

**THE UNIVERSITY OF DA NANG  
UNIVERSITY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES**

**PHAN THỊ HỒNG VÂN**

**A STUDY OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES  
USED BY THE MCs IN “THE GUESTS OF VTV3”  
AND “THE LATE SHOW WITH DAVID  
LETTERMAN”**

**Major: ENGLISH LINGUISTICS**

**Code: 822.02.01**

**MASTER THESIS IN  
SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES**

**(A SUMMARY)**

**Đà Nang, 2018**

This thesis has been completed at University of Foreign Language  
Studies,

The University of Da Nang

**Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lưu Quý Khương**

Examiner 1: **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nguyễn Tất Thắng**

Examiner 2: **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nguyễn Văn Long**

The thesis was orally defended at the Examining Committee

Time: October 2018

Venue: University of Foreign Language Studies

-The University of Da Nang

This thesis is available for the purpose of reference at:

*- Library of University of Foreign Language Studies, The  
University of Da Nang*

*- The Information Resources Center, The University of Da Nang*

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. RATIONALE

It has been agreed that politeness is a kind of pragmatic phenomenon. In fact, deeply understanding and applying politeness in communication is necessarily for Television MC in establishing, maintaining, and improving the interpersonal relationship between communication parties. For example, when speaker (S) wants to express his interest, approval, and sympathy with H, he wants to “come closer” distance between S and H, he can use positive politeness strategies (PoPoSs). On the other hand, when S wants to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded, in other words, he wants to keep distance between communicative partners, he can use NePoSs.

Communication in talk shows is the one via media, directly delivered to the public. As a kind of entertainment, talk shows aim to give good performances, which mean that participants’ roles, especially the master of ceremony (MC), become extremely important in TV reality shows. To ensure the smooth progression of the program, politeness between the MCs and their guests should be paid attention to. The S needs to consider the factors related to maintaining politeness in communication like age, gender, or social position or the politeness strategies to minimize imposition, give deference, or make their utterances more formal. For example, in the episode of “The Late Show with David Letterman” between MC David Letterman and his guest, actor Micheal Weatherly, the MC minimized the imposition by saying: “*I want you to tell us **a little bit** about your relationship, your friendship, your professional*

*relationship to Robert Wanger because you were in a ... you know... in a movie..*” (“The Late Show with David Letterman”, February 2012). The MC has used the understatement *“a little bit”* to show his high deference to his guest and satisfied his guest’s positive image. By doing this, the MC has used the NePoSs to make the communication smooth.

However, the PoSs used by the MCs convey specifically cultural features of each region. In particular, the PoSs in Vietnamese are not the same as those in the American or people from different societies do because of their cultural differences. In different social situations, we “as members of groups” are obliged to adjust the words which we use and the ways in which we behave to be polite “in more and less predictable ways in order to achieve social coordination and sustain communication”(Janney & Arndt, 1992). On the other hand, what is considered polite in one society may be different from what is considered polite in another one, people have different ways to express politeness. For instance, when responding with a speech act like: “You are really a lucky dog”, Vietnamese people often give negative responses such as “Anh nói cái kiểu gì đấy?”(What do you mean?), “Anh bảo ai là chó hả?” (who is a dog, do you mean?), while the American people may make positive ones like “Could be”, “I think I am.” (Nguyen Quang, 2004). All these interesting cultural differences actually capture my attention.

Because of the complex and interesting aspects of using PoSs in communication, especially in TV show talks, the study entitled: “Negative Politeness Strategies Used by the MCs in “The Late Show with David Letterman” and “The Guests of VTV3” was conducted with the hope to help readers be able to get an overview of how

NePoSs are used to manipulate the relationship in communication in English and Vietnamese between speakers. Also, the study is useful for journalist students or people who want to be TV MCs.

