

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter presents the theoretical framework of the study that consists of the Pragmatics and Speech Act (2.1), Politeness and Politeness Strategies (2.2), and Sentence Types and General Functions (2.3).

#### **2.1 Pragmatics and Speech Act**

##### **2.1.1 Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is the study of language use which offers a complementary perspective on language, providing an insight into the linguistics choices that users make in social situations. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the structure externally, that is how the unit of language used in communication. Leech (1983) defines pragmatics as the study of how utterances have meanings in situations. From his definition, it can be seen that pragmatics is a study, which understands the meanings of utterances by looking at the situation when the utterances happen. Levinson (1983:21) adds that pragmatics is the study of relation between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language (1985:9). Thus, pragmatics includes the relevant context or situation.

The ability to comprehend and to produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic competence (Kasper, 1997) which often includes one's knowledge

about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge explicitly and implicitly.

### **2.1.2 Speech Acts**

One of the topics that discussed in pragmatics is speech acts. According to Searle (1979), a language is performing speech acts such as making request, statements, giving comments, etc. Language will serve its meaning if only there are people who apply the language, and the process must be settled in social context. Parker (1986:14) states that every utterance of speech act constitutes some sort of fact. In general terms, it can usually recognize the type of action performed by a speaker with the utterance. The term speech act describes actions such as requesting, commanding, questioning or informing. A speech act is the action performed by a speaker with an utterance (Yule, 2006 :118). Based on Kreidler (1998:183), there are seven kinds of speech acts that differ in their purposes, they are:

A. Assertive utterances. Assertive utterances is a language that tell what they know or believe; assertive language is concerned with facts. The purpose is to inform and concerned with knowledge and cognition, then deals with data. Assertive utterances are either true or false and they can be verified or falsified. Assertives can be indirect (ex. *Most plastics are made from soy beans*), direct (ex.

*We declare that most plastics are made from soy beans*) which starts with *I* or *we* and assertive verb followed by a full clause). Assertives can also be identified from the verbs such as: *allege, announce, agree, report, remind, predict, protest,* which are independent of time or aspect and are neutral with respect to who is involved in what is reported, and other assertive verb such as *declare, disclose, explain, express, indicate, mention, proclaim, relate, report, affirm, assert, certify, guarantee, swear, attest, bet, claim, contend, maintain, confide, and deny* (Kreidler, 1998: 183).

B. Performative utterances. This speech act brings about the state of affairs they name are called performative: *bids, blessings, firings, baptisms, arrests, marrying, declaring a mistrial*. Performative utterances are valid if spoken by someone whose right to make them is accepted and in circumstances which are accepted as appropriate. The verbs include *bet, declare, baptize, name, nominate, pronounce*. Naturally there are strong limitations on what can be a performative utterance. First, the subject of the sentence must be *I* or *we*. Second, the verb must be in the present tense. And, the speaker must be recognized as having the authority to make the statement and the circumstances must be appropriate. “*I pronounce you man and wife*” and “*I declare this a mistrial*” are valid only if spoken by an appropriate person in socially determined situations. Thus many performatives take place in formal settings and are concerned with official acts. A performative

is neither true nor false but its purpose is to make a part of the world conform to what is said. Blessings and curses are performative utterances to the degree that people accept them as having effect (Kreidler, 1998: 185).

C. Verdictives utterances. Speech acts in which the speaker makes an assessment or judgement about the acts of another, usually the addressee. These include ranking, assessing, appraising, condoning. Verdictive verbs include *accuse*, *charge*, *excuse*, *thank* in the explicit frame. Since these utterances present the speaker's assessment of the addressee's previous action(s) or of what has befallen the addressee, they are retrospective (Kreidler, 1998: 187).

D. Expressive utterances. Expressive utterance springs from the previous actions—or failure to act—of the speaker, or perhaps the present result of those actions or failures. Expressive utterances are thus retrospective and speaker-involved. The most common expressive verbs (in this sense of 'expressive') are: *acknowledge*, *admit*, *confess*, *deny*, *apologize*. Example : *I apologize for having disturbed you* (Kreidler, 1998: 188).

