Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. Introduction

Over the last three decades there has seen a significant increase in research on politeness strategies from both the social and linguistic aspects. This is proven from the number of papers that have appeared on the subject in international journals and monographs. Politeness strategies are not only used in oral communication, but also in written communication-this is inclusive of articles in journals. This study focuses on the politeness strategies used in economic journal articles, using the discourse analysis approach .

In this chapter, the first section starts out with the explanation of discourse and discourse analysis as an approach. Then, it moves on to the discussion of politeness theory which covers the concept of politeness and politeness strategies itself, the discourse in economic articles and finally, the author-audiences relationship in texts that are deemed useful in studying politeness in written texts.

2.1   Discourse

The term 'discourse' is a complex and mammoth-like interpretation. Many previous studies mention the term discourse as very ambiguous since its introduction to modern science and the various broad interpretations of discourse. Here, discourse refers to the "linguistics of language use as a way of understanding interactions in a social context, specifically the analysis of occurring connected speech or written discourse", Dakowska (2001:4).

This present study only sees discourse as a subject of study in a particular community, namely, the academic community, who share the same speech conventions and how statements are used and considered acceptable by that community.

Moreover, the term of discourse has been used interchangeably in two separate contexts; *spoken discourse* and *written discourse*. In section 2.2.1, a brief overview of written discourse will be explained in detail.

2.2   Discourse Analysis

Frohmann (1994:9) postulates that discourse analysis is "basically an interpretative and deconstructing reading exercise with no specific guidelines or definitions to follow. One could, however, make use of the theories from Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva, or Fredric Jameson as well as of other critical and post-modern thinkers. Therefore, discourse analysis can be applied to any text, problem or situation". Moreover, Frohmann (1994) also mentions that:

> "Discourse analysis is a way of approaching and thinking about a problem. Although, discourse analysis does not provide a tangible answer to problems based on scientific research, but it enables us to understand the conditions behind a specific problem and make us realize that the essence of that problem, and its resolution".

Frohmann (1994:7)

Many prominent scholars in the past proposed their definition or theory on discourse analysis. However, this study will use the definition proposed by Carter (1993), who defines discourse analysis as "a way of examining the use of language functions in different speech communities and to discover patterns either in spoken or written forms as well as their correlation with the societies". This is in line with Cook's (1994:3) view

who mentions that "discourse analysis involves the analysis to recognize and identify linguistic patterns of various genres as well as the interrelationships among social relations, social identities and contexts of specific language use".

2.2.1 Written Discourse Analysis

McCarthy (1991:170) states that written discourse analysis "is a fundamentally different way of looking at language and by using it one can learn to regularly recognise the overall structure of a text".

As mentioned by Goldman (1997), the primary goal analysing written texts is "to describe its structure and content". Further, "a discourse analysis of written text provides a method for describing the written texts systematically. Additionally, the concerns in analysing written discourse is not just to look at individual words alone but also the relationship between the given words or phrases within a sentence or paragraph" (McCarthy,1991:12).

Therefore, as a conclusions written discourse analysis could be seen as a method for describing the ideas and the relations among the ideas that are present in the text. "The method draws on work in a variety of disciplines, including rhetoric, text linguistics, and psychology. The approach provides ways to describe and analyze how the structure and content of the text encodes ideas and the relation among the ideas itself."

2.2.2 Types of Texts

Goldman and Wiley (1997:3) mentioned that "there are a number of written text types differentiated by their purpose or function as well as their structure or form". Further,

in general all texts have certain features. For instance, written text is indented to convey meaning and information.

Halliday (1994:311) mentioned that "text is a form of speech or writing, listening or reading. When we analyse it, we analyse the product of this process, and the term 'text' is usually taken as referring to the product". Thus, journal articles that form the corpus of this study is the written product to be analysed of it politeness strategies.

2.2.3 Application of Written Discourse Analysis in Journals

Frohmann (1994) argue that "discourse analysis is basically interpretative and deconstructing reading. In line with that argument, McCarthy (1991), also says that:

> "reading is an exacting task which involves recipients' knowledge of the world, experience, ability to infer possible aims of discourse and evaluate the reception of the text. Through reading activity, the reader or researcher could make an interpretation or analysis of the text."