## **1.2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

### **1.2.1. Aims**

This study aims at examining PoSs used by the MCs in two reality shows “The Guests of VTV3” and “The Late Show with David Letterman”. It also tries to find out the similarities and differences in PoSs used by the MCs in “The Guests of VTV3” and “The Late Show with David Letter Man”

### **1.2.2. Objectives**

- Identifying and analyzing the PoSs used by the MCs in two TV Reality Shows.
- Finding out the similarities and differences between PoSs used by the MCs in two TV Reality Shows.
- Providing some implications for teaching and learning English conversations

## **1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What are PoSs used by the MCs in TV Reality Shows ‘The Late Show with David Letterman’ on American Television?
2. What are PoSs used by the MCs in TV Reality Shows “The Guests of VTV3” on Vietnam Television?
3. What are the similarities and differences in PoSs used by the MCs in TV Reality Shows “The Guests of VTV3” on Vietnam Television” in comparison with ‘The Late Show with David Letter Man’ on American Television?

## **1.4. SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

This study identifies PoSs used by the MCs in two TV Reality

Shows, thus, this study also focuses on comparing and contrasting the PoSs in communication between the MCs in both programs in American and Vietnamese cultures basing on the analysis of the data collected from Video Transcript of Interviews in relation to the three social variables (the social distance, relative power and absolute ranking of impositions) affecting politeness in interaction and talk show interviews.

### **1.5. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

From the result of the data analysis, this study gives two significances. First, the theoretical significance may offer a better insight into politeness for other researchers who want to analyze talk shows from the perspective of PoSs. Second, the practical significance may help readers use good PoSs in communication, especially in talk shows.

### **1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

- Chapter 1: **Introduction**
- Chapter 2: **Literature Review and Theoretical Background**
- Chapter 3: **Research Design and Methodology**
- Chapter 4: **Findings and Discussions**
- Chapter 5: **Conclusions and Suggestions**

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

#### **2.1. PREVIOUS STUDIES RELATED TO THE THESIS**

So far, there have been many researches related to politeness and PoSs in communication. Lackoff (1972, 1973) considers politeness as a pragmatic rule in communication in the form of do's and don't's. Leech (1983) sets a politeness principle with several maxims operating on a number of scales. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) claims politeness has a universal status. The choices of PoSs influence the face- threat to involve three fundamental sociocultural variables. Morizumi (1997), put forward some skills and techniques to make a TV talk show. Nguyen Quang (2004) gives out some tactics to hold a conversation in communication and cross-cultural communication. Sekar (2009) reveals that most of the PoSs used were intended to minimize the distance between the MC and the guest. The host tried to perform the most communicative, directive and procedural strategy during the talk show. Nguyen Ho Phuong Chi (2012) shows that age, religion, occupation, gender and the social situation clearly influence individual's linguistic uses as well as non-verbal behaviors and language is used to create social standards of express cultural norms.

#### **2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

##### **2.2.1. Politeness and Politeness Theories**

Politeness which is considered as a universal phenomenon in every cultural linguistic community has attracted a lot of attention from linguists and sociologists. Leech (1980:19) writes politeness is "*strategic conflict avoidance*" which "*can be measured in terms of the*

*degree of effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation*". Ide (1989:22) defined politeness as *"language associated with smooth communication"*. She mentions that politeness is one of many ways to smooth communication. Lakoff defined politeness as *"a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange"* (1990:34).

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) see politeness *"as a complex system for softening face threats"*. They states that politeness has a universal status and is seen as an ability to function as a way of controlling potential aggression between interactional parties. They tend to measure it according to a two-pole scale: negative politeness and positive politeness.

### **2.2.2. Faces**

Face is one concept in politeness. It is said that we need to consider other people's face to get a polite conversation. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) states that every member of society has a public self image, or "face". Face is defined as *"something that is emotionally invested, and that can be not only lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended to interaction"*(Brown and Levinson (1987:61). Brown and Levinson (1987) also suggest that every individual has two types of face: *positive face and negative face*. Negative face is *"the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others"* (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p.62). On the other hand, positive face is *"the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others"* (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p.62).