E. Directive utterances. Directive utterance has the pronoun you as actor, whether that word is actually present in the utterance or not. A directive utterance is prospective; one cannot tell other people to do something in the past. Like other

kinds of utterances, a directive utterance presupposes certain conditions in the addressee and in the context of situation. Three kinds of directive utterances can be recognized: commands, requests and suggestions. A command is effective only if the speaker has some degree of control over the actions of the addressee. Request is an expression of what the speaker wants the addressee to do or refrain from doing. Suggestions are the utterances we make to other persons to give our opinions as to what they should or should not do (Kreidler, 1998: 189). For examples :

- 1) Don't waste your time on that. (command)
- 2) We beg you to stay out of the way. (request)
- 3) I advise you to be prompt; I warn you not to be late. (suggestion)

F. Commissive utterances. Speech acts that commit a speaker to a course of action are called commissive utterances. These include promises, pledges, threats and vows. Commissive verbs are illustrated by *agree, ask, offer, refuse, swear, all with following infinitives*. They are prospective and concerned with the speaker's commitment to future action (for example : *I promise to be on time*) (Kreidler, 1998: 192).

G. Phatic utterances. Phatic utterances, is to establish rapport between members of the same society. Phatic language has a less obvious function than the six types

discussed above but it is no less important. Phatic utterances include greetings, farewells, polite formulas such as “*Thank you,*” “*You’re welcome,*” “*Excuse me*” when these are not really verdictive or expressive. They also include all sorts of comments on the weather, asking about one’s health, and whatever is usual, and therefore expected, in a particular society. Stereotyped phrases are common for conveying good wishes to someone starting to eat a meal, beginning a voyage, undertaking a new venture, or celebrating a personal or social holiday (Kreidler, 1998: 194).

## **2.2 Politeness**

According to Yule (1996:60), politeness in an interaction, can then defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face. In this sense, politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distance or closeness. Showing awareness for another person’s face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference.

Brown and Levinson assume that every individual has two types of face, positive and negative. Positive face is defined as the individual’s desire that her/his wants be appreciated and approved of in social interaction, whereas negative face is the desire for freedom of action and freedom from imposition.

A Face-Threatening Act (FTA) is an act which challenges the face wants of an interlocutor. According to Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]), face-threatening

acts may threaten either the speaker's face or the hearer's face, and they may produce either positive face or negative face threat. A distinction can be made between (i) FTAs which threaten positive face and those which threaten negative face, and (ii) FTAs which threaten the hearer's face and FTAs which threaten the speaker's face.

### **2.2.1 Politeness Strategies**

Brown and Levinson in Thomas (1995:169) state that certain speech act is liable to damage or threaten another person's face; such as known as Face Threatening Acts. In order to reduce the FTAs, Brown and Levinson sum up four main types of politeness strategy, namely bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and bald off record.

#### **2.2.1.1 Bald on Record Strategy**

Bald on record strategy do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is most often utilized by the speakers who closely know their audiences are not overriding 'face' concerns, but are rather oriented to 'face', e.g., in instances of greeting, warning, inviting, etc. Thus, it is used when the interlocutors act on the basis of equality and common ground. The prime reason for bald on record usage may be stated simply: in general, whenever S wants to do FTA with maximum efficiency and honesty *more than* he wants to

satisfy H's face, even to any degree. With the bald on record strategy there is a direct possibility that the audience will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy. For example, "I want some beer."

### **2.2.1.2 Positive Politeness Strategy**

The second strategy is positive politeness and this strategy attempts to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is most commonly used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well. Positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants (or the actions/acquisitions/values resulting of them) should be thought of as desirable. Brown and Levinson mention there are 15 strategies in indicating positive politeness, they are :

#### **1. Strategy 1 *Notice, attend to H (her/his interests, wants, needs, goods, etc.).***

In general, this strategy suggests that S should take notice of aspects of hearer's condition (noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, anything which looks as though hearer would want S to notice and approve of it.) Example : You must be hungry. How about some lunch?

#### **2. Strategy 2 *Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H).*** This strategy is

make something seem large, better, worse, etc. it can be done with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodic, as well as with intensifying modifiers. Example : What a fantastic garden you have!