McCarthy (1991:3)

Moreover, according to Goldman (1997), it is important to underline that clear understanding of writing is "believed not only what the writer puts in it but also on what the audience brings to this process while the primary goal of the analysis of any written text is to try to describe *structure* and *content*".

Based on the explanation above, this study sees written discourse analysis of journal articles as a method for systematically describing the ideas and the relations among the ideas that readers read as well as what writers write. The method draws on work in a number of disciplines, such as rhetoric, text linguist and psychology. These disciplines

provide ways to describe and analyze how the structure and content of the texts encode ideas and the relations among ideas.

2.2.4 The Discourse of Economics

Since the early 1980s, "the discussion of various controversial issues in the economics discourse community has led to increasing debate among concerned economists about the ways that they communicate with each other, as well as with non-economists. This debate has been vigorous, and has also influenced the direction and nature of the research into economics discourse by linguists". Economists' assessments of their own discourse has contributed to a growing awareness by many that the ways they communicate their ideas in economics do not accurately correspond to the ways they actually 'do' economics (Gal, 1989).

McCloskey in his book "rhetoric of economics" asserts that:

> "economists have two attitudes to their discourse, termed the "official and unofficial, the explicit and implicit." The official explicit attitude (rhetoric) reflects a scientific methodology which is "modernist", that is, a modernism which consists of "an amalgam of logical positivism, behaviourism, operational, and the hypothetic-deductive model of science".

<div align="right">McCloskey (1986:8-9)</div>

McCloskey (1986) He then argues and believes that "the rhetoric of economics should be examined by those economists who use it and suggests that the quality of their argument would be at a more sophisticated level if they were more aware of the grounds on which they were arguing". This is because they claim to be arguing on grounds of certain limited matters of statistical inference and on grounds of positive economics.

Besides McCloskey other economists have also been actively examining aspects of economic discourse. Henderson (1986), for example, offers a seemingly parallel but unconnected examination of the various ways that metaphor in economics can be investigated. He states that "they are very common both in economics as a science, and in discussions involving economic policy".

Other researchers who have touched on, but not focused specifically on visual information in economics discourse are Mauranen (1993), Tadros (1985), Allen and Pholsward (1988) and Cameron (1991). Furthermore, what McCloskey and Henderson and some economists have done provide economists with current views of their own discourse. Moreover, concerning the nature of economics writing, most of these scholars above shared similar view that economists, along with other academic writers, use linguistic and rhetorical devices in order to persuade readers of their point of view and that there is an intellectual hesitancy to see the use of such devices as acceptable within the conventions of the scientific methods.

2.3   The Politeness Theory

The concept of politeness in this present study is mostly based on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1978, 1987), "this theory of politeness comprises three basic notions; face, face threatening acts (henceforth FTA), and politeness strategies. Starting from the assumptions that people from all over the world are endowed with *face,* that is to say, with *public image* which needs to be preserved, further, Brown and Levinson go on to notice that certain actions that need to be performed in our everyday interaction may threaten our interlocutors' face (i.e. FTAs). Finally, in order to counteract the undesirable effects of FTAs, humans have developed politeness strategies which are just ways of performing such acts in a redressive or mitigated manner so that the threat to

hearer's face is minimized." With evidence from three different languages namely; English, Tzeltal, and Tamil, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1978) support their findings on politeness and, most importantly, the universality of the face concepts.

The following sub-sections cover "the concept of politeness and the claims for universality on the one hand, and diverse criticism or modification of one of the elements of the model on the other; mainly the concepts of face, face-threatening act, and the factors that determine the production and interpretation of politeness."

2.3.1 Face

Brown and Levinson said that they have derived the notion of face from Goffman (1963) in social interaction.

> "Our notion of 'face' is derived from that of Goffman and from the English folk term, which ties up face notions of being embarrassed or humiliated, or 'losing face'. Thus face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction. In general, people cooperate (and assume each other's cooperation) in maintaining face in interaction, such cooperation being based on the mutual vulnerability of face".

