employs an approach of presuming common interests. This strategy can be shown in many ways, including gossip, deixis, and small talk.

"I had a really hard time learning to drive, didn't I." (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 119).

Strategy 8: Joke

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), a joke is intended to indicate the speaker and the hearer have a common attitude and awareness. Moreover, the speaker applies this strategy since a joke is a way of positive politeness that may reduce FTA. For example,

"OK if I tackle those cookies now?" (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 124).

The speaker jokes about if he or she could tackle the cookies now. The intention of the speaker to create such a joke is to minimize the face-threatening act.

Strategy 9: Assert or Presuppose Speaker's Knowledge of and Concern for Hearer's Wants

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that this strategy encourages the speaker to communicate his or her knowledge of the hearer and be more engaged with the listener's needs. By employing the strategy, the hearer will feel that the speaker communicates well with him or her. Consequently, the hearer may believe that they both belong to the same party. For instance,

“I know you can't bear parties, but this one will really be good — do come!” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 125).

The example shows that the speaker pays attention that the hearer cannot bear parties. It can be seen by the statement of the speaker which says that he or she knows that the hearer cannot bear parties. By saying that, the hearer will feel that the speaker knows the hearer well.

Strategy 10: Offering and Promising

As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987), the speaker expresses his or her good intentions to the hearer by delivering or offering something. Since offering an offer or promise is one strategy for fulfilling the needs of the hearer's positive face, this strategy can minimize the potential threat of some FTA.

Strategy 11: Be Optimistic

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), be optimistic strategy leads the speaker to believe that the hearer wants to achieve what the speaker wants to be done, and it causes the hearer to assist the speaker in achieving the goal because they are both interested in the same thing.

“Wait a minute, you haven't brushed your hair” (as the husband goes out of the door) (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 126).

The conversation shows that the wife wants the husband to brush his hair before appearing in public; by expressing this want in terms that assume, H wants it too (even though he may well not care). As a result, Fred's positive-face want has been fulfilled by the speaker.

Strategy 12: Including Both Speaker and Hearer in Activity

In this strategy, Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that the speaker uses the plural term "we" rather than the words "you" or "me." The use of the plural 'we' form indicates that the speaker is

involving the participant in the same activity as the speaker that can be used to fix the FTA. An example of this strategy can be seen in this strategy:

“Let’s have a cookie, then.” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 127).

It is clear that the speaker feels hungry so he/she asks the hearer to stop doing something. Instead of directly asking the hearer to stop for a bite, the speaker uses the inclusive form of ‘we’ (let’s). By using the word ‘let’s’, the speaker can ease the threat which leads the hearer to feel that both of the speaker and hearer belong to the same group.

Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) Reasons

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the strategy happens when the speaker involves the hearer in the conversation by providing reasons to create the hearer's wants, whatever the speaker wants. Usually,

“Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend?”

In that example, the speaker wants the hearer to let him /her stay at the speaker’s cottage for the weekend. In order to reduce the face-threatening act, the speaker gives a suggestion by delivering “why not.” The speaker’s utterance will make the hearer think that there is a good reason to stay at that cottage. As a result, the speaker will stay in the cottage on the weekend.

Strategy 14: Assume/Assert Reciprocity

As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987), This strategy allows the speaker to convey his or her mutual rights by saying, "I will do the same for you if you're doing something for me." By expressing mutual privilege, the author expresses cooperation with individuals, which might lessen the face-threatening act.

Strategy 15: Giving Gifts to Hearer

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), This strategy appears when the speaker can please the listener's positive-face wants by expressing something associated with the listener's want. In the conversation, the speaker may use the positive-politeness acts by giving gifts.

2.1.2.3. Negative Politeness

Negative politeness is the exact opposite of positive politeness, aiming to have the hearer act independently to fulfill the negative-face wants. Generally, the strategy will be employed when there is a

perception of distance and formality between the speaker and the listener. Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest ten sub-strategies for showing negative politeness. The following are the strategies:

Strategy 1: Be Conventionally Indirect

Brown and Levinson (1987) found out that in the strategy the speaker makes an utterance with a clear contextual meaning but contrasts from its literal interpretation. The most typical approach to show this strategy is to use indirect speech acts. By providing indirect speech acts, the utterance is preserved. However, the speaker's aim is to portray his/her desire. For instance

“Can you please pass the salt?” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 133).

