CHAPTER 2

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

The theories and references that related to this study are present in this chapter to provide an addition information.

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the use of language in everyday communication in society life. According to Levinson (as cited by Sari: 2012: 7), pragmatics is the study of language use, that is, the study of the relationship between language and context, which is fundamental to an account of language understanding and involves the making of inferences that connect what is said to what is mutually assumed or what has been said previously. According to Leech (in Nur. 2018: 17) Pragmatics can also help to resolve issues between the speaker and the hearer, particularly those concerning point of view. It means that pragmatics focuses more on how language is used to communicate in daily life. In order for a statement to be comprehended by the hearer, the speaker must be able to select and use the suitable language.

On the other hand, Leech (as cited by Rukmanasari: 2012: 9), claims that people cannot truly understand the nature of language unless they understand pragmatics. It is the manner in which a language is used in communication. People usually express their intentions implicitly, which means that what they say does not have the same semantic meaning as what they mean. Speakers have goals in mind when they say something related to the context or situation in which the conversation took place.

2.2. Context

Context is an important aspect that we should aware in the conversation. According to Kisno (in Tantri: 2020: 8-9), when we discuss pragmatics, we also discuss the study of what to do with words in the study of a meaning in a context. This means that pragmatics has made the most significant contribution to the study of meaning in a context. Similarly, Levinson (in Septiyaningsih: 2007: 19) emphasizes the importance of context, which is include in the definition of pragmatics itself, as the study of a language user's ability to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate. Based on that, the role of context in language is studied in pragmatics, and it is necessary to pay attention to the context that surrounds the conversation's happening. More studies, accroding to Leech (as cited by Yetriannisyah, 2018: 16) explains context is "any background knowledge assumed to be shared by S (speaker) and H (hearer) that contributes to H"s interpretation of what S means by given an utterance." It means that in order to understand what the speaker says, the hearer must have the same level of knowledge with the speaker, which is the context.

2.3. Positive Politeness Strategy

Politeness includes both linguistic and non-linguistic behaviors that demonstrate that people consider how others want to be treated. Politeness, according to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Rachmasari: 2013: 1), can be defined as a desire to protect one's self-image. Through various strategies, a speaker must demonstrate awareness of the hearer's face and self-image. To be successful in interaction, some important politeness strategies must be followed. In social interactions, people usually expect their faces to be respected. A face threatening act (FTA) occurs when a speaker says something that threatens another person's face. Face has two aspects, namely 'positive' and 'negative'. Alternatively, if he or she says something that mitigates the potential threat, this is known as a face-saving act. A face-saving act oriented toward the person's negative face tends to be respected. This is also referred to as negative politeness. With the statement that Brown and Levinson stated, there are four strategies in this theory for performing the FTA, which is bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record.

Positive politeness has a purpose to keeping the positive face between both the speaker and the hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Aulia, et al.: 2019: 812), this linguistic behavior shows that the hearer has a desire to be respected. This second strategy most commonly used or seen in

family or a group of friends, it has to minimize the distance between one and another, by expressing kindness or friendliness. Positive politeness strategy includes the following fifteen sub-strategies, there are noticing, exaggerate, intensify interest to H, use in-group identity markers, seek agreement, avoid disagreement, presuppose common ground, jokes, presuppose S's knowledge of and concerns for H's wants, offer or promises, be optimistic, including both S and H in the activity, giving or asking for reasons, assume or assert reciprocity, and give gifts to H.

Strategy 1: Noticing, attending to H (her/his interests, wants, needs, goods)

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 15), noticing is the first strategy which means that it is important for the S or speaker to pay close attention to the condition of the H or hearers. Those can refer to their desires, interests, ideas, or other things that want to be noticed by the hearers. This first strategy may be expressed by the speakers to give a compliments about something and making the imposition itself less inappropriate. The example of this strategy is as follows:

"You must be hungry, it's a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch?"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 103)

This dialog shows that the speaker pays attention to the hearer and notice that the hearer must be hungry because it has been a long time since breakfast. It can be seen in the hearer's condition; the hearer might have a pale face or the speaker just notice and remember that the hearer have not eat. So, the speaker asks the hearer to have some lunch.

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

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 16), this strategy is frequently expressed through the use of exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosody, as well as intensifying

modifiers. This strategy will make something can be seem important that it actually is because the speaker wants the hearers to stay have a positive face when it comes to their conversation.

