

## CHAPTER II

### FRAMEWORK OF THE THEORIES

In this chapter, I discuss about the theories which are related to the politeness strategies. The term of politeness strategies is described in detail. The politeness strategies are analysed to help me answer the questions.

#### 2.1 Pragmatic

Many experts have various definitions of pragmatic. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is a study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). This study involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influenced what the speaker said. This approach also explores how listeners can make inferences about what they say in order to be understood with the interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning.

In reference to Stephen C. Levinson (1983), pragmatic is important to learn in trying to understand the social meaning of language usage patterns. It is essential to understand the main structural properties and procedures that require verbal interaction. Pragmatic allow people to understand about people's implicit intention, such as their purposes, assumptions, and actions. Pragmatic problems do not only happen in our daily lives, but also happen in dialogue of movies. It can be seen through the language used from the characters which supported by their environments and the used of their language. For that reason, the dialogues by the characters in movie becomes interesting to be studied. From the language used, the researcher finds some relevant aspects.

#### 2.2 Politeness

According to Yule (1996), politeness is a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange. We used to think that conversation is a conflict-free, where the speakers normally being able to satisfy

one another needs and interests. In fact, we enter every conversation, every kind of discourse with some personal desired thing in mind. For some of these needs, participant can approve to each other and gain each other's need, but with others, one must lose for the other to win. In such cases, there is the danger of insult which can caused the break-down of the communication. Politeness strategy is essential in order to avoid any kind of misunderstanding cases.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), politeness theory came from a concept about a social self-image. This self-image is known as "face". They explain that face refers to self-social image that every person claims for him or her. The term "face" has two types, positive and negative face. Positive face is known as the individual's need to be respected and accepted in social interaction. On the other side, negative face is known as the individual's need to have a freedom of action and imposition in social interaction. In social interaction sometimes we find that speaker say something that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image, and this is called as face threatening act (FTA). To lessen the utterances that might be interpreted as a threat is called face saving act. In order to avoid FTA's, the speakers use specific strategies to minimize the threat according to a rational judgement of the face risk to the participant.

### **2.2.1 Politeness by Brown and Levinson's Theory**

Based upon Brown and Levinson theory, there are four strategies of politeness; bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record. The four strategies are explained as follows.

#### **a. Bald on- Record**

In this strategy, FTA is performed whenever the speaker wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than the speaker wants to satisfy the hearer's face. There is no effort to acknowledge the hearer's face wants. This strategy is commonly found in people who know each other well, and who are comfortable in their surroundings, such as a close friend and family. And in this strategy, there are five sub-strategies. They are showing disagreement (criticism), giving

suggestion or advice, requesting, warning; threatening, and using an imperative form. Those five sub-strategies of bald on record are showed in Table 1.

Table 1. Sub-strategies of Bald on Record

No.	Sub-strategies	Example
1.	Showing disagreement (criticism)	That's wrong. The gap should be bigger
2.	Giving suggestion or advice	Take care of yourself, be good, have fun.
3.	Requesting	Your wig is askew, let me fix it for you.
4.	Warning; threatening	Careful! He's a dangerous man
5.	Using imperative form	Give me the nails!

#### b. Positive Politeness

Positive face is known as every individual's needs to be respected and accepted in social interaction. The positive politeness strategy is used when the speaker recognize that the hearer has needs to be respected. This strategy is commonly used in the groups of friends or the people where they are in the social situation know each other well. Here, the FTA is relatively low. It usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendly statement and the same interest in the hearer's needs. According to Brown and Levinson, there are three sub-strategies in positive politeness: claiming common ground, conveying that S and H are co-operation, and fulfilling H's wants for some X. Those sub-strategies of positive politeness are showed in Table 2.

