CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter contains the theories that I use to analyze the data I get and also answer the research questions described in chapter 1. This chapter also contains a comparison between my research and previous research which is still related to the theme of my research.

2.1 Pragmatic

Yule (2020), stated that pragmatics is the study of intended meaning, or how people can recognize that intended meaning when it is not written or said. For that to happen, the speaker or writer must be able to depend on a lot of shared knowledge when they try to communicate. The investigation of that shared knowledge gives us some insights into how more is always being communicated than is said. Understanding what someone else means when they talk is central to pragmatics. Consequently, students of Pragmatics learn how to decipher the intended meaning of a given language. Additionally, the study of pragmatics seeks to avoid misunderstanding in physical context-dependent communication. Last but not least, pragmatics is the study of how language and social context influence the meaning of words exchanged between the speaker and the hearer.

Studying polite language requires an understanding of pragmatics, which is foundational knowledge. The objective of pragmatics is to ensure that people have the tools they need to communicate effectively through the use of language. If you want to avoid misunderstandings, it helps to know some pragmatics (Permadi, Mulyati & Hasibin, 2022). In addition, according to Birner (2021), he defines pragmatics as a field of linguistics that studies the meaning according to the circumstance specifically, how interlocutors of the speaker understand the intended based on what the speaker said. In communicating, humans sometimes do not directly convey their intention through the words they say, but that true intention is hidden in the words they say.

2.2 Context

Context plays a significant role in analyzing the meaning and intent of a speech act. Setting, participants, background knowledge of participants, and social relations among participants are all factors that influence an utterance. Understanding the aim and meaning of an utterance requires knowledge of the environment in which the communication occurred. The reason for this is that when one utterance emerges in a new context, its meaning and the meaning of the utterance change. Horn and Ward (2006) define "context" as all relevant contextual information that can help determine the real intention of the speaker. In other words, context can be described as information relating to the topic of conversation, which can help determine the true meaning of the utterances spoken by the speaker. The information here is everything that the speaker knows, and according to the speaker's expectations, the listener knows that too, so that the listener can know the true meaning of the utterances that the speaker is saying. So, in uttering his utterances, the speaker depends on the "context" that he knows or is around where the interaction occurs, in which this "context" allows the listener to understand or know the true meaning of the utterances that the speaker is saying. Cutting (2002), divides context into 3 types: situational context, background knowledge context, and co-textual context.

2.2.1 Situational Context

According to Cutting (2002), situational context is the knowledge of the speaker about things that can be seen by the speaker around where the interaction occurs. In other words, situational context can mean information related to the environment, time, and place where the interaction occurs that is known by the speaker. For example, people who talk or chat on public roads or outdoors in a normal or slightly high-pitched voice will not get any reactions from the people around them where they are chatting. However, when people chatted inside the library in a normal or slightly high-tone voice, they would get "shushed" or reprimanded by the people around them. Here the "situational context" is a library that does have rules that require visitors to be silent. It's the same as the difference between when we talk at a party and when we talk at a funeral. At parties, we talk

happily, but when at a funeral, our tone tends to be slower to respect the funeral. That's what's called a situational context, so the place or situation where you're talking can affect the speaker's intention.

2.2.2 Background Knowledge Context

According to Cutting (2002), background knowledge context is a context that focuses on things that the speaker and listener know about their interlocutor and also on information in the world that they know. So, it can be said that the background knowledge context is based on assumptions related to something about the interlocutor or common things that are shared between the speaker and the interlocutor. Cutting (2002), divides background knowledge into two kinds, namely cultural and interpersonal.

2.2.2.1 Cultural

Cutting (2002) stated that cultural background knowledge is general knowledge that most people carry with them in their minds, about areas of life. It can be said that this cultural background knowledge is general information that people have regarding things in life. People who are passing someone that they consider older will consciously bow. It can be assumed that the people who do it are mostly Indonesians because Indonesians have this shared general knowledge and it was taught to them by their parents from childhood, which became their cultural background knowledge. Actions that are carried out together or information that is shared by several people or groups related to life, like the example above, can be called cultural background knowledge on a small scale because it only involves a race. We can see a great example in the fact that the United States is a country. This conversation about the United States can be understood because it is general information that is shared or had by everyone.