3. **Strategy 3 *Intensify interest to the hearer.*** Another way for speaker to communicate to hearer that he shares some of his wants is to intensify the interest of his own (speaker's) contributions to the conversation, by making a 'good story'. Example: 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 . . .
4. **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. For example: Help me with this book, will you **honey?** (address form).
5. **Strategy 5 *Seek agreement in safe topics.*** Another characteristic way of claiming common ground with hearer is to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with him. The raising of 'safe topics' allows speaker to stress his agreement with hearer and therefore to satisfy hearer's desire to be 'right', or to be corroborated in his opinions. Example: I agree. Right. Manchester United played really badly last night, didn't they?
6. **Strategy 6 *Avoid disagreement.*** A further output of the positive politeness desire to avoid disagreement is the social 'white lie', where S, when confronted with the necessity to state an opinion, wants to lie rather than damage hearer's

positive face. For example: A: Can I borrow your pencil? B: Oh, I left it at home. For this reason, one characteristic device in positive politeness is to hedge these extremes, so as to make one's own opinion safely vague. Example : *I suppose you're sort of right. But look at it like this. Why don't you . . .?*

**7. Strategy 7 Presuppose, raise, assert common ground.**

**Gossip, small talk.** The value of speaker's spending time and effort on being with hearer, as a mark of friendship or interest in him, gives rise to the strategy of redressing an FTA by talking for a while about unrelated topics.

**Personal centre switch.** speaker to hearer. (This is where S speaks as if H were S, or H's knowledge were equal to S's knowledge.) Example : I had a really hard time learning to drive, didn't I.

**8. Strategy 8 Joke.** Joking is basic positive - politeness technique for making hearer feels more comfortable. Example : OK if I tackle those cookies now?

**9. Strategy 9 Assert or presuppose knowledge of and concern for hearer's wants.** One way of 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. Example : **I know you like marshmallows, so I've brought you home a whole box of them.** I wonder if I could ask you for a favour . . . (request/ offer)

**10. Strategy 10 Offer, promise.** Speaker may choose to stress his cooperation in

another way by claiming that whatever hearer wants, speaker also wants. Speaker will help to obtain offers and promise that are the natural outcome of choosing this strategy. Example : I'll take you out to dinner on Saturday

11. **Strategy 11 *Be optimistic.*** Optimistic means expecting the best, confident. Speaker should be optimistic that what speaker has done is good and perfect. Speaker feels confident that speaker will give a good result. Example : I have finished all my work on time, I think I'll get best score for this week.
12. **Strategy 12 *Include both S and H 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 FTAs. Noting that *let's* in English is an inclusive 'we' form, common examples are: "I'm feeling really hungry. **Let's stop for a bite.**" Or it can be "Shall we stop for a bite."
13. **Strategy 13 *Give or ask for reasons.*** Giving reasons is a way of implying 'I can help you' or 'you can help me', and, assuming cooperation, a way of showing what help is needed. Example : Why not stay at our place this evening?
14. **Strategy 14 *Assume or assert reciprocal exchange.*** Reciprocity means principle or practice of give and take of making mutual concession, the granting of privilege in return for similar privileges. Example : if you help me with my maths homework, I'll mow the lawn after school tomorrow.
15. **Strategy 15 *Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation).***

Speaker may satisfy hearer's wants by actually satisfying some of hearer's wants. Example : Don't be sad, I know you've just lost your novel.

### 2.2.1.3 Negative Politeness Strategy

The third strategy is negative politeness, which presumes that the speaker will be imposing on the hearer. The potential for awkwardness is greater than in bald on record strategy and positive politeness strategy. Negative face is the desire to have freedom of action (Watts:2003). Thus, a request without consideration of the hearer's negative face might be uncomfortable, for example "I need \$5" is awkward if five dollars is outside the recipient to the question's financial capabilities. However, if the speaker knows that the hearer wants to maintain his autonomy, adds an out for the listener like "I know you've been kinda strapped for cash, but could I borrow \$5?", the hearer is more likely to give him that money because the request showed a respect for his ability to maintain autonomy. There are 10 strategies of negative politeness, they are:

1. **Strategy 1 *Be conventionally indirect.*** In this strategy a speaker is faced with opposing tensions: the desire to give hearer an 'out' by being indirect, and the desire to go on record. In this case it is solved by the compromise of conventional indirectness, the use of phrases and sentences that have contextually unambiguous meanings which are different from their literal meanings. In this way the utterance goes on record, and the speaker indicates

his desire to have gone off record (to have conveyed the same thing indirectly).