### ***2.2.2.1. Bald on- Record Strategies***

On record strategy without redress action is the clearest, and most direct possible way. E.g. for a request, saying “Do X!”. Bald on – record strategy provides no effect of the Ss to minimize the impact of FTA. Bald on – record acts are performed when the S has significantly more power than the H, the S can shock the Hs or make them feel uncomfortable. Brown and Levinson (1986:95) note that the prime reason for doing Bald on – record is whenever the S wants to do FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy the H’s face, even to any degree, he will choose the bald on- record strategy. There are two cases of bald on record strategies: *Cases of non-minimization of the face threat* and *Cases of FTA- oriented bald–on–record usage*

### ***2.2.2.2. Positive Politeness Strategies***

Positive politeness is oriented toward the H’s positive face. As the S wants at least some of the H’s wants, the potential face threat off an act is mitigated in this case. Brown and Levinson (1987:101) states that “*positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee’s face, his perennial desire that his wants should be thought as desirable*”

Yule (1996:64) also states that positive politeness leads the requester to appeal to a common goal. Brown and Levinson (1987) list fifteen positive politeness with first eight of the strategies, the S claims common ground, “*indicating that S and H belong to the same set of people who share specific wants, including goals and values*” (p.103).

#### **a. Claim common ground**

Strategy 1: Notice, attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods).

Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H).

Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H

Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers

Strategy 5: Seek agreement

Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

Strategy 7: Presuppose/ raise/ assert common ground

Strategy 8: Joke

**b. Convey that speaker and hearer are cooperators**

Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose S knowledge of and concern from H's wants.

Strategy 10: Offer, promise

Strategy 11: Be optimistic

Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity

Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons

Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

**c. Fulfill H's want for some X**

Strategy 15: Giving gifts to H

**2.2.2.3. Negative Politeness Strategies**

Negative politeness is associated primarily with directive speech acts and variation in the degree of imposition. Negative face is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, right to non-distraction such as freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Cutting (2008: 45) notes that "*negative politeness pays attention to negative face by demonstrating the distance between interlocutors and avoiding intruding on each other's territory*"

Brown and Levinson (1987:129) mention that "*Negative politeness is redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded*".

**a. Be direct**

Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

**b. Don't presume/assume about H's wants**

Strategy 2: Question, hedge

**c. Don't coerce H**

Strategy 3: Be pessimistic

Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition (Rx)

Strategy 5: Give deference

**d. Communicate S want not to impinge on H**

Strategy 6: Apologize

Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H

Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule

Strategy 9: Nominalize

**e. Redress others' wants of H**

Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting H

**2.2.2.4. Off Record Strategies**

An actor goes off record in doing A, then there is more that one unambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held to have committed himself to one particular event as stated by Brown and Levinson (1978:69). The H's face is protected by having the option to retreat behind the literal meaning of the words (Cutting, 2008, p.46), the S can save his face by denying having performed the FTA. In other words, the actor leaves himself an "out" by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations.

**Invite Conversational Implicatures:**

Strategy 1. Give hints

Strategy 2. Give association clues

Strategy 3. Presuppose

Strategy 4. Understate

Strategy 5. Overstate

Strategy 6. Use tautologies

Strategy 7. Use contradiction

Strategy 8. Be ironic

Strategy 9. Use metaphors

Strategy 10. Use rhetorical questions

**b. Be vague or ambiguous**

Strategy 11. Be ambiguous

Strategy 12. Be vague

Strategy 13. Over generalize

Strategy 14. Displace

Strategy 15. Be incomplete, use ellipsis

**2.2.3. Social Factors Influencing the Choice of PoSs**

***2.2.3.1. The Social Distance (D)***

The social distance refers to the degree of social familiarity of the two people. It refers to the close relationship between interlocutors. It is a symmetric social dimension of similarity or difference within which S and H stand for the purposes of the act. It can be based on an assessment of the frequency of interaction and the evaluation will be normally measures of social distance based on stable social attributes.

***2.2.3.2 .The Relative Power (P)***

The relative power is the degrees to which H can impose his own plans and face on S. It refers to the states, ranking, gender, age and social station.

***2.2.3.3. The Absolute Ranking (R) of Imposition in the Particular Cultures***

The absolute ranking of imposition which is culturally defined is the degree to which they are considered to interfere with an agent's

want of self- determination or approval. It refers to the degree of difficulties in the situation occurring during the conversation and the rank of imposition is also ranked according to the cost of the FTA.