2.2.2.2 Interpersonal

Cutting (2002) explained that interpersonal knowledge is specific or perhaps private information about the speaker or the interlocutor. Information that

we know about our interlocutors, such as a home address, the name of a wife or husband, or maybe also the color of the car that our interlocutor has, is interpersonal knowledge. This information is usually obtained through past conversations, so that the speaker's interlocutor or vice versa knows this specific information.

There is a conversation that can exemplify this interpersonal background knowledge, which is like this:

Jack : Hey, how is Martha? Is she okay now?

Robert : Yes, my mother is now in a good condition.

Jack : Glad to hear that, hopefully, she will recover very soon.

Robert : I hope so.

Jack here mentions "Martha" and Robert says "My Mother," so it can be assumed that Jack knows that Robert's mother's name is Martha. The information that Jack knows about Robert's mother is considered interpersonal background knowledge.

2.2.3 Co-textual Context

Cutting (2002) defines co-textual context as the interlocutor's knowledge of surrounding words mentioned in the text that aids in determining what the speaker meant. Co-textual context is the words that are in the sentence, which can help conclude the main intent of the sentence spoken by the speaker. We hear someone say, "I want to go to the bank to deposit money," and someone else says, "I camped at the river bank." Both of these sentences contain the word "bank," but have different meanings because of the contextual context in the sentences. In sentences containing the word "money" as well as "deposit," the interlocutor can assume that the word "bank" in question is a financial institution that is licensed to accept checking and savings deposits and provide loans. Meanwhile, the word "bank" in the second sentence has another meaning because of the surrounding word "river" in the co-text, so it can be assumed by the interlocutor that what is meant by the word "bank" in the second sentence is land on the side of a river.

2.3 Politeness

An integral part of human nature is politeness. All the ways in which one's outlook shapes their lives fall under its purview. It's an often-overlooked aspect of social interaction that's crucial to maintaining positive relationships with others (Ayuningrum, Pulungan, & S, 2019). Yule (2020) defines politeness as showing awareness and consideration of another person's self-image. In other words, politeness is an act of showing awareness and concern about other people's self-image. Being tactful, modest, and nice to other people means you are doing politeness. In addition, Cutting (2002) defines politeness as an act of friendliness through language. So, politeness can be said as an act of showing that you are polite in speaking to keep one's face.

2.4 Face

A person's "Face" is their linguistic and social identity. In politeness theory, "face" refers to a person's sense of self-worth or self-image, which can be hurt, maintained, or boosted depending on their interactions with others (Saputra, 2019). In practicing politeness, the main goal of it is to maintain or respect the "face" that people have. Based on Cutting (2002), face is a public self-image or sense of self, of the people that we address. In life, especially in social life, humans must maintain their social relationships between humans. One thing that can be done to maintain this relationship is to be aware of one's image and respect that image. Especially in communicating, where in communicating humans can express various kinds of emotions with just words.

According to Yule (2020), there are two kinds of face we have, they are negative face and positive face. A negative face is the need to be independent and unimpeded by others. Positive face is the need to be part of a group or the need to be accepted. Negative face is related to their freedom of act, their rights to act as they want. While positive politeness is the desire of one person to be accepted, and admired by others and desires his wishes to be appealing at least to some members (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Face-saving act (FSA) are spoken or performed words or deeds that lessen the harm to another person's face, whereas

face-threatening act (FTA) are spoken or performed words or deeds that increase the threat to another person's self-image (Hartoyo, Mansyur & Listiani, 2019). For example, you work as a waiter and then ask someone with a higher position than you to make coffee during breaks. This can be called a face-threatening act (FTA). On the other hand, something that is an indirect request, which uses a question as a concern of the possibility of the request being done by the interlocutor or not, can be called as a face-saving act.

2.5 Politeness Strategies

The politeness strategy is a method to express good manners. The politeness strategy is one way of showing tactfulness, and consideration as the speaker to the interlocutor. Politeness can be interpreted as how people choose their words to convey the true meaning of the sentences they speak. Brown and Levinson (1987), proposed politeness strategies into four types. There are Bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record.