Conventional inaireciness encodes the clash of wants, and so partially achieves them both. Example: Could you tell me the time, please?

2. **Strategy 2 *Question, hedge***. This strategy derives from the want not to presume and the want not to coerce hearer. In the literature, a ‘hedge’ is a particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set; it says of that membership that it is partial, or true only in certain respects, or that it is more true and complete than perhaps might be expected (note that this latter sense is an extension of the colloquial sense of ‘hedge’). For example: A swing is *sort of* a toy.
3. **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. This polite pessimism is often encoded in request, for example: *Perhaps* you’d care to bring this book.
4. **Strategy 4 *Minimize the imposition***. In this strategy, speaker suggest that the imposition is not intrinsically serious. This can be achieved by a number of expressions, all of which attempt to minimize the potential threat to addressee. Example: Could I talk to you *for just a minute*?
5. **Strategy 5 *Give deference***. Deference is often show by the terms of address, which reflect the relative social status of the participant in interaction. Example : (to a police constable) Excuse me, *officer*. I think I might have parked in the

wrong place.

6. **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. There are (at least) four ways to communicate regret or reluctance to do an FTA.

a. **Admit the impingement.** speaker can simply admit that he is impinging on hearer's face, with expressions like: I hope this isn't going to bother you *too* much...

b. **Indicate reluctance.** Secondly, speaker can attempt to show that he is reluctant to impinge on hearer with the use of hedges (discussed above) or by means of expressions such as the following: *I normally wouldn't ask you this, but . . . I'm terribly embarrassed to have to admit. . .*

c. **Give overwhelming reasons.** Thirdly, speaker can claim that he has compelling reasons for doing the FTA (for example, his own incapacity), thereby implying that normally he wouldn't dream of infringing hearer's negative face: I can think of nobody else who could ...

d. **Beg forgiveness.** Finally, speaker may beg hearer's forgiveness, or at least ask for 'acquittal' — that is, that hearer should cancel the debt implicit in the FTA: Excuse me, but . . ., I'm sorry to bother you . . .

7. **Strategy 7 Impersonalize the speaker and the hearer.** This strategy avoid the word "I" and "You". Example :

- 4) A: **That car's parked in a no-parking area.**  
 B: It's mine, officer.  
 A: **Well, it'll have to have a parking ticket.**

**8 Strategy 8** *State the FTA as a general rule.* One way of separating speaker and hearer from the particular impositions in the FTA, and 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. Example : Parking on the double yellow lines is illegal

**9 Strategy 9** *Nominalize.* In English, degrees of negative politeness run hand in hand with degree of nouniness that is formality. Not only subjects and predicates, but also compliments have such degree of nouniness, that is associated with the noun end of the continuum. Example :

- 5) You performed well on the examinations and we were favourably impressed.  
 6) Your performing well on the examinations impressed us favourably.  
 7) Your good performance on the examinations impressed us favourably.

Here (c) seems more formal, more like a business letter than (b), and (b) more than (a). Version (a) seems very much a spoken sentence, (c) very much a written one.

**10 Strategy 10** *Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H.* Speaker can redress an FTA by explicitly claiming his indebtedness to hearer, or by disclaiming any indebtedness of hearer, by means of expressions such as the following, for requests, for example : *I'd be eternally grateful if you*

would ..., and for offers: *I could easily do it for you.*

#### 2.2.1.4 Off Record Strategy

The final politeness strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is the bald off record strategy. This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to being imposing. For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say “Wow, it’s so hot. It makes you really thirsty” insinuating that it would be nice if the hearer would get up and give the speaker a drink. There are 15 strategies of off record strategies, they are :

1. **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. Many cases of truly indirect (off-record) speech acts are accomplished by hints that consist in ‘raising the issue of some desired act A, for instance, by stating motives or reasons for doing A: Examples :
  - 8) It’s cold in here. (c.i. Shut the window)
  - 9) This soup’s a bit bland. (c.i Pass the salt).
2. **Strategy 2 Give association clues.** In a sense, association clues for indirect request are nothing but more remote hints of practical-reasoning premises. What is special about them is that specific knowledge extrinsic to hearer’s desired act is required to decode them. Examples:
  - 10) Are you going to market tomorrow? There’s a market tomorrow, I suppose,



(c.i. Give me a ride there).