Brown and Levinson (1987:63)

In 1963, Goffman published the article "On Face Work" where he first created the term "face". According to him "Face is a mask that changes depending on the audience and the social interaction.". Face is broken down by Goffman (1963) into two different categories namely positive face and negative face. He defines "positive face as the desire of being seen as a good human being while negative face is the desire to remain autonomous then he mentions that face is maintained by the audience, not by the speaker".

Face in communicative events is "a universal concept, but it is employed in culture specific ways. It is defined in psychological, philosophical and symbolic terms, as ...the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact". (Goffman, 1963:12).

In politeness theory the concept of "face has come to play an important role". Therefore, Brown and Levinson (1978) have chosen it "as the central notion for their study of universals in language usage and politeness phenomena". In their study, Brown and Levinson (1978) define the concept of face as

> "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" and explain that face as something that is emotionally invested and the face can be lost, maintained or enhanced and it must be constantly attended to in interaction, roughly the want to be unimpeded and the want to be approved of in certain respects".

> Brown and Levinson (1978:61)

Moreover, in the process of analysing politeness, Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) have come to a claim that "we are all motivated by two desires: positive face and negative face". Therefore, in the next section the working definition on positive and negative face are presented.

2.3.1.1 Positive Face

A number of articles concerning the notion of face have been published in the last few years. Most of theses previous studies such as Ho (1976), Huang (1987), Holtgraves and Yang (1990) Carr (1993), Scollon and Scollon (2001), and Mills (2003), defined positive *face* as "the claim for the recognition and appropriate validation of one's social self-image or personality. The positive face is the want of every member to be liked and

appreciated. Additionally, positive face is the positive consistent self-image or personality". This is quite similar to the concept of positive face proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978) as mentioned below:

> "Positive face is the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others", or alternately, "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants"

<div align="right">Brown and Levinson (1978:62)</div>

2.3.1.2 Negative Face

Brown and Levinson (1989) define negative face as "the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others", or "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, i.e. the freedom of action and freedom from imposition".

The study conducted by Goffman (1967) as well as Brown and Levinson (1978) share a similar view that "negative face is the maintenance and defense of one's territory and freedom from imposition. It is a desire to be autonomous and not to infringe on the other person". Therefore, this present study sees negative face to be related to autonomy; freedom from imposition and freedom of action .

2.3.1.3 FTA

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 threaten either positive face or negative face". FTA or *Face Threatening Act* includes expressing thanks, apologies, promises, even non verbal acts such as stumbling, falling down or any utterance that

intrinsically threatens another's face (positive or negative). Conclusively, FTA is an act which challenges the face wants of an interlocutor.

Brown and Levinson (1987:65) propose that "when confronted with the need to perform an FTA, the individual must choose between performing the FTA in the most direct and efficient manner, or attempting to mitigate the effect of the FTA on the hearer's positive-negative face". The mitigation strategies are what Brown and Levinson labelled as "*politeness strategies*".

The next sub-sections will deal with politeness strategies as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978).

2.3.2   Politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson's (1978) theory of politeness has become the model for research on politeness strategies. Central to Brown and Levinson's theory is the concept of face, as proposed by Goffman (1967) who defined face as:

> " … the positive social value of a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes –albeit an image that others might share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself".

(Goffman 1967:5)

The main focus of Brown and Levinson's (1978) study as part of a linguistic project to show universals in language use, "they constructed a system in which a *model person* is endowed with *negative and positive face;* and tie both strategies to the importance of face in every culture". As claimed by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), "being polite

16

consists of attempting to save face for another, and though all cultures have 'face', they do not maintain face in the same way". In their books, Brown and Levinson (1978:68) explained "that certain acts can damage or threaten another person's face and these acts are referred to as face threatening acts (FTAs)". "An FTA has the potential to damage the hearer's positive or negative face, or it may even damage the speaker's own positive or negative face". In order to reduce the possibility of damage to the hearer's or the speaker's face, speakers may adopt certain strategies. These strategies are called 'politeness strategies'.

"The concepts of politeness strategies are developed to avoid embarrassing the other person or making him/her feel uncomfortable in order to save the hearer's face". Further, according to Brown and Levinson (1978) "Politeness strategies can be divided into four main strategies namely: bald-on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record politeness strategies".