2.5.1 Positive Politeness

Positive politeness is an attempt to make amends by appealing to the hearer's positive face, that is, his or her ever-present hope that his or her needs (or the doing, acquiring, or valuing that comes from them) will be regarded as desirable. In order to make amends, one must convey to the other person that one's own desires (or at least some of them) are similar to those of the hearer in some way. People are more likely to be nice to one another when they are in the company of friends or in a social setting where they already know each other well. It typically seeks to close the gap between them by voicing warmth and a genuine concern for the other person's desire to be respected (minimize the FTA) (Hutauruk, 2017).

The positive politeness strategy is divided into fifteen strategies by Brown and Levinson (1987). They are as follows: notice, attend to the hearer; exaggerate; intensify interest to hearer; use in group identity markers; seek agreements; avoid disagreement; presuppose/raise/assert common ground; joke; assert or presuppose the speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's wants; offer, promise; be

optimistic; include both the speaker and the hearer; provide (ask for) reasons; assume or assert reciprocity; and give gifts to the hearer.

2.5.1.1 Notice, attend to Hearer (his interest, wants, needs, goods)

The strategy recommends that the speaker should take into consideration different aspects of the condition of the hearer (noticeable changes, extraordinary possession, and everything that the hearer wants to be noticed and recognized by the speakers). For example:

"*Goodness, you paint your nails!".*

2.5.1.2 Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)

The speaker used this strategy by saying an utterance that way higher than the actual condition using an exaggerating adjective, intonation, stress, and intensifying modifier. For example:

"*What a fantastic bag you have!"*

2.5.1.3 Intensify interest to hearer

Speaker wants to share his/her interest to hearer as a form of speaker's contribution into the conversation by making a good story This strategy is the way for the speaker to communicate with the hearer. For example:

"I come down the stairs, and what do you think I see? a huge mess all over the place, the phone's off the hook and clothes are scattered all over" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 106)

When doing this strategy, it is not uncommon to move back and forth between the past and the present tense, as is the case in the example, in which the speaker is describing the responses of her family members to an earlier event. For example:

"Yesterday night I went to that shop. I buy some things from him. He's all right, isn't he? He speaks nicely. Today I heard that he's dead and gone and I was very surprised" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 107)

2.5.1.4 Use in-group identity markers (addressed forms, dialect, jargon or slang)

The speaker is able to implicitly claim the common ground with the hearer that is carried by the definition of the group if they use any one of the countless ways to indicate in-group membership. Ingroup usages of address, varieties of language such as dialect or slang, and ellipsis are some examples of these.

Forms of address, which are utilized in various languages as the second person or plural pronoun of address forms, include generic names and phrases of address such as *Mac, mate, buddy, pal, honey, dear, duckie, luv, babe, Mom, blondie, brother, sister, cutie, sweetheart, guys, and fellas*. For example:

"*Bring me your dirty toys to wash, son.*"

The utterance indicates that the speaker considers the relative power (power, status difference) The utterance demonstrates that the speaker believes the relative power gap between himself and the hearer to be relatively small. As a result, the imperative is made more palatable by demonstrating that it is not a command that is backed by power.

2.5.1.5 Seek agreement (safe topics, repetition)

Seeking out ways in which it is possible to agree with the hearer is another characteristic manner of asserting that you share common ground with the hearer. The use of safe topics gives the speaker the opportunity to emphasize his agreement with the hearer and, as a result, satisfies the hearer's desire to be "correct" or to have his opinions validated. One other component of trying to get an agreement is identifying the aspects of the subject matter on which it is possible to reach an agreement and then sticking to those aspects.

The use of repeating is appropriate when the speaker wishes to emphasize their emotional agreement with the utterances, or when they wish to emphasize their attention and astonishment. In a conversation, one way to emphasize repetition agreement is by repeating either part or all of what the previous speaker has said. This can be done in whole or in part. In addition to proving that one has heard the information that was presented in the correct manner. It is common

practice to employ repetition in order to emphasize either one's emotional agreement with the utterance or one's attention and astonishment in it. For example:

John   : *I was hospitalized for 3 days*

Damian   : *You were hospitalized for 3 days?!*

The example above showed that the speaker using repetition. Damian repeats the part of John's utterances to emphasize his emotional agreement.