The example shows that the speaker delivers an indirect request. Although the speaker asks the hearer whether the hearer can pass the salt or not, the intention of the speaker is not about asking the capability of the hearer in passing the salt. The speaker's real intention is to make the hearer give the salt to the speaker.

Strategy 2: Question, Hedge

Brown and Levinson (1987) clarify that the usage of a hedge can protect the hearer's negative face because a hedge lowers the impact of a speech. An example of this strategy can be seen in this expression:

“A swing is sort of toy.” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 145).

The speaker tries to satisfy the hearer's negative face by reducing the force of imposing him/her by delivering the phrase 'sort of'. Thus, the hearer's negative face will be saved.

Strategy 3: Being Pessimistic

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) in this strategy the speaker attempts to address the listener's negative face by directly having concerns over whether or not the hearer can provide what the speaker desires. This strategy has three primary aspects: the use of the negatives, the use of the tense, and distant markers.

“Could you jump over that five-foot fence?” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 173).

The speaker uses the remote possibly marker. By saying that, the speaker succeeds in redressing the hearer's negative face since the speaker, indirectly, gives an option to the hearer whether the hearer will accept or refuse it.

Strategy 4: Minimizing the Imposition

As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987) the speaker of this strategy can use this strategy by making the imposition's inherent intensity seem lower. This type of strategy is frequently indicated by the words 'only,' 'a little,' and 'a few. An example of this strategy can be seen in the expression below.

“I just dropped by for a minute to ask if you . . .” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 177).

The example shows that the speaker minimizes the imposition by saying “Dropped by” meanwhile the real intention of the speaker is to pay a casual visit.

Strategy 5: Giving Deference

Brown and Levinson (1987) found that this politeness strategy convinces the speaker to employ abbreviations when talking to the hearer. Since showing deference to a person indicates a barrier between both the speaker and the hearer, the usage of honorific language will satisfy the hearer's negative-face needs.

“Yes, sir, I thought perhaps you wouldn't mind and . . .” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 183).

The speaker emphasizes the social distance between him/her and the hearer by delivering the word 'Sir'. The purpose of the speaker is to satisfy the negative-face wants of the speaker. Thus, the face-threatening act will be accepted by the hearer.

Strategy 6: Apologizing

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the Apologizing strategy tells the speaker to apologize to the hearer when there is a threatening act. By using this strategy, the speaker emphasizes his or her refusal to insist on the hearer's negative face and specifically redresses the infringement.

“I don't want to bother you, but...” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 188).

From the example above, Brown and Levinson (1987, p 188) stated that the utterance indicates reluctance as in the following FTA of confession an accidental misdeed.

Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H

In order to make this strategy work, Brown and Levinson (1987) clarify that the speaker must avoid using the words 'I' and 'you' to create a more formal context than usual. This strategy can be shown in some ways, such as the use of impersonal verbs, passive, performatives, imperatives, indefinite to replace the pronouns 'I' and 'you,' into the plural form of 'I' and 'you' pronouns.

“I ask you to do this for me.” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 190).

The example shows that the speaker avoids the use of the pronouns 'I' and 'you' by deleting the subject and the object of the utterance. The purpose of deleting those two elements is to keep the distance between the speaker and the hearer in order to fulfill the negative-face wants of the hearer.

Strategy 8: Stating the Face Threatening Act as a General Rule

As mentioned by Brown and Levinson (1987) in this strategy, the speaker expresses that he or she won't intrude on the hearer's face but that he/she is needed to do so due to the situation. The hearer will assume that the FTA is the consequence of regulation or requirement. As a result, the speaker can avoid the hearer's face damage.

"I am going to spray you with DDT to follow international regulations." (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 206).

The speaker shows that he/she, actually, does not want to intrude on the hearer but he/she has to do it because of the general rule. The general rule of that utterance is signaled by the statement "to follow international regulations."

Strategy 9: Nominalizing

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that in nominalization an adjective, verb, or adverb transforms into a noun. The strategy requires the speaker to nominalize the utterance to make the statement seem more formal, allowing the speaker to meet the hearer's negative-face wants.