The following sections present each of the theory of politeness strategies separately as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

2.3.2.1 Bald-on-record

According to Brown and Levinson (1978:74), bald on record strategy "is a direct way of saying things, without any minimisation to the imposition, in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way".

For example:

> "Do X!"
> "Do the dishes. It's your turn."

Brown and Levinson (1978: 100) give an example of bald-on-record strategy and say that "direct imperatives are clear examples of bald-on-record usage. Imperatives are often softened with hedges or conventional politeness markers".

2.3.2.2 Positive politeness

The second strategy is positive politeness and "it is generally found in groups of friends, or in situations where people of given social circumstances know each other fairly well. It usually tries to minimize the distance between them by showing friendliness and solid interest in the addressee's need to be respected (minimize FTA), in other words this strategy attempts to minimize the threat to the hearers face", Brown and Levinson (1978:101). For example "*So when are you coming to see us?*"

Positive politeness is less polite than negative politeness because is not necessarily redress of the particular face infringed by the FTA. According to Brown and Levinson (1978:106), in positive politeness the redress consists in partially satisfying that desire that one's own wants or some of them are in some respects similar to the addressee's wants.

> ". . .the linguistic realizations of positive politeness are in many respects simply representative of the normal linguistic behaviour between intimates, where interest and approval of each others personality, presuppositions indicating shared wants and shared knowledge, implicit claims to reciprocity of obligations or to reflexivity of wants, etc, are routinely exchanged. Perhaps the only feature that distinguishes positive politeness redress from normal everyday intimate language behaviour is an element of exaggeration; this serves as a marker of the face-redress aspect of positive politeness expression by indicating that even S can't with total sincerity say 'I want your wants' he can at least sincerely indicate 'I want your positive face to be satisfied."

> Brown and Levinson (1978:106)

Brown and Levinson (1978), added "the element of insincerity in exaggerated expressions of approval or interest is compensating for by the implication that the speaker sincerely wants positive face to be enhanced", such as for example; "*So, is it O.K. if I use one of those pens.*"

2.3.2.3 Negative Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1978:129) said "it is a redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face, which is the addressee's wants to have freedom of action unhindered and addressee's attention unimpeded, and distinguish among negative and positive politeness, that negative politeness is the heart of respective behaviour, just as positive politeness is the kernel of 'familiar' and 'joking' behaviour". Moreover, Brown and Levinson (1978:129) also said negative politeness corresponds to the rituals of avoidance. "Where positive politeness is free-ranging, negative politeness is specific and focused; it performs the function of minimizing the particular imposition that the FTA gives unavoidable effects and mention that negative politeness is the kind of politeness used between acquaintances whereas positive politeness is used between closer friends".

Nasb (2006:8) also noted that negative politeness is "the most elaborate and the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress". Further, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:135), "the linguistic realization of negative politeness, conventional indirectness, hedges on illocutionary force, polite pessimism, and the emphasis on hearer's relative power are very familiar".

2.3.2.4   Off-record

Brown and Levinson (1978:216) noted that for off-record strategy "the actor leaves it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret the act". Off-record strategy as "a communicative act which is done in such a way that is not possible to attribute one clear communicative intention to the act. In this case, the actor leaves her/himself an "out" by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations."

Off-record utterances are essential in indirect use of language. One says something that is rather general. In this case, the hearer must make some inference to recover what was intended. For example, if somebody says *"It is hot in here"*, the hidden meaning of the utterance can be a request to open the window or to switch on the air conditioner.

Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1978:230-232) list inviting conversational implicatures as one of the main strategies of off-record-ness and its subcategories are giving hints, giving association clues, presupposing, understating, overstating, using tautologies, using contradictions, being ironic, using metaphors, and using rhetorical question. The other main strategy of going off-record is being vague or ambiguous, and its subcategories are being ambiguous, being vague, over-generalising, displacing hearer and being incomplete.

2.3.3 Politeness In Scientific Articles

This section aims to present an overview of recent trends in the research of academic writing. Myers (1989) found that politeness strategies are used explicitly in scientific research article, for instance, to make claims and avoid FTAs. In his study "The

Pragmatic of Politeness in Scientific Articles", Myers mentions that he adopted politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987)

Brown and Levinson (1978) have developed a theory of politeness to explain the nature of politeness phenomena in language. According to them, "it is possible to define generic types of politeness strategies to explain and predict the adoption of politeness in oral or written discourse". As already mentioned in the previous section, this theory is based on the work of Goffmann (1967) and it states that people who want to be polite assess the degree of 'face' threat that their discourse will cause in others.

Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1978) outline "a whole hierarchy of politeness strategies and argue that cultures can be compared in terms of which categories of redress preferred". "Most of the claims in the corpus of scientific articles illustrate either positive or negative politeness strategies". But there are instances that illustrate the other choices open to Brown and Levinson (1978)'s Model Person "who has a rational faculty for choosing the course of action that will give the highest pay-off with the least loss of face. He will then evaluate three variables before making a decision on the best move - the social distances (D); the relative difference in power between the speaker and hearer (P); and the rank of imposition (R)".

Myers (1989) used Brown and Levinson's model to help understand the interaction between writers and readers in written text, and particularly in scientific texts. He underlies that these three basic variables are affective to help in understanding the interactions of politeness between writers and readers in written text.

In the realm of written communication, the influence of the above factors to politeness has been assessed also by Chiappini and Harris (1996); Holtgraves and Yang (1990); and Pilegaard (1997) and they shared a view that politeness in written communication has been generally seen as a strategy used to create and maintain a friendly atmosphere for relations, to close distance between speakers and hearers and to mitigate the impact of impositions.

In 1989, Myers published his article "The Pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles" by using the model of the politeness principle, Myers (1989) pioneers the application of Brown and Levinsons's (1987) politeness strategies onto written text, and he discovers the existence of politeness are used explicitly in scientific articles. Below are the strategies employed by the writers in the scientific articles found by Myers (1989).

2.3.3.1   Positive Politeness and Solidarity

In Brown and Levinson (1987), the hierarchy of positive politeness is directed at showing the speaker concerns with hearer's concern. Similarly, Myers (1989) in his article illustrates the situation:

> "That in scientific writing the range possible references to the readers' wants is severely restricted: one cannot for instance, make any remark praising the general talents of a researcher, or remind the readers of a readers past success. But there are positive politeness devices for showing the writer acceptance of the wants of rival researcher, or of the scientific community as whole".

Myers (1989:7)

Myers (1989:8) points out that the researchers show their solidarity with the community by showing "identification with common goals". For instance, when a researcher expresses disappointment, it does not mean that it is a display of personal feelings. Instead, it is an expression of despair for the loss of the opportunity to contribute towards the community. In another example, when an author or a researcher expresses his pleasure or sheer delight, it is not a celebration of personal achievement; it is meant to indicate how glad the author is that "the findings fit with the larger goals of the scientific community".

Moreover Myers (1989:7-8) found that strategic use of *pronoun* "is to stress solidarity, as imposition is made and the use of modifiers to assume common ground, the use of emotional response to indicate solidarity and such unscientific-seeming devices as *joking* and *giving gifts*, and also *the use of citations* are normally used to show solidarity".

Furthermore, Myers (1989:8) also noted that "one way of making criticism while minimizing the FTA is for the writers to use pronoun that include themselves in the criticism". Besides the use of *we* that means the writers, there is *we* that means the discipline as a whole. The use of the first person plural pronoun lessens the impact of the claim or criticism made (Myers, 1989). When an author uses *we*, it shows solidarity with others, such as research partner(s) or supervisor(s). Further, *Joking* would seem to be an unlikely politeness strategy in scientific text, and indeed there is not much room for humour in it.

Jokes according to Myers (1989:10) are useful for "scientists, linguists, economists or other academic communities, in establishing a sense of shared knowledge or assumptions. This sense can emerge in two features of scientific articles, namely *new terms* and *titles,* and they may serve to mitigate the FTA of claim. While *giving of gift*s is listed also as one of the tactic in positive politeness strategy in Myers's study. He mentioned the concerned device in the analysis of writing is the gift of credit, especially in the disposition of citations. It may seem odd that the choice of who to cite and who not to cite could be matter of strategy. One special case of this of giving credit is the acknowledgement of simultaneous, independent claims". Historically, priority disputes have been major causes of tension within the scientific community. Furthermore, "authors can show their solidarity with the community more subtly by exhibiting response that assumed shared knowledge".