Table 2. Sub-strategies of Positive Politeness

No.	Sub-strategies	Example
1.	Claiming common ground: a. Noticing, attending to H (his interest, wants, needs and goods)	What a beautiful vase this is! Where did it come from?

	b. Exaggerating (interest, approval, sympathy with H)	What a fantastic garden you have!
	c. Intensifying interest to H	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...
	d. Using in-group identity markers: in-group language or dialect, jargon, slang, contraction or ellipses	Help me with this bag here, will you <b>son?</b>
	e. Seeking agreement: safe topics, repetition	A: John went to London this weekend! B: To London!
	f. Avoiding disagreement: token agreement, pseudo-agreement, white lies, hedging opinions	A: You hate your Mum and Dad B: Oh, sometimes.
	g. Presupposing/raising/asserting common ground: gossip, small talk, point of view operations, presupposition manipulation	Oh dear, we've lost our little ball, haven't we, Johnny?
	h. Joking	How about lending me this old heap of junk?
2.	Conveying that S and H are co-operators:	
	a. Asserting or presupposing S's knowledge or and concerning for H's wants	I know you can't bear parties, but this one will really be good--- do come!
	b. Offering, promising	I'll buy you a new phone, if you get a good grade.

	c. Being optimistic	Look, I'm sure you won't mind if I borrow your typewriter
	d. Including both S and H in the activity	Let's have a cookie, then
	e. Giving or asking for reasons	Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend?
	f. Assuming or asserting reciprocity	Mom, if you let me stay on Molly's house tomorrow, I will help you clean the dishes.
3.	Fulfilling H's want for some X	A: here, a cup of coffee for you, Meg
	a. Giving gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	B: Great! Thanks A: No problem. I wonder if you could spare me a minute or two

### c. Negative Politeness

Negative face is known as the individual's need to have a freedom of action and imposition in social interaction. Negative politeness also recognizes the hearer's face and admits that the speaker is in some way imposing on the hearer. According to Yule (1996) the tendency to use negative politeness forms, emphasizing the hearer's right to freedom can be seen as a deference strategy. A deference strategy is involved in what is called "formal politeness". This strategy is commonly used in a group or just an option used on a particular occasion.

In negative politeness, the threat to face is relatively high. The negative politeness is focus on minimizing the imposition by trying to soften it. There are five sub-strategies of negative politeness: being indirect, not presuming/assuming, not coercing H, communicating S's want to not impinge on H, and redressing other wants of H's. Those sub-strategies are showed in Table 3.

Table 3. Sub-strategies of Negative Politeness

No.	Sub-strategies	Example
1.	Be indirect a. Be conventionally indirect	Can you pass the salt?
2.	Do not presume/assume a. Questioning, using hedge: hedge on ilucotinary force, prosodic/kinesic hedges	I wonder if ( <b>you know whether</b> ) John went out.
3.	Not coerce H: a. Be pessimistic	I don't imagine there'd be any possibility of you to talk to me tomorrow.
	b. Minimize the imposition	I just want to ask you if you could lend me a single sheet of paper.
	c. Giving deference	Excuse me, <b>sir</b> , but would you mind if I close the window?
4.	Communicating S's want to not impinge on H a. Apologize: admit the impingement, indicate reluctance, give overwhelming reasons, beg forgiveness	I'm sorry to bother you....

	b. Impersonalize S and H: use performatives, imperative, impersonal verbs, passive and circumstantial voices, replace the pronouns 'I' and 'You' by indefinites, pluralize the 'I' and 'you' pronouns, use point-of-view distance	Do this for me
	c. Stating the FTA as a general rule	Passenger will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train
	d. Nominalize	Your good performance on the examination impressed us favourably
5.	Redressing other wants of H's a. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebted H	I'd be eternally grateful if you would help me with this math homework

#### d. Off-Record

Off-record or indirect is a communicative act which is done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act. In other words, the actor leaves himself an 'out' by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations. Off record utterances are indirect uses of language and contains less information in the sense that it rules out fewer possible states of affairs or actually different from what one means. In this case, H must make some inference to recover what was in fact intended. If the speaker wants to do the FTA, in contrast, the speaker wants to avoid the responsibility by doing it. The speaker can do an off-record and leave it up to the H to decide how H interpret it. The hearer cannot know that a hint has been mentioned; the speaker can credibly

claim a different possible interpretation. In this sense, the threat to face is very high. The sub-strategies of off-record is invite conversational implicature, be vague or ambiguous. Those sub-strategies are showed in table 4.

Table 4. Sub-strategies of Off-Record.