"You performed well on the examinations and we were favorably impressed." (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 207)

The speaker succeeds in making the utterance sound formal since the speaker uses the noun phrase 'good performance' as the subject. By nominalizing, the speaker also succeeds in keeping the distance between him/her and the hearer. Thus, those acts lead the speaker fulfill the hearer's negative-face want.

Strategy 10: Go on Record as Incurring a Debt, or as not Indebting H

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), This strategy happens when the speaker reduces the imposition by giving the hearer credit for agreeing to do something to the speaker's advantage. The example of this strategy can be seen in the following expressions:

"I'd be eternally grateful if you would..." (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 210)

In the example above, the speaker shows his/her debt to the hearer by saying “I’d be really grateful.” By saying that expression, the speaker succeeds in saving the hearer’s negative face since the hearer will feel that the speaker has a debt if the hearer agrees to do what the speaker wants.

2.1.2.4 Off-Record

One of the four main politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson's (1987) is off-record. This happens when the speaker does an indirect face-threatening act. This means the off-record strategy is employed in direct language and intends to allow the speaker to pick expressions while avoiding responsibility for taking action or what is meant. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), Off Record consist of 15 strategies as follow:

Strategy 1: Give Hints

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy happens when the speaker says something that is not explicitly relevant. S invites H to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance. For example,

This soup’s a bit bland. (c.i Pass the salt) (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 215).

Strategy 2: Give Association Clues

Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that this strategy triggered when the speaker mentions something associated with the act required of the hearer. For instance, as follows,

Are you going to market tomorrow? . . . There’s a market tomorrow, I suppose, (c.i. Give me a ride there) (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 216).

Strategy 3: Presuppose

This strategy happens when the speaker makes the listener search for the presupposed former event by implicating something. An example of this strategy can be found below.

“I washed the car again today.” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 217)

The speaker here presupposes that he has done it before and therefore may implicate a criticism by using “again”.

Strategy 4: Understate

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy happens when the speaker is saying less than what is required. The example can be seen in the expression below.

A: What do you think of Harry?

B: Nothing wrong with him. (c.i. I don't think he's very good)

(Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 218).

Strategy 5: Overstate

On the other hand, this strategy is the opposite of the previous strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that this strategy is done when the speaker exaggerates or chooses a point on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs. For example, "I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer" (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 219).

Strategy 6: Use Tautologies

As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy occurs when the speaker encourages the hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance. The example of this strategy can be seen below.

"Boys will be boys." (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 216).

Strategy 7: Use Contradictions

Brown and Levinson (1987) found out that this strategy is done by stating two things that contradict each other. This happens when the speaker stresses that he/she cannot tell the truth, thus, encourages the hearer to look for an interpretation from two contradicting propositions. The example of this strategy as follows:

"Well, John is here and he isn't here." (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 221).

Strategy 8: Be Ironic

Brown and Levinson (1987) clarify that this strategy appears when the speaker incidentally conveys his/her intended meaning by saying the opposite of what he/she means.

"John's a real genius," (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row) (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 222).

Strategy 9: Use Metaphor

This strategy is triggered when the speaker uses metaphors and makes the hearer interpret his/her intended meaning by his/herself. The expression below is the example of this strategy.

“Harry’s a real fish. (c.i He drinks/swims/is slimy/ is cold-blooded like a fish) (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 222).

Strategy 10: Use Rhetorical

As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy occurs when the speaker wants the hearer to provide him/her the indicated information with no intention of obtaining an answer. For instance, excuses like the expression below.

“How was I to know . . .?” (c.i. I wasn’t) (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 223).

Strategy 11: Be Ambiguous

For this strategy, Brown and Levinson (1987) describe that the speaker achieves purposeful ambiguity through metaphor and allows the hearer to guess what the speaker means. The expression below can be considered as an example of this strategy.

“John’s pretty {sharp or smooth} cookie.” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 225).

Strategy 12: Be Vague

Brown and Levinson (1987) said that in this strategy the speaker may go off record with an FTA by being vague about the object of the FTA, or what the offense is. for example,

“Looks like someone may have had too much to drink,” (vague understatement) (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 226).