Myers (1989:8) in his paper also states that in scientific writing such as economic journals "an indication of emotional response to results, or desire for certain results and pattern of citations is used to show solidarity with the scientific community". For example the use of citation, authors used this tactic to show the referee or the editorial board that their work is in agreement with the previous studies and it is supported by these studies. In additional by citing the findings of the established members of the academic community, the researchers hoped that their suggestions would be more convincing.

Based on the explanations above, those basic concepts of the positive politeness in scientific articles have not changed much compared to the basic concepts proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), that the communication is "framed so that all parties maintain a positive face". Further, positive politeness "is an effort to make up for a threat to the desired self-image or it generally tries to narrow the distance between them

by expressing friendliness and solid interest. Positive politeness devices are used to mitigate both claims and denials of claims.

2.3.3.2   Negative Politeness and Hedging

Using the model of the politeness principle, Myers (1989) found that negative politeness in scientific articles is the strategy "to assure the readers that the writers do not intend to infringe on their wants and their freedom to act.   As he also mentions that in scientific texts, most of the features that are considered conventional such as hedging, personal construction, impersonal construction and the assertion of general rules, can be reinterpreted as negative politeness devices".

Lakoff (1972:7) defines the concepts of hedging as "words whose jobs is to make things fuzzy or less fuzzy". While   Nikula (1997:10) adds *Hedging* can be described as "a strategy by which speakers mitigate and soften the force of their utterances". Additionally, hedging, which is a negative politeness strategy, is "considered to be a tool of scientific practice and a discursive strategy in academic and professional writing. It is a classic strategy in making claims and communicating ideologies", (Lakoff, 1972: 34)

Many researchers agree that hedging is useful, Skelton (1988:38) for instance mentions, "Can not see how language can function without hedging, as language without hedging is language without life". Salager-Meyer (1998:296) said that "this *linguistic manoeuvring* has indeed contributed towards a richer and deeper understanding of the device".

Furthermore, Myers (1989) in his study on scientific articles discovers the use of hedging was reserved for representation when there was uncertainty, as in the following examples show the case.

E.g.1 . . . *Perhaps* most appropriately called precursor mRNA (Messenger Roboneuclid Acid) . . .

<div align="right">(Source: Myers 1992: 11)</div>

Myers also mentions that hedging in textbooks is used to indicate "remaining uncertainty", for example:

E.g. 2: . . . they *appear* never to leave the nucleus . . .

<div align="right">(Source: Myers 1992: 11)</div>

Moreover, in scientific text Myers (1989) also found other tactics classified as negative politeness employed in some scientific text.

" . . . it may seem paradoxically that in redressing some FTAs, there is some reference to personal opinion or desire ('it seem improbable *to us*'; 'we wish to suggest') while redressing others the personal subject is replaced by some impersonal actors such as 'findings' or 'result'. it is of course true that personal subject often uses ***impersonal construction*** and passives. but it is not true that **personal subjects** are eliminated; the subject *we* (and, less often *I*) plays and important role in politeness".

<div align="right">Myers (1989:14)</div>

Brown and Levinson (1987:145) also note "that several kinds of impersonal constructions can be a form of negative politeness, as one says '*one shouldn't smoke in this section*' rather than '*don't smoke here*'". Myers in his study finds a similar example in the scientific text such as '*these results imply a novel mechanism for biosynthesis of . . .*' or another example ' *these observations suggest that both mRNAs contain a long common sequence*'. Moreover, Myers (1989) mentions that ". . . personal construction

and impersonal construction are the main forms of negative politeness found in the scientific articles".

Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1989:206) also mention this in their paper one way of dissociating S and H from the particular imposition in the FTA, and hence a way of communicating that S 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". ***The assertion of general rules*** was found in the situation when the writer is describing activity, process, or method expressed in general rule or obligation, something that every researcher in the field usually follows so as to avoid impingement, so by stating this phenomenon author redress the imposition from impose the audience. The example below shows the assertion of general rules:

 . . . international regulations require that the fuselage be sprayed with DDT.