No.	Sub-strategies	Example
1.	Invite conversational implicatures:	
	a. Give hints	It's cold in here (c.i shut the window)
	b. Give association rules	Oh God, I've <b>got a headache again</b>
	c. Presuppose	I washed the car <b>again</b> today
	d. Understate	That car looks as if it <b>might go!</b> (about a flashy sports car, c.i compliment)
	e. Overstate	There were a <b>million</b> people in the Co-op tonight!
	f. Use tautologies	Boys will be boys
	g. Use contradictions	A: are you upset about that? B: well, <b>I am and I'm not</b>
	h. Be ironic	<b>John's a real genius.</b> (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row)
	i. Use metaphors.	<b>Harry's a real fish.</b> (He is cold-blooded like a fish)



	j. Use rhetorical questions	<b>How many times do I have to tell you?</b> (too many)
2.	Be vague or ambiguous: violate the manner of maxim:	
	a. Be ambiguous	John's pretty smooth cookie.
	b. Be vague	I'm going down the road for a bit (to the local pub)
	c. Over-generalize	The lawn has got to be mown
	d. Displace H	<b>A: someone has to be responsible with this mess.</b> B: you know who was having party with his friends tonight here. (C, the one who was having time there, is close to A and B. A pretends that the FTA is addressed to B, but s/he hopes C will realize that the FTA is threaten to him/her
e. Be incomplete, use ellipsis	Well, I didn't see you...	

### 2.3 The Sociological Variables of Politeness Strategy

Based on Brown and Levinson theory, the assessment of the seriousness of an FTA involves these following factors in many and perhaps all cultures such as: the 'social distance' (D) of S and H, the relative "power" (P) of S and H, and the absolute ranking (R) of impositions in the particular culture. Another important

element to understand about the relation between the face and politeness are connected and involves the face-threatening act (FTA). The seriousness or weightiness of an FTA is compounded of both risk to S's face and risk to H's face. For example, apologies and confessions are essentially threats to S's face, and advice and orders are basically threat to H's face, while request and offers are likely to threaten both S and H faces.

**a. Distance (D)**

Distance (D) is a symmetric social dimension of similarity or difference within which S and H stand for the purposes of this act. In many cases, it is based on an assessment of the frequency of interaction and the kinds of material or non-material goods including face exchanged between S and H. An important part of the assessment of D will be measures of social distance based on stable social attributes. The reflex of social closeness is the reciprocal giving and receiving of positive face.

This table is the example of distance in politeness strategy. For example, the relative power of S and H is more or less equal, and the impositions is not great. Such small impositions are found for example, in requests for "free goods" such as like a match, telling the time or giving directions which all members of the public may reasonably demand from one another. With P and R held constant and small, only the expression of D varies in this following example:

Distance (D)	(1) Excuse me, would you by any chance have the time? (2) Got the time, mate?
--------------	--

In that situations, (1) would be used where S and H were distant or strangers and number (2) would be used where S and H were close or know each other. Therefore, (D) is the only variable that changes from (1) to (2).

**b. Power (P)**

Power (P) is an asymmetric social dimension of relative power. Power is the degree to which H can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation at the expense of S's plans and self-evaluation. In general, there are two sources of P, either of which may be authorized or unauthorized, material control, and metaphysical control. In many cases, an individual's power is drawn from both these sources or is thought to overlap them. The reflex of a great P differential is perhaps the representative of deference

The next is an example of Power shown in the table. In this context, D and R are held constant and have small values if S and H know each other by sight, and the imposition is a request for free goods.

Power (P)	(3) Excuse me sir, would it be alright if I smoke? (4) Mind if I smoke?
-----------	--

In the situation above number (3) might be said by an employee to his boss, while number (4) might be said by the boss to the employee in the same situation. Therefore, P is the only variable that changes from (3) to (4).

**c. Rank / imposition (R)**

Rank (R) is a culturally defined as ranking of impositions by the degree to which they are considered to interfere with an agent's wants of self-determination of approval of their positive or negative face wants. In general, there are two ranks that are identifiable for negative face FTA" a ranking of impositions in proportion to the expenditure of services which includes the provision of time, and of goods which include non-material goods like information, as well as the expression of regard. These intra-culturally defined costings of impositions on an individual's preserve are in general constant only in their rank order from one situation to another. For the FTA against positive face, the ranking involves an assessment of the amount of 'pain' given to H's face, based on the discrepancy between H's own desired self-image and that presented blatantly in the FTA.