2.5.1.6 Avoid disagreement

In this strategy, the speaker must agree with the hearer to save the hearer's face. Using this strategy, speakers could twist their words as if they agree with the hearer to hide disagreement. This strategy consists of token agreement which is where the speaker pretends to be agreed with the hearer, pseudo-agreement which is the use of the word "then" as the conclusory marker, white lies which are when the speaker is in a position of necessity to state an opinion want to lie rather than damage the hearer's positive face, and the last one is hedging opinion where the speaker chooses to be vague to not be seen to disagree. (Brown & Levinson So, it can be concluded that in this strategy the speaker may go in twisting his utterances to agree or to hide disagreement.

1. Token Agreement

   This approach is taken when the speaker wants to give the impression that they agree with the hearer, but in the reality they do not. Instead of saying "no," the speaker will decide to say "yes, but..." in order to give the impression that they do. For example:

   John   : *Your cat is small*

   Rey   : *Yes but, she eats a lot*

The example above showed that Rey is actually avoiding disagreement with John. Rey is actually disagreed with John's statement but rather than saying "*no*" Rey says "*yes*" to minimize the FTA towards John's positive face. Therefore, it makes John feels his statement is not wrong and it maintain his positive face.

2. Pseudo-agreement

   This strategy is usually used when the speaker wants to conclude their conversation, this action possibly could be used to end the conversation without damaging the positive face of the hearer. The most common way to use pseudo-agreement is by using the words "*then*" and "*so*". Example:

   "*I will meet you in front of the store, then*"

The example above shows that the speaker concludes his conversation with the hearer.

3. White lies

   This way occurs when the speaker needs to lie rather than damaging the hearer's positive face. This strategy is typically used when the speaker is requested to state an opinion and refusing a request by lying and pretending there are reasons why the request cannot be completed. This can be seen when the hearer requested the speaker to play skateboard together. For example:

   "*I can't join you, my skateboard is broken*"

The example above showed that the speaker avoiding disagreement using white lies. The speaker and the hearer know the statement is not true. But the speaker saved the hearer's face by not refusing his request directly.

4. Hedging opinion

   This method was utilized whenever the speaker wished to conceal his disagreement with the topic at hand by remaining ambiguous with his opinion. When someone is unclear, it indicates that they are using hedges (in some cases hedges also applied in positive politeness)

2.5.1.7 Presuppose/ raise/ assert common ground.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy deals with gossip and small talk, point of view operation by means of deixis and, presupposition manipulation.

1. Small Talk

    This strategy is typically utilized when the speaker wants to redress the FTA of the hearer's positive face. It involves the speaker spending time with the hearer as a sign of friendliness and interacting with them about a variety of issues that are irrelevant to the topic at hand.

2. Point of View Operation

    This strategy is used to bring a point of view closer to the speaker and the hearer by shortening the space between them. Which consisting of a personal-center switch (which speaks like the hearer is the speaker), a time switch (which swiftly changes the tenses from the past to the present), and a place switch (use here, this rather than there, that).

3. Presuppose Manipulation

    When a speaker employs this strategy, they are making the assumption that the hearer will share their perspective or will simply accept their point of view. Presuppose manipulation is divided into several types those are; Presuppose knowledge of the hearer's wants and attitudes (by asking questions in which the response is always assumed to be "no," this strategy used to demonstrate an understanding of the listener's desires, preferences, and routines), presuppose the hearer's value being the same as the speaker's value (the use of a scale that assumed the speaker and hearer share the same criteria), presuppose familiarity in the speaker-hearer relationship (the use of familiar address like 'honey' or 'darling' presuppose that the hearer is familiar), presuppose the hearer's knowledge (the speaker says something presupposes that the hearer also knows about what the speaker talking about).