Strategy 13: Over-Generalize

The speaker completing the rule instantiation may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record. The examples of this strategy are mentioned below.

“The lawn has got to be mown”

“If that door is shut completely, it sticks.” (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 226).

Strategy 14: Displace H

(Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 226) explain that in this strategy “the 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.”

Strategy 15: Be Incomplete, Use Ellipsis

In this strategy, Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that the speaker purposefully does not finish his utterance and leaves FTA undone, thus leaving the implicature ‘hanging in the air’, just as with rhetorical question. The expression is the example when this strategy is applied.

“Well, I didn’t see you . . . “(Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 227).

Table 2.1 The Summary of Brown and Levinson (1987) Politeness Theory by The Writer.

Type of Politeness Strategy	Explanation
Bald on Record	This strategy occurs where the speaker speaks to the hearer directly that he/she wants something without considering lowering the threats to the listener's Face.
Positive Politeness	The strategy used to stabilize the hearer's face by presenting the needs of the speaker is identical to the needs of the hearer.
Negative Politeness	This Strategy's purpose is to have the hearer independently act avoiding the attention. Generally, this approach is employed when there is a perception of distance and formality towards the speaker and the hearer.
Off-Record	The off-record strategy employs indirect language and intends to allow the speaker to pick expressions while avoiding responsibility for taking action or what is meant.

The theories stated by Brown and Levinson (1987) above are essential and very helpful for the writer since the writer is focusing the study to analyze and to explain the politeness strategies used by Bagas as the main character of the *Pakai Hati* web series.

2.2 Review of Related Studies

With the purpose of supporting the writer's study, two related studies about the use of politeness strategies found in movies are presented. Both of the studies were conducted by Nadia Probosini (2020) and Yulianita (2006).

2.2.1 Politeness Strategies in the Main Characters of *The Devil Wears Prada* Movie (Probosini, 2020)

Probosini's study focused on utterances from *The Devil Wears Prada* movie, which was released in 2006. She then transcribed the data from the movie. Probosini analyzed the utterances taken from 12 scenes in the movie.

Throughout the study, Probosini found out that most of the characters in the movie used positive politeness strategies. Probosini also found out that the closeness of a relationship between two people or more influenced the use of politeness strategies. It would be less polite if the relationship is very close.

The similarity of both studies is that both studies seek to find out the types of Politeness strategies used in the utterances between employers to the employee. Both writers used the same theory of face by Brown and Levinson (1987), and both writers used movies for the study. Meanwhile, Probosini's study is different from this present study.

From Probosini's research, the writer learns that positive politeness strategies are found to be the most frequent in this film. It showed that the main characters of the movie preferred to employ positive politeness to express respect so they had a comfortable working situation.

2.2.2 The Politeness Strategies Relating to role relationship and gender used between the employer and the worker of *Jaya Melati* Store (Yulianita, 2006)

Conducted at *Jaya Melati* Store, Yulianita's study presents a thorough investigation on the type of politeness strategies related to role relationship and gender are used by employers and the *Jaya Melati* store worker. It was carried out to discover the different classification of politeness strategies when the male and female workers talk to the employer and vice versa.

In collecting the data, Yulianita used a tape recorder to record the utterances of the conversation between the employer and the employees. She then transcribed the data. The duration of collecting the data was four days.

Throughout the study, Yulianita found out that the employer mostly used Bald on record, Off-record, and Positive politeness while talking to the workers, while the male workers used off-record

in talking to the employer. Nevertheless, the female worker of the store used negative and positive politeness while talking to the employer.

The writer found out the similarity to the writer's study is that both studies discover the usage of Politeness strategies types in the utterances between employers to the male and female workers. Both writers use the same theory of politeness by Brown and Levinson (1987). But, the object of Yulianita's study is particularly different from this present writer. The present writer uses utterances from a TV Series. Whereas, Yulianita used utterances taken from authentic interactions between people in a store.

What the writer discovered from Yulianita's research is the boss repeatedly used the term bald on record when speaking with the fellow worker. The employer, on the other hand, mostly spoke to the staff member off the record.