#### **2.2.4. Talk Show Interviews**

Talk show interview, as defined by Tolson (1991:178), *“frequently transgresses those protocols and presumes an increasing sophistication on the part of the television audience. The result is a certain ambivalence between forms of talk which are designed both to inform and to entertain”*. Talk Show interviews are performed by journalists (or MC) and guests. High competitiveness and importance of audience ratings force broadcasters to experiment with new formats (Clayman and Heritage, 2002. p2). Lauerbach (2007) lists self-help, issue shows, counseling and therapy shows, political and celebrity shows, confrontation and reconciliation and so on.

##### **2.2.4.1. “The Late Show with David Letter Man” Talk Show**

“The Late Show with David Letterman” was a sixty-minute weeknight comedy and hosted by David Letter Man, an American Television host, comedian, writer, and producer, on the CBS in the United States. It was ranked The Top Ten List and nominated as Outstanding Variety, Music and Comedy six times.

##### **2.2.4.2. “The Guests of VTV3” Talk Show**

“The Guests of VTV3” is a forty five-minute celebrated comedy and hosted by Lai Van Sam, a journalist, Television host, and producer, on Vietnam national TV program broadcasted very Sunday morning, including three parts: the story of the program, the story of the guests and the story of reality.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. RESEARCH METHODS**

The source of data is the conversations between the participants in the two programs. The data analysis uses the descriptive, qualitative and quantitative methods because its aims are to collect, describe, interpret and analyze the numbers of PoSs occurred in conversations.

#### **3.2. RESEARCH DESIGNS**

##### **3.2.1. Sampling**

The data in this study are the MCs' utterances containing PoSs chosen as the samples to be analyzed because the Mcs are the interviewers, and as the interviewers they need to consider their PoSs in order to ask and give comment or feedback to their guests. Then, the researcher analyzed the utterances in the perspective of PoSs by Brown and Levinson (1987).

##### **3.2.2. Data Collection**

In this section, three steps in collecting the data are used: selecting, identifying, and transcribing.

##### **3.2.3. Data Analysis**

The data analysis in this study used descriptive qualitative and quantitative method because its aims are to collect, describe, interpret and analyze the numbers of PoSs occurred in conversations in the talk shows. According on Miles and Huberman (1994. p10-11) the data analysis is divided into three concurrent flows of activities consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

#### **3.3. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY**

In order to verify the reliability and validity of this research, the data were collected and extracted from two talk shows: "The Guests of

VTV3” on Vietnam Television from June 2011 to December 2012 and “The Late Show with David Letter Man” on American Television from June 2011 to December 2012. Samples taken in this research are utterances from the conversations between the MCs and their guests in two talk shows.

Samples were also identified and reduced to decide which ones that would be chosen and which ones contain FTAs, PoSs and reflect the influence of the sociological variables. It was essential that the samples were thoroughly considered and selected in order to assure the reliability and validity of the result as well as the objectives of the research are also guaranteed.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **4.1 FINDINGS**

The similarities and differences in using PoSs were concluded from comparison of the strategies' frequencies in conversations. It is obvious that the researcher will obtain a better insight into politeness to provide some implications for teaching and learning English conversations. The comparison analyzed may help the readers, especially English learners use good PoSs in communication.

Sociological variables (P, D, R) also gave influence to the use of the PoSs. The influence of relative power could be seen in the use of higher PoSs when the MCs spoke to their guests who had higher position and power than them. On the other hand, the influence of social distance could be seen in the use of PoSs to the guests who had high social distance. Finally, when the rank of imposition was high, the MCs employed PoSs to lessen the effect of the FTAs in communication.

The researcher found 1.561 utterances in transcripts of two talk shows containing PoSs chosen as samples to be analyzed. The samples were collected from 68 episodes (four episodes per each month) from June 2011 to December 2012, on the website: <https://www.youtube.com/khachcuavtv3>; <https://www.youtube.com/lateshowwithDavidLetteman>. These utterances could be categorized into all four PoSs: bald on record; politeness politeness; negative politeness and off record. There are 43 utterances (2.75%) used in bald on record strategies, 942 utterances (60.34%) of PoPoSs, 429 utterances (27.48%) of NePoSs and 147 utterances (9.41%) of off record strategies. From table 4.1 and chart 4.1 above, it can be seen