2.5.1.8 Joke

This strategy is employed on the basis of mutually shared background knowledge values, which reframe the range of the FTA. The FTA of requesting may be reduced by the speaker through the use of a joke. The conclusion that can

be drawn from this is that the speaker makes use of jokes in order to put the hearer at ease and entertain.

2.5.1.9 Assert or presuppose speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's wants.

This strategy is employed in situations in which the speaker wishes to show their cooperation with the hearer by showing their knowledge and awareness towards the hearer. Because the speaker is aware of the things that the hearer dislikes, they are able to make assertions that are designed to pique the attention of the hearer. As a consequence of these assertions, the hearer will desire to comply with the speaker's request. This act has the potential to redress the positive face of the hearer because the speaker acts as if they comprehend the hearer's dislikes.

2.5.1.10 Offer, promise

The speaker may choose to emphasize his cooperation with the hearer in a different way as a means of reducing the threat posed by doing FTA. In other words, the speaker can assure the hearer that, within a given context, he will do everything it takes to make his desires a reality. This strategy inevitably results in the speaker making offers and promises, even if they are fake because they are meant to display good intentions toward satisfying the hearer's positive face. It can be concluded that the speaker will try to satisfy the hearer's positive face by offering or promising something to the hearer.

2.5.1.11 Be optimistic.

Using this strategy, the speaker will likely believe that the hearer wants the same thing they do, and the hearer will be more willing to assist the speaker in achieving their goal. Accordingly, it follows that the speaker employing this strategy will expect the hearer to assume that the speaker and the hearer want the same things and will work together to achieve their shared goal.

2.5.1.12 Include both the speaker and the hearer in the activity.

In this strategy, the speaker uses the inclusive 'we' form to include the hearer in his utterances. An inclusive 'we' form done by the speaker could redress the FTA to the hearer. So, it can be concluded that the speaker in this strategy includes the hearer in his utterances to cooperate with the request to minimize the FTA.

2.5.1.13 Give or ask for reasons

Another way to involve the hearer in the action is for the speaker to explain the motivations behind his desires, or why he wants what he wants. Through the use of hearer practical reasoning and the assumption of reflexivity (hearer desires speaker's wants), the hearer is ultimately brought to recognize the reasonableness of the speaker's FTA (at least, this is the hope of the speaker). In other words, providing explanations is a method of saying "I can help you" or "you can help me," and presuming cooperation is a way of demonstrating what assistance is required. In addition, providing reasons is a way of showing what help is needed.

2.5.1.14 Assume or assert reciprocity

The strategy is done by giving evidence of reciprocal rights or obligations obtained between the speaker and hearer. Therefore, the speaker can say "I'll do X for you if you do Y for me,' or 'I did X for you last week, so you do Y for me this week '(or vice versa). So, it can be concluded that in this strategy the speaker will ask for reciprocal rights or obligations to the hearer.

2.5.1.15 Give gifts to the hearer (sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

The speaker will satisfy the hearer's positive face by action, not only just giving a tangible gift but also sympathy, understanding, and so on. Human loves affection, they love to be liked, cared about, listened and understood. So, it can be concluded that the speaker will satisfy the hearer's positive face by doing some action to redress the FTA.

2.5.2 Negative Politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), negative politeness is corrective action directed at the hearer negative face, which is his desire for freedom of action and uninterrupted attention. In contrast to all aspect of positive politeness, the goal of negative politeness is to reduce the impact that the FTA will inevitably place on a certain group of people. The goal of this strategy is to have the speaker impose as little as possible on the hearer.

The main point of the negative politeness is maintaining the hearer's face while doing FTA. Saying what we want and maintaining our freedom of act without impingement while also giving redress to the hearer's face is the point of doing negative politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987), divided negative politeness strategy into 10 strategies.

2.5.2.1 Be Conventionally Indirect

When employing this strategy, the speaker must manage two competing tensions. The first of these is the need to satisfy the urge to provide the listener with an "out" by utilizing indirect language. The second is the desire to go one record. In this particular instance, the problem can be fixed by utilizing words and sentences that, when taken in context, have meanings that are crystal clear but are not the same as their literal meanings (due to conventionalization).

