

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK**

This chapter discusses the framework of the theories which support the understanding of the problems formulated in Chapter 1. This chapter contains: theory of pragmatics, theory of politeness, bald-on-record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, off-record strategy, factors influencing politeness strategies, and previous related studies.

#### **2.1. Theory of Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistic science, the use of which is very important in everyday life. According to Levinson (as cited by Ardifa, 2022, p.5), 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 Yule (1996: 3), pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (writer) and interpreted by the listener or (reader). Pragmatics studies the ways in which individuals use language to carry out actions, including requesting, commanding, committing, and showing appreciation, as well as how language is utilized to handle social interactions, indicate courtesy, and communicate feelings. Leech (as cited by Sari, 2012: 7) states that pragmatics involves problem solving both from the speaker's point of view and from the hearer's point of view. The problem of speaker's point of view is how to produce an utterance which will make the result. Pragmatics helps us understand how language is used in everyday situations and how meaning is created through language use in context.

Context serves as a structure that allows for the interpretation and comprehension of a specific piece of information, communication, or action. Yule (1996: 21) states that context simply means the physical environment in which a word is used.

Context is the most important aspect in linguistics especially in pragmatics study. According to Kisno (in Tantri: 2020: 8-9), when we discussed pragmatics, we also discussed the study of what to do with words in the study of meaning in a context. This mean pragmatics has had the most substantial impact on exploring meaning within a given context.

## **2.2. Theory of Politeness**

Politeness strategies can be beneficial for building favorable connections and facilitating successful communication, particularly in scenarios where there is a chance of disagreement or confusion. According to Yule (as cited by Pratiknyo, 2016: 7) politeness can be defined as a way to show alertness towards the face of someone else. As a technical term, face means the public self-image of a person. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize. Meanwhile Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction.

In communication, individuals are influenced by both the immediate context and their personal desires or goals. This means that people's behaviour and responses are not solely determined by the situation they find themselves in, but also by their own individual motivations and objectives. According to Brown and Levinson (cited in Watts, 2003:86), there are two aspects of face: positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to an individual's desire to be accepted and valued by others. On the other hand, negative face pertains to a person's desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition.

In communication, individuals often strive to fulfil the face wants of others in order to maintain a smooth interaction. Additionally, people can engage in actions that threaten the positive or negative face of both the speaker and the listener in a conversation. Brown and Levinson (1987 : 65) state that any action that goes against the desires of the speaker or listener can be considered as a face-threatening act. In order to minimize face-threatening acts, Brown and Levinson suggest four politeness strategies: bald-on-record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, and off-record strategy.

### 2.2.1. Bald-on-Record Strategy

The initial form of politeness strategy is referred to as "bald-on-record." Brown and Levinson (1978: 68) define this strategy as one in which the speaker straightforwardly communicates the desired message to the hearer, without trying to minimize potential threats to the hearer's face. The bald on record strategy involves fulfilling the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner when delivering a message.

### 2.2.2. Positive Politeness Strategy

The strategy aims to create a closer relationship between the speaker and the listener by showing care and friendship. By fulfilling the positive-face desires of the listener, the speaker can create a sense of belonging and convince the listener that they are part of the same group. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:103) positive politeness utterances are used metaphorically to create a sense of intimacy or commonality even between strangers who view themselves as similar and can be used not just for addressing face-threatening situations, but also to enhance social connection by expressing a desire to "come closer" to the other person.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978: 103-130), there are 15 strategies of positive politeness. Those strategies are as follows:

- a) Strategy 1: Notice, attend to hearer (his interests, wants, needs, goods)

In general, the output indicates that speaker should pay attention to noticeable changes and possessions that hearer might want them to notice and approve of.

*Example: What a beautiful vase this is! Where did it come from?*

- b) Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer)

This is often done with exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodies, as well as with intensifying modifiers.

*Example: How absolutely marvellous*

c) Strategy 3: Intensify Interest to Hearer

Another way for speaker to communicate to hearer that he shares some of his wants is to intensify the interest of his own (speaker's) contributions to the conversation, by making 'a good story'. This may be done by using the 'vivid present'.

*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.*

d) Strategy 4: Use in-group Identity Markers

By using any of the innumerable ways to convey in-group membership, speaker can implicitly claim the common ground with hearer that is carried by that definition of the group. These include in-group usages of address forms, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis.

*Example: Bring me your dirty clothes to wash, darling.*

e) Strategy 5: Seek Agreement

When communicating with someone, a way to establish common ground is by finding topics on which you can agree with them, focusing on seeking of agreement can help facilitate productive communication and understanding.

*Example:*

*A: I had a flat tyre on the way home.*

*B: Oh God, a flat tyre!*

f) Strategy 6: Avoid Disagreement

The desire to agree or appear to agree with hearer leads also to mechanisms for pretending to agree, instances of 'token' agreement.

*Example:*

*A: What is she, small?*

*B: Yes, yes, she's small, smallish, um, not really small but certainly not very big.*

g) Strategy 7: Presuppose/Raise/Assert Common Ground

The strategy involves using gossip and small talk to establish a connection between the speaker and the listener. This is done by highlighting similarities and showing an interest in each other, often as a mark of friendship.