that all four kinds of PoSs were used for all their guests. There are 1561 utterances which consist of 750 utterances (48.04%) used by MC David Letterman and 811 utterances (51.95%) used by MC Lai Van Sam. The using of PoSs is different for each guest because each strategy has its own function. Bald on record was used with the smallest rate among four PoSs with 43 times (2.76%) and it is used to talk with people that the Ss already know, be familiar with. MC David Letterman with 28 utterances (1.79%) used this strategy with more rate than MC Lai Van Sam with 15 utterances (0.96%) in his conversations. Contrary to the bald on record, positive PoSs were used the most frequency with 942 utterances (60.35%) to express solidarity and cooperation by two MCs. However, the table also shown that MC Lai Van Sam with 522 utterances (33.44%) applied the positive PoSs more than MC David Letterman with 420 utterances (26.90%). This was followed by the negative PoSs with 429 utterances (27.48%) to express respect and satisfy the H's negative face. In this strategy, MC David Letterman with 225 utterances (30%) had higher frequency than MC Lai Van Sam with 204 utterances (25.15%). It can also be seen that the use of positive and negative PoSs had greater amount than off record strategies with 77 utterances (4.93%) by MC David Letterman and 70 utterances (4.48%) by MC Lai Van Sam.

## **4.2. DISCUSSION**

### **4.2.1. Bald on Record Strategies in English and Vietnamese**

#### ***4.2.1.1. Cases of Non – minimization of the Face Threat***

#### ***4.2.1.2. Cases of FTA – oriented Bald on Record Usage***

#### ***4.2.1.3. Concluding Remarks***

There were 43 utterances with bald on record strategies used by

two MCs. There were 23 cases of non-minimization of the face threat utterances (53.49%); 17 utterances (25%) used by David Letterman and 6 utterances (8.8%) used by Lai Van Sam. In the cases of FTA oriented bald record usage, the total frequency utterances of two programs were 19 times (44.17%), MC David Letterman with 11 utterances (16.1%) made up a larger number than MC Lai Van Sam with 9 utterances (13.3%). Table 4.2 also shows that MC David Letterman with 28 utterances (41.1%) used Bald on Record strategies more than his partner, MC Lai Van Sam with 15 utterances (22.1%).

#### **4.2.2. Positive Politeness Strategies in English and Vietnamese**

The PoPoSs used by two MCs in two talk shows were 942 utterances. PoPo contains fifteen strategies. However, there was unequal usage among them. Strategy 6 (avoid disagreement) made up the biggest frequency with 271 times (28.77%). This was followed by the strategy 1 (note, attend H) with 105 times (11.15%). The third rank was strategy 12 (include both S and H in the activity) with 98 utterances (10.40%) used by two MCs. On the other hand, there were two strategies not found in the interview such as strategy 13 (give (or ask for) reasons) and strategy 14 (assume or assert reciprocity). Moreover, strategy 10 (offer, promise) was only found in the talk show “The Guests of VTV3”. In general, MC Lai Van Sam with 522 utterances (55.41%) was more dominant than MC David Letterman with 420 utterances (44.58%) in using positive PoSs. But there was also two strategies used more by MC David Letterman, for example, strategy 3 (Intensify interest to H): 36 utterances (3.82%) used by David Letterman and 30 utterances (3.18%) used by Lai Van Sam. From the analysis, it can be concluded that both MCs used the PoPoSs to maintain the

relationship to their guest and to make the positive face of their guests satisfied in order to make good rapports although the hear had low or high relative power, casual social distance and also low or high rank of imposition.

#### **4.2.3. Negative Politeness Strategies in English and Vietnamese**

There were 429 utterances (NePoSs used in the interview of two MCs with 225 utterances (52.45%) used by David Letterman and 204 utterances (47.55%) used by Lai Van Sam. Strategy 2 (question, hedge) had the biggest frequency with 133 times (31.0%) while the strategy 3, 8 and 9 were the least used with zero time in both programs. A bit lower than those of strategy 2 was the rate of the strategy 5 (give deference) with 90 times (20.98%). Strategy 7 (impersonalize S and H) was a bit lower with 78 times (18.18%) and strategy 10 (go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting H) could be only used by MC David Letterman with 10 times (2.33%). In contrast the use of PoPoSs, MC Lai Van Sam with 204 utterances (47.55%) was lower than MC David Letterman with 225 utterances (52.45%) in using the NePoSs. However, MC Lai Van Sam with 20 utterances (4.66%) was higher than MC David Letterman with 11 utterances (2.56%) in using strategy 1 (be conventionally indirect). In general, both MCs used the NePoSs to avoid the further imposition of obscurity or prolixity, to satisfy H's negative face and to minimize the threat by clarifying S view of the P, D and R values.