2.5.2.2 Question, hedge

Question, hedge is a negative politeness strategy that is used when someone doesn't want to do what the speaker says. To go along with a desire, hedges are used to reduce risk of doing FTA (Julius & Ambalegin, 2021).

2.5.2.3 Be pessimistic

In this strategy, the focus is on giving redress to the hearer's negative face by explicitly showing doubt that is appropriate according to the hearer's condition. The speaker will perform an indirect request with appropriate expression based on the hearer condition that indirect requests have had negated probability. It can be

concluded that in this strategy to redress the FTA the speaker explicitly shows doubt, the speaker assumes that what is requested by him cannot be done by the listener.

2.5.2.4 Minimize the imposition

Imposition probably will damage the hearer's face. So, to minimize the imposition the speaker needs to redress the seriousness of the imposition. Using the word "*just*" can be the example of using this strategy. Using the word "*just*" can minimize the seriousness of the imposition since the word "*just*" implicitly limit the extent of FTA.

"*I just want to ask you, can I borrow your pencil?*"

The example above showed that the speaker minimized the seriousness of the imposition. The word "*just*" makes the hearer to think that the request done by the speaker limited to only one thing. Therefore, the speaker can save the negative face of the hearer.

2.5.2.5 Give deference

The goal of this strategy is to have the speaker refer to the hearer using more respectful language. Because showing respect for another person implies a gap between the speaker and the listener, it satisfies the hearer's "negative face" needs. So, it can be concluded that the speaker in using this strategy will use some honorific expressions to pay respect to hearer.

2.5.2.6 Apologize

This strategy is used to mend or lighten the FTA by mentioning if the speaker does not want to disturb the hearer's negative face. The speaker indicates his reluctance to impinge on the addressee's negative face and thereby partially redress that impingement (Hartati, 2020). This is done so that the speaker can avoid the negative face of the hearer. Apologize can be separated into four different categories, which are recognizing the pressures and distractions that were present, showing reluctance and using certain expressions, delivering the reason

that forces the speaker to do that, and begging forgiveness while also pleading for a delay in the FTA from the speaker's utterance that stated previously.

"*Sorry, I was wrong I did not mean to do it*"

The examples above showed that the speaker recognizes the pressures and distractions to the hearer's negative face. Thus, the speaker conveys the apologies to minimize the imposition on the hearer's negative face.

2.5.2.7 Impersonalize speaker and hearer

A speaker does not want to impinge on the hearer. The speaker will utter his utterance as if the agent were other than the speaker or perhaps not the speaker or not the speaker alone and the addressee were other than the hearer, or only inclusive to the hearer. In this strategy, the speaker tries to minimize the FTA by phrasing his words by avoiding inclusive "I" and "you" as if not only the speaker and the hearer that in the conversation.

2.5.2.8 State the FTA as a general rule

Brown and Levison (1987) explains that, stating the FTA as a general rule in the utterances is one way to minimize the imposition. The speaker could state his utterances as a general rule, obligation, or regulation if the condition or circumstance matches. So, it can be concluded that if the condition forced the speaker to do FTA, the speaker may state or do FTA as a general rule, obligation, or regulation to the hearer.

2.5.2.9 Nominalize

According to Brown and Levinson (2020), this strategy focuses on the degree of formality. The speaker could replace the word to be a noun to insert formality. So, it can be concluded that the speaker may nominalize the subject, predicate, object, or even complement his sentence to a noun, to get the sentence sound more formal.

2.5.2.10 Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting hearer

Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that this strategy is where the speaker imposes heavily on the hearer by going on record. The speaker may claim indebtedness to the hearer or disclaim any indebtedness of the hearer to redress the FTA So, it can be concluded that in this strategy for the speaker to redress the FTA, the speaker will express his indebtedness to the hearer for doing FTA and can also disclaiming any indebtedness of hearer.

2.6 Factors Influencing the Choice of Strategies

In general, no one does something out of pure motive, regardless of whether or not there are benefits. Some factors can affect the use of politeness strategies when completing the FTAs. There are two factors mentioned by Brown and Levinson (1987) that influence the speaker to employ politeness strategies. They are payoffs and circumstances.