The next is the example of R. in this context, P is small and D is great, for example S and H are strangers, the P and D are held constant.

Rank (R)	<p>(5) Look, I'm terribly sorry to bother you but would there be any chance of your lending me just enough money to get a railway ticket to get home? I must have dropped my purse and I just don't know what to do</p> <p>(6) Hey, got a change for quarter?</p>
----------	---

In the situation above (5) considers the FTA to be much more serious than the FTA done in (6). In conclusion, asking for a substantial amount of money without recompense is much more of an imposition than a request to search in one's pockets for change.

#### 2.4 Context of Situation of Politeness Strategy Use

There are some factors that affects the use of politeness strategy. First is the difference social status, people tend to speak more polite when they speak to someone who has higher status than him or her. Second is the difference age gap. People tend to speak more polite when they speak to someone who is older than him or her. According to Cutting (2002), he referred to Brown and Levinson theory (1978) in order to enter into social relationships, we have to acknowledge and show an awareness of the public self-image to the people we address. It is a universal characteristic across cultures that speakers should respect each other's expectation regarding self-image.

#### 2.5 Literature Review

There are some researches that dealing with pragmatic especially politeness strategies have been conducted several times. Mifta Hasmi (2013) analysed "A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Reflected in *Nanny McPhee* Movie". The objectives of the research are: (1) to identify the types of politeness strategies employed by the main characters in *Nanny McPhee* movie, and (2) to describe the way politeness strategies are realized in the utterances employed by the main

characters in *Nanny McPhee* movie. The result of the research was that in the application of the strategies, the main characters in *Nanny McPhee* movie mostly applied positive politeness strategy compared to other strategies.

Another analysis of politeness strategy is a thesis “A Pragmatic Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies as Reflected By The Characters in *Carnage* Movie” which was written by Jeihan Jade Archia (2014) The objectives of the research are: (1) to find the strategies of positive politeness expressed by the characters in *Carnage* movie, and (2) to identify the types of maxim violation applied by the characters in *Carnage* in expressing the positive politeness strategies. The result of the research was that in the application of positive politeness strategy, the main characters mostly applied of sub-strategies noticing, attending to H and giving gifts to H compared to other sub-strategies of positive politeness. And the next result showed that in the application of violation of maxims, the main characters mostly applied of violation of relation maxim which the character violate the maxim of relation during their utterances.

A research journal entitled “Theories on Politeness by Focusing on Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Theory” by Hossein Sadegoghli and Masoumeh Niroomand (2016) from Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran, is also used as the reference for my research. This journal aims to investigate the denotation of politeness in different cultures and try to identify the different patterns and discourse strategies. It employs the theory of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson.

Another research journal entitled “Politeness Strategy in Everyday Communication” by Marina Ryabova (2015) from Kemerovo State Univeristy, Russia, is used as the reference of my research. This study aims to analyse the use of some models of English speech etiquette, specifically the use of politeness forms typical of the English.

A research journal entitled “The Use of Politeness Strategies in the Analysis and Discussion Sections of English Research Articles” by Ebenezer Agbaglo (2017) from University of Cape Coast (UCC), Cape Coast, Ghana, is used as the

reference of my research. This study aims to analyse the use of politeness devices in the analysis and discussion sections of research articles produced by English Language Teachers in the University of Cape Coast.

The first, second, third and the fifth research applied the same theory which is politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson. The difference of the second research compared to other researches is she or he applied Grice theory which is the cooperative principle focusing on the violation of maxims. On the other hand, the fourth research focused in the models of English speech etiquette, specifically the use of politeness forms based on Leech (1996) *Principles of Pragmatics*.

Similar with the fifth previous study, in this research I analyse the politeness strategies in *Little Women* movie. I analyse the use of politeness strategy and the way politeness strategies are realized in the utterances reflected by the characters in *Little Women* movie. I use Brown and Levinson's theory to observe the politeness strategies in the movie. The differences between this research and the previous study are the object of the research, theme of the movie that will lead to different results. The objective of this research is to find the politeness strategies in the movie reflected in the utterances.