(Source: MJES; 2003:121)

2.3.3.3   Bald on Record

Brown and Levinson (1987) have developed a theory of politeness to explain the nature of politeness phenomena in language they mention claim politeness in verbal communication has been generally seen as "a strategy used to create and maintain a friendly atmosphere for relations and to mitigate the impact of impositions by saving the hearers' face".

In scientific articles, Myers (1998) finds a parallel situation happened "when the imposition on the reader is so small it can be ignored, or where the demands for efficiency are so great that they override the demands of politeness". However, according to Myers (1989:21) the choice to use bald on record "is made when writers feel that sometimes demands for efficiency may override the demands of politeness. In general, the authors made the choice of using bald on record to state their claims in order to be more efficient and clear".

2.3.3.4 Off-record

According to Myers (1989), in scientific texts, one might not expect to find any example off "off-record" strategy. This kind of strategy is made only by implications, not in literal sense of the statement. The purpose of this strategy is "to record claim and an explicit statement is usually required to establish priority. But claim can be made in this indirect way only in unusual circumstances in which careful attention to the article is guaranteed, so that there is no implication".

Furthermore, if in the text of the journals Myers found phrasing which assume that the writers and the audiences share the same power as an obvious implication with no need to claim priority by using a 'coy' and echoic word or a word inside quotation, it can be considered as off-record claim. Generally, off-record means that the speakers are removing themselves from any imposition whatsoever, (Myers, 1989).

2.3.4 Politeness in Written Persuasive

One of the best known and systematic books on persuasive tactics with hundreds of examples was proposed by Mulholland in 1994. She was the first to initiate the compilation of persuasive tactics in communication. Mulholland (1994) in her book presents a catalogue of the compilation of 300 cases of persuasive tactics use either in speech or writing in communication in daily lives. Mulholland's compilation of persuasive tactics will be use in this study to strength the analysis of politeness alongside Brown and Levinson's (1978) politeness theory and Myers (1989) politeness in written scientific articles. This study believed the integration of these studies could explain the phenomena of politeness strategies and tactics employ by journal writers in economic articles.

According to Cherry (1987), Mulholland, 1994 and Belchers, (1995), politeness tactic both in verbal and non-verbal communication were a friendly persuasion. They have a similar point of view that "everyone communicating no matter how apparently trivial or brief has an effect on others. Additionally they mention that by employed polite tactics communicators were being friendly to others".

Furthermore, they also have a similar view that the art of persuasion is something that every author and speakers should learn if ever they wish to be more successful to convince others. They noted that "one of the importance elements to persuade people is politeness". By being polite to other people, means speaker or writer are trying to satisfy one of the deepest of all subconscious desires in humans, the need to feel important and respected.

In written persuasion discourse, Cherry (1987), also found that politeness was "used as a tactic to persuade audience of academic community". Politeness persuasions were set "to convince readers to agree with the facts, the values or to accept the writers' argument and conclusions in their writing". Similarly Mulholland (1994) found that politeness in written communication was used to persuade and to influence the reader in a friendly atmosphere.

Meanwhile, Belchers (1995) and Pilegard (1997) claim that "politeness in written discourse use by writers to persuade the readers in order to achieve a goals or set of goals". Towards these certain goals, these writers were found use some elements toward building a good persuasive in written text. These elements are; establishing facts, clarifying relevant values, prioritizing or sequencing, forming, stating conclusions and having confidence.

Furthermore, Mulholland (1994) added that persuasion both in written or speech communication seek to achieve the goals of the person using it. In this case the persuader simply presents the best case possible, and leaves it to the audiences to accept or reject it.

Conclusively, the writers use politeness strategies in order to persuade what they proposed (facts, method. etc) can be accepted in the scientific community, as the nature politeness strategies in written texts are used to persuade, to argue, to convince and to influence audience in a friendly situation.

2.4   The Author-Audience Relationship in Scientific Text

Hunt (1995:33) describes in his paper that "a good piece of writing creates a clear picture of an audience, a writer and a relationship between them. Therefore, a good writing could possess a general knowledge of the different types of audience".