2.6.1 Payoffs

Payoff can be thought of as a form of prioritization. This means that before deciding to use the strategies, the speaker needs to weigh the benefits of each. By way of illustration, if a speaker employs positive politeness, the hearer may infer that the speaker regards him favorably and values his input. Speaker's ability to satisfy the hearer's face is also a plus. When a person uses negative politeness, the hearer perceives that the speaker is showing him respect. By assuring the hearer that he or she is of the same kind as the speaker, positive politeness negates the potential face-threatening effects of an act. By engaging in negative politeness, one can achieve the following goals: maintaining social distance and avoiding the threat (or potential face loss) of advancing familiarity towards the addressee; repaying the FTA by showing respect and deference to the addressee; and avoiding future debt.

2.6.2 The Circumstances

Brown and Levinson (1987), define the circumstance as a set of variables that influence the FTA seriousness level in a conversation such as power, distance, and level of imposition. These variables come from the determination of age, gender, social class, and circumstances that are surely found in the real-life conversation environment which has significant influences on interaction. The explanations of power, distance, and level of imposition based on Brown and Levinson (1987) are presented below.

1. Power

   The concept of power is concerned with the dominance of superior over inferior. When we talk about the importance of power, we're not just talking about individuals; we're also talking about roles. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) the concept of relative power describes the tendency for people to be more polite or use more formal language when interacting with those in positions of authority over them. Such situations are common in hierarchical institutions.

2. Distance

   The frequency of interaction between a speaker and their audience is directly correlated to the distance between them. It is connected to the proximity between them. The distance between a speaker and his or her hearer in a discussion is a politeness variable that depends on the degree of familiarity between the two parties. Several factors, including the closeness of the speaker's and hearer's relationship and the familiarity of the two with the topic at hand, can indicate the degree of familiarity between them. As a result, this factor established that the degree of politeness used amongst close friends is distinct from that used amongst strangers.

3. Level of Imposition

   The level of imposition deals with the level of disturbance specified in the FTA. For example, the level of FTA is different between asking people for 10.000 rupiah and 10.000.000 rupiah.

2.7 Previous of Related Studies

In supporting this research, there are several previous studies that have similarities and differences with this research. Hereby proves the existence of research that uses same theory and approach with different object of literature.

First, Novi Indriana Dewi (2021) wrote a research paper titled "The Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Maleficent: Mistress of Evil." In her research, it was concluded that there are four types of politeness strategies found in the movie Maleficent: Mistress of Evil. There are four: bald on record, off record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. Compared to my research, the research conducted by Novi Indriana Dewi (2021) has more politeness strategies to be analyzed, but the theories are not as detailed to support the accuracy of her research results. In contrast, my research has only 2 politeness strategies to be analyzed, but the theories that I put into my research are more detailed in order to achieve a more accurate result. I also discuss the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies, which were not found in the research conducted by Novi Indriana Dewi (2021).

Second, Permadi et al. (2022) conducted research titled "A Descriptive Study on Politeness Strategies in the Aladdin Movie" This research explains the politeness strategies used by the main character in the movie Aladin. The result of this research was that the bald on record strategy turned out to be the most strategy that the character used in the movie followed by a positive politeness strategy, an off-record strategy, and the last one, a negative politeness strategy. As a comparison, my research has only 2 politeness strategies to be analyzed, but the theories that I put into my research are much more detailed in order to achieve a more accurate result. I also discuss the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies, which were not found in the research conducted by Permadi et al. (2022).

The last is the research done by Hartoyo et al. (2019) with the title "Positive Politeness Strategy in Greatest Showman 19th Century Society And Chappie 21st Century Society Movie Script" This research explains the positive politeness displayed by the main characters in the movie. The result of this

research was that the main character showed different ways of using positive politeness. As a comparison, my research has more politeness strategies to be analyzed. Also, the theories that I put into my research are much more detailed in order to achieve a more accurate result. I also discuss the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies, which were not found in the research conducted by Hartoyo et al. (2019).