"What a fantastic garden you have!"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 104)

This sentence shows that the speaker gives a compliment to the hearer's garden with exaggerated words. The speaker indicates his exaggeration by saying that the hearer's garden is fantastic. The result is the hearer feels satisfied and appreciated because the speaker gives interest by exaggerating his/her utterance.

Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 16), here is another way for the speaker to show that he or she has same goals or ideas in common with the hearer is to arouse the hearer's interest in the speaker's contribution. This strategy can draw the hearer's attention to the conversation by telling a good story or narrative. As a result, the speaker must explain the narrative clearly and with excitement. The narrative will be like:

"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 and Levinson, 1987: 106)

Before tells the story, the speaker tries to catch the hearer's attention by saying "What do you think I see?." This phrase arouses the hearer's interest in speaker's story. It demonstrates that the speaker can make the hearers to stay have a positive face by involving the hearer in this discussion. The hearer will be satisfied because the speaker contributed him or her as a closest friend.

Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 17), the speaker can demonstrate solidarity and intimacy with the hearer by using in-group address forms. The hearer's cheerful expression is preserved when the speaker refers to him or her as "hun," "mate," "buddy," or even his or her familiar nickname "Kela" rather than "Kayla." These identity markers deepen the bond between the speaker and the hearer. The following is a model of this strategy:

"Here mate, I was keeping that seat for a friend of mine .."

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 107)

This shows that both the speaker and the hearer are close to each other, it will be called as in-group identity. "Mate" used to convey such in-group membership. A result of being treated as a closest friend, the hearer's positive face is preserved.

Strategy 5: Seek agreement

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 18), The speaker can also use the strategy of seeking agreement in safe topics when expressing positive politeness. It is a strategy that allows the speaker to find possibility in which he or she can match what the hearer said, such as discussing the cute animals in social media. This strategy is evident in the following sentence:

A: John went to London this weekend!

B: To London!

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 112)

The speaker is repeating the word to stress interest and surprise agreement with the utterance by saying "To London!". As a result, when the speaker repeats the word, the hearer can stay in hir/her positive face and excited to have a conversation more.

Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 18), one of the ways to keep the hearer's positive face is to avoid disagreement. The speaker of this strategy may conceal his or her disagreement by telling a white lie. A white lie is a lie with good intentions. Furthermore, the speaker can conceal his or her disagreement by pretending to agree with the use of hedges. Cutting (2002:42) provides some hedge examples, such as "if possible," "sort of," "in a way," and "I wonder." As in the following example, the speaker can use this strategy:

"I don't know, like I think people have a right to their own opinions."

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 116)

Using hedges in the sentence make the hearer keep his or her positive face because the speaker uses a hedges in a sentence and conceals his or her disagreement rather than "No, I disagree with you." As a result, the hearer feels not bad because the speaker makes the hearer believes that people have a right to their opinions.

Strategy 7: Presuppose, rise, assert common ground

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 19), this strategy is to assume, raise, and assert common ground. This can be accomplished by the interlocutors sharing similar interests, beliefs, and opinions. In this strategy, the speaker makes small talk that draws the hearer into the conversation. He or she will usually use the pronoun "we" to include the hearer in the conversation, such as:

"Oh dear, we've lost our little ball, haven't we, Johnny?"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 119)

This indicates that the speaker is attempting to persuade Johnny to talk about their little ball. She is doing a conversation that includes Johnny by using pronoun "we." This shows that the speaker and the hearer have a common ground. As a result, when the speaker asks Johnny to talk, she can reduce the threat.

Strategy 8: Jokes

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 20), Positive politeness' speaker can demonstrate solidarity by telling a joke that makes the hearer feel relieved. This strategy can be used to emphasize the fact that the speaker and the hearer must have some mutual background knowledge and values. As a result, the strategy of joking may be useful in reducing the social distance between them. The example as follows:

"How about lending me this old heap of junk? (H's new Cadillac)"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 124)

This shows that B knows background knowledge that H is have a new cadillac. Jokes in this conversation make the conversation not strained also can reduce the demand.

Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concerns for H's wants

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 20), the speaker expresses solidarity by showing that he or she is aware of personal information about the hearer and trying to satisfy the hearer's wishes in order to demonstrate that the speaker is cooperating with the hearer. By satisfying the hearer's desires, so the speaker can keep the hearer's positive face. This strategy is illustrated in the following example:

"I know you can't bear parties, but this one will really be good — do come!"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 125)

This sentence demonstrates the speaker's knowledge. He or she indicates the hearer's personal information. Because the speaker knows the hearer can not bear parties, he or she gives an understanding and assuring that the party will be good. As a result, the positive face of the hearer has been satisfied because he or she has been appreciated by the speaker.

Strategy 10: Offer or promises

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 21), to reduce the potential threat and demonstrate cooperation between the hearer and the speaker, the speaker can offer or promise something to the hearer. The speaker may state that the speaker does something for the hearer. This strategy demonstrates the speaker's good intentions in satisfying the hearer's desires. As can be seen in the following example:

"I'll drop by sometime next week"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 125)

This example demonstrates how the speaker conveys to the hearer that they are cooperating. The speaker emphasizes her cooperation by promising the hearer that he or she will drop him or her next week. As a result, the hearer's positive face has been satisfied.

Strategy 11: Be optimistic

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 21), When expressing positive politeness, the speaker can use the strategy of being optimistic that the hearer wants what the speaker wants. The speaker saves the hearer's positive face by being optimistic that the hearer will do what the speaker wants. In this case, the hearer assisted the speaker because they shared a common interest. This strategy is exemplified by the following sentence:

"Wait a minute, you haven't brushed your hair! (as husband goes out of the door)"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 126)

In this sentence, the wife wants the husband to brush his hair by expressing her wants in terms that assume he (the hearer) wants it too. The speaker puts pressure on him to cooperate with her. It demonstrates that the speaker has appreciated the hearer and has satisfied the hearer's positive face.

Strategy 12: Including both S and H in the activity

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 22), the speaker can use the pronoun "we" to include both interlocutors in the activity. As a result, the speaker has recognized the hearer as a member of the same group and has preserved the hearer's positive face. This strategy is illustrated in the following example:

"Let's get on with dinner, eh?"

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 127)

In the given example, the speaker asks the hearer to go to dinner. In that sentence, the use of the word "Let's" indicates that the speaker includes the hearer in his or her activity. It makes the request more polite because it indicates cooperation between the speaker and the hearer, implying that the goals are for both of them, not just the speaker.

Strategy 13: Giving or asking for reasons

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 23), by giving or asking for reasons, the speaker of this strategy demonstrates cooperation with the hearer. The speaker does this to make his or her wish clear to the hearer. As a result, the hearer agrees to assist the speaker in fulfilling his or her wish. This sentence exemplifies the giving or asking for reasons strategy:

"Why don't I help you with that suitcase."

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 128)

In this conversation, the speaker might knows that the hearer looks fuss about what he or she brings. So, the speaker with inisiative ask the hearer to help him or her to bring the suitcase. Therefore, the speaker has satisfied the hearer's positive face.

Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 23), mutual exchange can also be used to demonstrate the existence of cooperation between the speaker and the hearer. The following is an example of asserting reciprocal exchange or tit for tat strategy:

"I'll do X for you if you do Y for me."

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 129)

By assuming reciprocity, it is clear that the speaker and the hearer are cooperating. Both the speaker and the hearer have their own rights. The speaker receives something and vice viersa.

Strategy 15: Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Archia: 2014: 24), giving gifts to the hearer is the final positive politeness strategy. By satisfying some of the hearer's desires, the speaker may be able to save the hearer's positive face. This strategy can be implemented not only through the provision of goods, but also through the provision of sympathy, understanding, cooperation, and so on. An example of this strategy is as follows:

A: Have a glass of malt whisky, Dick.

B: Terrific! Thanks.

A: Not at all. I wonder if I could confide in you for a minute or two

(Watts, 2003: 90)

In the example, the speaker demonstrates cooperation by offering the hearer a glass of malt whisky. The objective of doing something like this is to make the hearer realize that the speaker cares about him. As a result, when the speaker asks the hearer to listen to him, the hearer will comply because his or her positive-face desires has been achieved.

2.4. Factors Influencing the Use of Positive Politeness Strategies

This research also examines the factors influencing the use of positive politeness strategies in Spider-Man: No Way Home movie script. According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Septiyaningsih: 2007: 41) there are two factors that influencing the speaker to use positive politeness strategies, which is payoff and circumstances.