In scientific texts such as journals, the role of audiences is crucial to the development of arguments made by writers. Myers (1989:4) defines "two groups of 'real' audience of scientific articles immediate to the community, to whom a research report is supposed to be present: **Exoteric,** or wider scientific community, to whom a research report is supposed to be addressed, and the **Esoteric,** or 'immediate audience of individual researchers doing the same works, who in a sense, 'overhear' about their work". The second group of immediate audience are the ones, according to Myers, who "overhear" this distinction between the two groups is important.

> "The distinction is important because politeness involves displaying to the exoteric group proper respect for the face of members of the esoteric group…In other hand writer of scientific article, were writes in two roles; firstly as writer whose voice is in the text, and as researcher describing the work carried out "

Myers (1989:3-4)

The writers' stance refers to the way they position themselves rhetorically when they communicate with their audience, that is, the readers. The image they project as writers are the result of the stance they take and the total impression that readers get from reading. The following elements help to determine the image projected by writers:

- Writing Style
- Voice
- Grammar

- Neatness
- Spacing of text
- Visual used

<div align="right">(Mayberry and Golden, 1990:7)</div>

The above elements are related to the language, format and supports used by writers. Apart from these elements, writers improve their character by demonstrating that they made conscientious efforts to refer to the best authorities before presenting their arguments (Rotenberg, 1991:15-16). Furthermore, they may identify themselves with the audience and share similar view. They would have also taken into consideration the interest and needs of others besides their own (Gong and Dragga, 1995:404). In the process of writing journals such as economics, writers act as their own *internal readers* while the editorial board examine the appropriate language and arguments for a particular audience. Winkler and McCuen (1994:7) define this ability as the "basic aim of any instruction in rhetoric", in which writers are trained to develop a sixth sense in choosing the most appropriate and effective way to address a target audience. An ideal internal reader cum editor is one who is able to tailor a written text in format that the intended audience is "willing to hear out" (Winkler and McCuen, 1994: 9).

In conclusion, readers or audiences play an important role in writers' attempt to present a good piece of written discourse. The choice of language, the support used as well as the development of an argument rest on whom the writers are addressing whereas the success of a comprehensive argument is determined by the readers. Furthermore, this study also concludes that the writers need to be aware of who the intended audience are, and in the case, the readers. The outcome of this awareness is the selection of appropriate language and comprehensive strategies used to present their findings, claim or arguments.

2.5   Format of Academic Journal

"The term 'academic journal' applies to scholarly publications in all fields; this article discusses the aspects common to all academic field journals. Scientific journals and journals of the quantitative social sciences vary in form and function from journals of the humanities and qualitative social sciences. The function of a journal is to share knowledge".

"Academic journal is a peer-reviewed periodical in which scholarship relating to a particular academic discipline is published. Academic journals serve as forums for the introduction and presentation for scrutiny of new research, and the critique of existing research. Content typically takes the form of articles presenting original research, article reviews and book reviews".

In academia, "professional scholars typically make unsolicited submissions of their articles to academic journals. Upon receipt of a submitted article manuscript, the journal editor or editors determine whether to reject the submission outright or begin the process of peer-review". In the latter case, the submission becomes subject to anonymous peer-review by external scholars of the editor's choosing.

The editors use "'the reviewers' opinions in determining whether to publish the article, return it to the writers for revision or to reject it. Even accepted articles are subjected to further, sometimes considerable, editing by journal's editorial staff before they appear in printed or online media. Typically, because the process is lengthy, an accepted article will not be published and read by the audience immediately as the process might extend for several months after its initial submission".

2.6 Summary

In this chapter, the researcher started this section with explanation of discourse and discourse analysis as the approaches. This study concludes that, the term "discourse" analysis is a mammoth-like interpretation. Thus, it mainly refers to the linguistic of language usage in social context, specifically on the analysis of occurring connected speech or written discourse. Then, it deals with politeness theory which covers the concept of politeness itself and the claims for universality. Also, there are diverse criticisms or modification on the elements of the politeness theory by Brown and Levinson. By using Myers's (1989) study "Politeness in Scientific Text" alongside Mulholland's (1994) "compilation of persuasive tactics".

This chapter, then explain the nature of strategies and tactics regarding politeness in written persuasive. Further, in the last part of this chapter, discusses about author-audience relationship in scientific journal or to whom a research report is supposed to be presented and the format of academic journal.