

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with background of the research, statement of problem, research question, research objective, research significance and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the research

Having a good conversation is important matter. With a good conversation, a speaker enables to establish a good social relationship with a hearer. It helps the speaker in creating friendship, getting job and simply giving a good impression of ourselves. In this case, Hoza (2007:1) states that the first impression when people talk is not about the topic that the speaker chooses, but how a speaker communicates with a hearer and how the communication proceed.

When a speaker tries to have a good conversation that runs well and smoothly, a speaker has to mastered politeness in communication. Politeness is having or showing behavior that is respectful and considerate of the other people. So, basically it is treating people with respect.

There are many reasons why politeness is important in communication but the most important thing is that when the speakers are polite, the speakers are more likely to achieve their objectives and get what they want, and people are more likely to take them seriously and deal with them in a good way. If the speakers polite, the other people will listen to their arguments, ideas, opinion and take the speaker seriously and maybe change their own behavior or even do what the speakers would like to do.

However, there are people who do not pay respect to the other people and do the opposite things by performing impoliteness. By performing the impoliteness, the speakers do not considerate or respect the other people as the result of that, the speakers will hurt the hearers.

People can observe polite and impolite acts in real life because it is the truth that language is used in daily live. It can be in the informal situations or in the formal situations, yet it is more interesting to find polite or impolite in the formal situation. It is very common to see the impoliteness in an informal situation like when the speakers talk with their friends. Oppositely, it is very uncommon to see the impoliteness in a formal situation because the hearers usually are the people who just barely meet and the speakers have to be polite to make a good impression.

One of the formal forms is debate, although debate is one of formal forms of communication, there are no guarantees that the participant will always do polite act.

People use debate as a medium to speak openly about their opinions and try to solve the problems. However in this modern day people use a debate as a tool to take the others down. People use debate to attempt dominance over the others, berate the opposite side, demands their evidences be taken as a strong point. They forget actual purpose of debate that is searching the best solution.

This fact has become one interesting issue to be analyzed further. In this research, the researcher uses the 2016 Second U.S Presidential Debate as the research object. The 2016 U.S Presidential Debate is appropriate to be the object of the research because of some reasons. First, the researcher is interested in observes the election of

U.S President. Second, there has been very little actual policy discussed and majority of the discussion revolve around the candidate's scandal. Third, the second 2016 U.S presidential debate's candidate consisted of influential figures in the world.

1.2 Previous Studies

There are some previous studies which are related to this research. The first research is done by Beom (2011). In this research, Beom indicated that the U.S. presidential candidates employed direct, aggressive communication strategies for attacking or supporting opponents significantly more frequently than Korean candidates, who preferred indirect, moderate strategies.

The second research is done by Kuntsi (2012). This thesis uses lawyer's speech in courtroom. The politeness theory used in this study was proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The researcher found that lawyers use both polite and impolite linguistic strategies when they are communicating with their colleagues, the judge and witnesses and Kuntsi also found that more occurrences of polite linguistic strategies than of impolite strategies occur in the courtroom.

The third research is done by Hartini (2016). In this research, Hartini focuses her research on the violation of politeness principle in Indonesian Presidential Debate. In this research, Hartini found that the most dominant violated of politeness principle is generosity Maxim.

The last research is done by Tri Agustin (2014). In this research, Tri Austin elucidates that Barack Obama in his debate uses positive politeness dominantly. It reaches 80 %. It indicates that Obama uses positive politeness because he wants to be

closer to the hearers. Moreover, Obama wants to persuade the hearers or audience in his debate by using positive politeness dominantly to hearers.

Meanwhile, this research, which is entitled “The Impoliteness Strategies in the 2016 Second US Presidential Debate”, is different from those previous ones. This study aims to find out the impoliteness strategies when the participants in this debate argue each other after the researcher find out the impoliteness, the researcher tries to describe the participants’ response to the impoliteness strategies addressed to them. The researcher uses Jonathan Culpaper’s theory of impoliteness strategies (1996).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

It is very common to see the impoliteness strategies in an informal situation like when we talk with our friends but it is something uncommon to see the impoliteness in formal situations, where the speaker must pay respect to the hearer, like in a debate. So, it is very interesting to observe the impoliteness strategies in a formal situation like in a debate. This research focuses on the study pragmatics especially on impoliteness strategies. The researcher solely focuses his research to the impoliteness strategies on the 2016 second US Presidential Debate. The writer uses the Culpaper’s theory (1996) about the impoliteness. Then, the researcher will find some impoliteness strategies on the dialogue and how the participants response to it.

Based on the statement of problem above, the formulation of problems can be arranged as follows;

- a. What are the realizations of impoliteness strategies employed by the participants in the 2016 second U.S presidential debate?

- b. What are the responses of the participants in replying to impoliteness strategies addressed to them?

1.4 Research Objective

The research objective must be clear, considering that a research must have purposes and keep the research on the track. Based on the research question, the objectives of the research are:

- a. To describe the kind of realization of impoliteness strategies in the 2016 second U.S presidential debate.
- b. To identify the kind of response are applied by the addressee in replying the impoliteness strategies.

1.5 Research Significance

The research in the field of politeness especially in disclosing the impoliteness strategies phenomenon in the 2016 second U.S presidential debate has significant contributions both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, this research is able to give explanation about the impoliteness strategies that can be one of source of references for English Department of State Islamic university Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. Thus, by analyzing this research, the readers who are interested in doing research in this field can understand the use of impoliteness strategies in certain formal occasion which have specific kinds of language applied. Practically, it also gives knowledge for the readers to know more about such kinds of words that have impolite sense. Hence, they are expected to be more careful in producing sentences

that potentially have impolite meanings that can cause the misunderstanding for the hearers.

1.6 Definition of Key terms

- a. Politeness strategies: Brown (1987:322) states that politeness strategies are some strategies for making our utterance become more polite.
- b. Face: the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself (Brown, 1987:311), in this case face is the self-image of person does not refer to a facial appearance.
- c. Debate: A brainstorm activity between two or more, each participants are trying to influence people to accept the proposal which is submitted.
- d. The 2016 second U.S presidential debate: The second of 2016 US Presidential Debate.