11) My house isn't very far away. There's the path that leads to my house. (c.i. Please come visit me.)

**3. Strategy 3 Presuppose.** A third set of clues to speaker's intent is related, in a different way to the Relevance Maxim. An utterance can be almost wholly relevant in context, and yet violate the Relevance Maxim just at the level of its presuppositions. Example : I washed the car again today. (c.i. He presupposed that he has done it before/ last day/ last week.) It may implicate, a criticism

**4. Strategy 4 Understate.** Understatements are one way of generating implicatures by saying less than is required. Typical ways of constructing understatements are to choose a point on a scalar predicate (e.g. tall, good, nice) that is well below the point that actually described the state of affairs or to hedge a higher point which will implicate the (lower) actual state of affairs.

Examples:

12) That house needs a touch of paint. (c.i. A lot of work.)

13) She's some kind of idiot, (c.i. She's an idiot)

**5. Strategy 5 Overstate.** If speaker says *more* than is necessary, thus violating the Quantity Maxim in another way, he may also convey implicatures. He may do this by the inverse of the understatement principle— that is, by exaggerating or choosing a point on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs.

Examples :

14) I tried to call *a hundred times*, but there was never any answer.

15) Why are you *always* smoking?

6. **Strategy 6 Use tautologies.** By uttering a tautology, speaker encourages hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance. It may be an excuse such as *War is war* or *Boys will be boys*.

7. **Strategy 7 Use contradictions.** In this strategy speaker forces hearer to find some implicature that preserves the assumption which is perhaps the most basic principle of language No one could ever learn a language in a society where there was an assumption that no one told the truth. Example: *Well, John is here and he isn't here*.

8. **Strategy 8 Be ironic.** By saying the opposite of what he means, again a violation of Quality, speaker can indirectly convey his intended meaning, if there are clues that his intended meaning is being conveyed indirectly. Such clues may be prosodic (e.g. nasality), kinesic (e.g. a smirk), or simply contextual. Examples:

16) It's not as if I warned you or anything. (c.i. I did, you know)

17) Beautiful weather, isn't it! (to postman drenched in rainstorm)

9. **Strategy 9 Use metaphors.** 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. For example: *Harry's real fish*. (c.i. He swims like a fish.)

- 10. Strategy 10 Use rhetorical question.** This strategy used to ask a 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. Example : *How many times do I have to tell you?* (c.i. Too many.)
- 11 Strategy 11 Be ambiguous.** Purposeful ambiguity may be achieved through metaphor, it is not always clear exactly which of the connotations of a metaphor are intended to be invoked. For example: *John's a pretty sharp cookie.*
- 12 Strategy 12 Be vague.** Speaker may go off record with an FTA by being vague about who the object of the FTA is, or what the offence is — e.g., in criticisms: *Perhaps someone did something naughty*, or in some euphemisms: *I'm going (you-know-where) down for the road for a bit.*
- 13. Strategy 13 Over- generalize.** Rule instantiation may leave the object of the FTA vaguely off record. Such generalized advice may, in context, serve as criticism; but as criticism with the weight of tradition, it is perhaps easier on face than other kinds of rule-stating. Example: *The lawn has got to be mown.* Similarly for the use of proverbs, although their implicatures may be conventionalized to the extent of being on record, for example: *People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones.*
- 14. Strategy 14 Displace H.** 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.