#### **4.2.4. Off Record Strategies in English and Vietnamese**

The total occurrences of utterances of two programs were 147 in which MC David Letterman spoke out 77 utterances (52.38%) making up the larger number than MC Lai Van Sam with 70 utterances (47.62%) in using off record strategy. Among four strategies found

in two MC's utterances, strategy 1 (give hints) had the biggest utterances with 55 times (37.41%). This was followed by strategy 6 (Use tautologies) with 34 times (23.13%). Strategy 5 (overstate) and strategy 9 (use metaphors) had the same frequency with 29 times (19.73%). In most of their utterances, two MCs not only needed a context to interpret the real meaning of off record utterances but also were influenced by three sociological variables (P, D and R).

### **4.3. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED BY THE TWO MCs**

#### **4.3.1. Similarities**

There are four kinds of PoSs utilized by two MCs, namely *bald on record*, *positive politeness*; *negative politeness* and *off record*. These PoSs were used in the two MCs' interviews with 1.561 utterances which consist of 750 utterances (48.04%) by MC David Letterman and 811 utterances (51.95%) by MC Lai Van Sam. All these were used with almost MCs' guests in the two talk shows to minimize the conflict or the effect of the FTA and to maintain the communication. It can be found that the two MCs were influenced by three sociological variables (P, D and R) in interviewing their guests. For example, the forms of address such as sir, madam, Mr, Mrs, were used for the guests who had high relative power and social distances to give deference and also use hedge to modify their utterances. The PoPoSs were often used for the guests who had low and equal relative power and social distance so that the MCs could minimize the distance or get cooperation from their guests in answering and giving feedback. Two MCs used the NePoSs with the guests who had high relative power and social distance to minimize imposition, give deference, avoid nuisance or make their utterances get more formal.

The strategy off record was also influenced by the rank of imposition more than the relative power and social distance because the interpretation of the utterances almost depended on the existence of contexts that frames up the utterances. It related to the condition and situation that took place when the conversation happened. The two MCs seemed to be similar in using this strategy and in leaving themselves an “out” by providing themselves with a number of defensible interpretations and in leaving it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it.

Moreover, in some cases, both MCs were similar in the use of the PoSs to satisfy the guests’ negative face or avoid reference to their guests involved in the FTAs in giving comment or indirect request. For example, with tactful and unsafe topics such as privacy, religious, bad news or sex, both American and Vietnamese MCs tend to be indirective, and reserved by using phrases: *by the way, kind of, a bit, it is said that, I hope that ...*

#### **4.3.2. Differences**

From the results of descriptive, qualitative, quantitative methods, it can be seen that there are differences in expressing the two MCs’ utterances. MC David Letterman used bald on record with larger rate than MC Lai Van Sam with 1.79% and 0.96% respectively. Similarly, the American MC also used more NePoSs than Vietnamese MC, accounting for 225 utterances at 52.45% compared with 204 utterances at 47.55%. With the American’s individual and open-minded characters, the American MC utilized two strategies in his utterances to create the maximum efficiency in his conversations and tend to be freer in minimizing imposition, using hedge and giving deference to his guests. Therefore, it could be inferred that The

American MC is more personal, straightforward and direct in showing his ideas and preference, while the Vietnamese MC appears to be more tentative, careful, and reserved in expressing his opinions and predilection.