1. Payoff

For examples:

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Septiyaningsih: 2007: 42), applying positive politeness strategies can minimize FTAs by assuring the hearer that the speaker recognizes the hearer's wants and interests. Thus, the speaker does not threaten the hearer's positive face because it can be seen for their mutual shares. For the result, positive politeness brings to mutual friendship, unity, amd equal participants.

"Let's get on with dinner."

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 72)

In the preceding example, the speaker reduces the FTA (request) to the hearer by including the speaker as an equal participant.

2. The relevant circumstances: sociological factors

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Septiyaningsih: 2007: 42), the seriousness of an FTA is also influenced by the circumstances, sociological variables, and thus the level of politeness. Further, Brown and Levinson state that three sociological factors influence the choice of politeness strategies. In the particular culture, those are the 'social distance', the 'relative power', and the 'absolute ranking of impositions.'

a) Relative Power

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Septiyaningsih: 2007: 42), power is the general terms that we tend to be more polite to people who have power or authority over us than to those who do not. It is another factor that influences someone's ability to speak politely and based on the asymmetry of the speaker-hearer relationship. These forms of power are most common in clearly hierarchical settings, such as courts or the workplace. For example, you would probably be more polite when conveying to your employer because she or he is always forget about something than when conveying to your sister. This is due to the fact that your employer can have a positive or negative impact on your career.

b) Social Distance

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Septiyani: 2016: 22), "Distance is a symmetric social dimension of similarity or difference within which speakers and hearers stand for the purposes of this act." Based on that, social distance can be defined as a composite of psychologically real factors (status, age, sex, degree of intimacy, and so on) that together determine the overall level of respect in a given speech situation. For example, if you feel close to someone or know her very well because you are similar in age or gender, you will get closer to her and the distance rating will be lower. Thus, when you ask her to do something, you usually will not apply polite language. In contrast, you will use polite language when interacting with strangers or someone older than you.

c) Size of imposition

According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Septiyani: 2016: 22), the relative status of one-speech act to another in a context can reveal the size of imposition, the value of impositions can still vary depending on the situation. For example, borrowing a laptop in normal circumstances will make us hesitant, but in an emergency situation, it will be natural. As a result, in the first context, we will use polite utterance. Meanwhile, because the situation is urgent, it is not necessary to use polite language in the second context.

2.5. Previous 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 objects.

The first research is written by Septiyaningsih (2007) and the title of this research is "An Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies in the Film Entitled "In A Good Company" (Pragmatics Approach)" It was concluded that there are 15 positive politeness strategies employed by the characters in the dialog of the film but the characters also employed all kind of the positive politeness strategies. She also found two factors, which is payoff and relevant circumstances.

The second research is written by Septiyani (2016) and the title of this research is "The Use of Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies by the Main Characters of Bride Wars Movie" It was concluded that the characters of the movie applied all kinds of Brown and Levinson's strategies, which is baldon record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record. She also found two factors, the first one was payoffs and the second one was sociological factors.

The last research is written by Tantri (2020) and the title of this research is "An Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies in the Ellen Show: Pragmatics Approach". In her research, it was concluded that the research only focuses in one strategy of positive politeness strategies, which is jokes. Since joking is commonly used by everyone but some people sometimes used it as the negative one. This strategy is concerned with minimizing face-threatening acts, and its purpose is to make the hearer feel at ease with interaction. The similarity is she used Brown and Levinson (1987) theories to analyzed this research.

Based on the three researches above, this research is more similar to the first research because we only analyze about the positive politeness strategies, not all of the strategies that made by Brown and Levinson. However, the differentiation between Septiyaningsih's and mine is she only analyze the main character in that movie. Then, the differentiation between the second research and mine is that she is analyzed all of the politeness strategies from bald on record until off record strategy and only use main characters' utterances as the data, meanwhile I only analyze positive politeness strategies and using all of the characters' utterances as the data. Lastly, Tantri is analyzed positive politeness strategies but more detailed about strategy 8 namely jokes because she is analyzed about *The Ellen Show* that is often interview people with jokes. It can be concluded that this research has some similarities, but this research also has some differences with those three researches in terms of the object, the data which is I analyze all of the character and using movie script, research year, and the politeness strategies use in each research.