- 15. Strategy 15 Be incomplete, use ellipsis.** Elliptical utterances are legitimated by various conversational contexts—in answers to questions. But they are also warranted in FTAs. By leaving an FTA half undone, speaker can leave the implicature 'hanging in the air', with just as with rhetorical questions. Example : *Well, if one leaves one's tea on the wobbly table ...*

### 2.2.2 Factor Influencing the Use of Politeness

The employment of politeness strategy is influenced by several factors. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:71) there are two factors that influence the speaker to employ politeness strategy: payoff and circumstances.

#### 2.2.2.1 Payoff : a priori considerations

Payoff is a kind of considering priority. It means that speaker ought to consider the advantages that he gets by using each strategy. For instance:

- a. The speaker uses on record, he can get honest and direct answer and also avoids any misunderstanding.
- b. The speaker uses positive politeness, hearer might feel that speaker approves and appreciates him. Speaker could also satisfy the hearer's

positive face.

- c. The speaker uses negative politeness, hearer feels that speaker pays respect and give deference to him. He could also satisfy hearer's negative face.
- d. The speaker uses off record, he might lessen the risk of threatening hearer's face, avoid the responsibility of giving a threat and he does not appear to force hearer.

#### 2.2.2.2 The Circumstances: Sociological variables

According to Brown and Levinson, the circumstances deal with sociological variables including the social distance between speaker and hearer, the relative power of speaker and hearer, and the absolute size of imposition. These variables are used to estimate the weightiness of the FTA given by the speaker.

- a. **Social distance** deals with the frequency of interaction between speaker and hearer. It relates to their closeness that can be seen as the composite of psychologically real factors (status, age, sex, degree of intimacy, etc) which together determine the overall degree of respectfulness within a given speech situation..
- b. **Relative power** deals with the domination of the superior over subordinate. Power value does not always refer to individual, but it also refers to role-sets. E.g. Manager/employee. In addition, ranking of

imposition deals with the degree of interruption given in the FTA.

- c. **Size of imposition**, it is not seen only by relevant factors, but it also seen from status, authority, occupation, ethnic, identity, friendship, and situational factors. Then, in this case, if the distance between speaker and hearer is great or it means that they are not close and the power of hearer over speaker is great and the ranking of imposition is also great, then, the speaker must lessen the imposition. In this case, if speaker gives great imposition over hearer, then, it might threat hearer's face a lot.

### 2.3 Sentence Types and General Functions

The discussion on the sentence types and general functions is necessary in this study as the basis for identifying the forms of politeness expressions. According to Quirk & Greenbaum (1990: 231), sentences may be divided into four major syntactic types and their use mostly corresponds with four different discourse functions, they are :

A. Declaratives. Declaratives are sentences in which a subject is present and precedes the verb. They are primarily associated with statements. A statement represents a major sentence function and is mostly declarative in form. From the linguistic point of view, it is the statement that serves to convey information. It is used to assert or report information (Crystal 1992: 367). For examples:

18) Wallets, £ 199 a month won't leave you spent.

19) Bargain hunters, at just £ 99 per month, this one is a gem.

B. Interrogatives. Interrogatives are typically associated with a discourse function of questions that are used to seek information. Questions can be divided into further subcategories. The basic distinction, according to Quirk & Greenbaum (1990), is the following: “Yes–no questions are those questions that expect affirmation or negation. Wh-questions are those questions that expect a reply from an open range of replies. Alternative questions are those questions that expect as the reply one of two or more options presented in the question. For examples :

20) Yes–no question: Ready for the attention?

21) Wh-questions: What would you go through?

C. Imperatives. Imperatives are sentences that normally have no grammatical subject and whose verb has the base form. Their discourse function is primarily a directive which means that they are mostly used to instruct somebody to do something. Headlines in the form of imperatives, according to the Bovée (1992:296), order us to do something and therefore might seem negative. The following example is a directive without a subject:

22) Enjoy the rush hour.

D. Exclamatives. Exclamatives are sentences which have an initial phrase introduced by what, how. They primarily express exclamations that show the extent to which the speaker is impressed by something. According to Quirk & Greenbaum (1990: 244), “exclamatives as a formal category of sentence are restricted to the type of exclamatory utterance introduced by what or how.” A lot of positively evaluative adjective could be stressed by exclamations. For example:

23) What a fantastic, wonderful, amazing,...car!