There are differences in the occurred rate of the PoSs in two talk shows. The PoPo ranked the highest in frequency with 942 utterances (60.34%) in comparison with other strategies. The tables also show that MC Lai Van Sam with 522 utterances (33.44%) applied his strategy more than MC David Letterman with 420 utterances (26.90%). Following the PoPo was NePo with 429 utterances (27.48%) used both MCs. The most common strategies used by MC Lai Van Sam were PoPo with 522 utterances (33.44%) while the most preferred strategies used by MC David Letterman were NePo with 225 utterances (16.34%). It can be seen that the MC Lai Van Sam preferred to be milder and less direct in having a close relationship or friendliness because of the Vietnamese's high community and share characters. Off record ranked the third in frequency with 140 utterances (8.97%) in comparison with the four strategies. Bald on record was used with the smallest rate among four PoSs (2.63%). This strategy was used when the MCs' wants to satisfy their guests' face was small or they did not fear of with non cooperation with their guests. And because the conversation delivered in the talk shows had to be clear and efficient, the MCs had to manage the show and create a communicative and interesting talk show.

Finally, differences of category occurrences were also found in PoSs used by two MCs. There are small differences in the categories of PoSs used by two MCs. For example, in the PoPoSs, strategy 2 is of nearly equal frequencies with 17 times (25%) by MC Letterman and

20 times (29.4%) by MC Van Sam. Similarly, strategy 12 was used 48 times (70.6%) by MC Letterman and 50 times (73.5%) by MC Lai Van Sam. However, big differences are found in the frequencies of NePoSs in specific categories. For instance, in the NePoSs, strategy 2 had the biggest frequency with 133 times (31.0%) while strategy 3, 8 and 9 were used the least with zero times in both programs. A bit lower than those of strategy 2 was the rate of strategy 5 with 90 times (20.98%). Strategy 7 was a bit lower with 78 times (18.18%) and strategy 10 could be only used by MC David Letterman with 10 times (2.33%).

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

#### 5.1. CONCLUSIONS

1. PoSs found in this analysis were *bald on record*, *positive politeness*, *negative politeness* and *off record*. The most frequently used strategy among them was PoPo with higher utterances than any other strategies. With regard to used strategies, it is evident that the American MC was more direct than the Vietnamese MC in general. American and Vietnamese MCs appeared to be significantly different from each other in using strategies. While American MC tended to increase the level of directness by employing more imposing strategies like bald on record and NePo, Vietnamese MC tended to be in favour of PopPo and off record.

2. The three sociological variables (P, D and R) had impact on the MCs' using of strategies. Two MCs tended to use bald on record and NePo where the MCs had equal or higher rank and social status than their guests. The higher the P and D between the MC and the guests are, the more directive imposing utterances they tended to utilize. In comparison between PoPo and NePo used by two MCs, it seems evident that more PoPoSs were used according to the higher degree of solidarity and familiarity. Vietnamese MC tended to be consistent in using PoPoSs under any circumstance. It can be seen that the main effect on the usage of strategies of Vietnamese MC is the relative power while the D and P give significant effect to the usage of strategies of American MC. Using off record strategies of two MCs was influenced by the rank of imposition more than the P and D where the existence of contexts frames up the utterance. Off record is an indirect politeness strategy in which the S says something that can

be interpreted in more than one way.

3. American and Vietnamese MC can have access to the same range of speech acts, but they can differ in the PoSs they used. Two MCs were observed to bring into interactions, assumptions and norms of their own cultures, which was probably the source of using different strategies in communication. For example, using off record strategy is determined by the existence of context, experience and mutual knowledge, pragmatic rules between the MC and their guests.

## **5.2. SUGGESTIONS**

The studies should be expanded with a larger and more complete research since one of the limitations of this thesis is attributed to the scope of study. This thesis focuses on using PoSs in verbal communication, but other important factors such as paralinguistic factors, non-linguistic factors were not taken into account because of their culture-specific features. It is hoped that this study can be used as the reference for the next researcher who wants to conduct the research in the same field and broaden the object of the research.

The findings of this research may serve as guidance in providing some implications for teaching and learning English conversations. It should be necessary to design situational exercises or exercises of recognizing PoSs in teaching, learning daily dialogues in English and Vietnamese and training communicative skills for people who want to be TV MCs.

The American and Vietnamese MCs were culturally different so they had different ways in using PoSs. American Ss seemed to utilize more direct strategies than Vietnamese ones when they make communication. Moreover, the interpretation of utterances in using PoSs is determined by the existence of the context, the different

pragmatic rules between two languages. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers and course designers should be responsible for raising the learner's pragmatic knowledge so that the learners could acquire native communication in using English.