*Example: I really had a hard time learning to drive, you know.*

h) Strategy 8: Joke

Joking is a basic positive politeness technique. Jokes rely on shared background knowledge and values, which can be used to reinforce the importance of that shared knowledge and values.

*Example: How about lending me this old heap of junk? (Hearer's new Cadillac)*

i) Strategy 9: Assert or Presuppose Speaker's Knowledge of and Concern for Hearer's Wants

This strategy involves asserting or implying knowledge that aligns with the hearer's desires in order to create a sense of cooperation and potentially pressure the hearer into cooperating with the speaker.

*Example: know you can't bear parties, but this one will really be good — do come!*

j) Strategy 10: Offer, Promise

To address the potential threat of some FTAs, a speaker may choose to emphasize their cooperation with the hearer in a different manner.

*Example: I'll drop by sometime next week.*

k) Strategy 11: Be Optimistic

This strategy is linked to the cooperative strategy, where the speaker assumes that the hearer desires certain outcomes and will work towards achieving them.

*Example: You'll lend me your lawnmower for the weekend, I hope.*

l) Strategy 12: Include Both Speaker and Hearer in the Activity

Using the inclusive pronoun "we" instead of "you" or "me" can help to reinforce cooperative assumptions and address potential threats in FTAs.

*Example: Give us a break, (i.e. me)*

m) Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) Reasons

By including the hearer in their practical reasoning and providing reasons for their desires, the speaker aims to involve the listener in the activity and assume that the listener wants the same things as the speaker. This approach may lead the hearer to see the reasonableness of FTAs, as the speaker hopes.

*Example: Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend?*

n) Strategy 14: Assume or Assert Reciprocity

To claim or urge cooperation between the speaker and the listener, the speaker can provide evidence of reciprocal rights or obligations between them. By pointing out the reciprocal nature of doing FTAs with each other, the speaker may soften their stance on FTAs and minimize the potential for debt or face-threatening aspects such as criticisms and complaints.

*Example: I did X for you last week, so you do Y for me this week.*

o) Strategy 15: Give Gifts to Hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

To satisfy the listener's positive-face wants, the speaker can fulfil some of the listener's desires. This can be done through classic positive politeness actions



such as gift-giving, which not only fulfils tangible wants but also human-relations wants like the desire to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, and listened to. By demonstrating that they understand and want to fulfil the listener's wants, the speaker can satisfy the listener's positive face want.

### 2.2.3. Negative Politeness Strategy

Negative politeness strategy is another type of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) Negative politeness is redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face. This strategy is specific and focused; it performs the function of minimizing the particular imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects. This strategy assumes that the speaker may cause inconvenience or disruption to the listener when entering their personal space. Both the speaker and the listener acknowledge the presence of social distancing or barriers during communication. Brown and Levinson (1987:129-210) propose 10 ways or strategies to convey negative politeness strategy. Those strategies are as follows:

#### a) Strategy 1: Be Conventionally Indirect

The speaker employs indirect speech acts to express a meaning that deviates from the literal understanding of their words.

*Example: "Why are you painting your house purple?"*

The example above could be either an innocent question provoked by curiosity (the literal reading) or critical challenge (a conveyed indirect reading).

#### b) Strategy 2. Questioning and Hedging

The use of hedge by a speaker can save the hearer's negative face since by putting a hedge the strength of an utterance will be modified.

*Example: I'm pretty sure I've read that book before.*

c) Strategy 3. Be Pessimistic

This strategy acknowledges the hearer's concerns by expressing doubt about the conditions necessary for the speaker's speech act to be appropriate. There are three major realizations of this strategy: the use of the negative (with a tag), the use of the subjunctive, and the use of remote-possibly markers.

*Example: Could you do X?*

The speaker uses the subjunctive. The use of the subjunctive in English seems also to be related to the satisfaction.

d) Strategy 4. Minimize the Imposition

In this strategy the speaker can make the imposition seem less serious by using words like 'just', 'only', 'a little', or 'a few' to downplay its significance.

*Example: Could I call you for just a minute?*

The speaker intends to talk to the hearer for a few minutes but tries to downplay it by saying "for just a minute" in order to minimize the imposition.

e) Strategy 5. Give Deference

This strategy encourages the speaker to use respectful language and honorific expressions when referring to the listener. By using such expressions, the speaker acknowledges and respects the listener's social status, which helps maintain the listener's sense of dignity and personal boundaries.

*Example: Well, Mr President, if I could only put your mind at ease...*

*The speaker emphasizes the social distance between him/her and the hearer by delivering the word 'Mr. President'.*



f) Strategy 6. Apologize

By apologizing for doing an FTA, the speaker can indicate his reluctance to impinge on hearer's negative face and thereby partially redress that impingement. The deferential use of hesitation and bumblingness discussed above is one way of showing this reluctance, but there are many expressions in common use that have the same effect.

In this strategy, there are four different ways to show apologize:

1) Admit the impingement

The speaker can simply admit the impingement towards the hearer's face.

*Example: I know this is a bore, but...*

2) Indicate reluctance

The speaker can express his/her reluctance to impinge the hearer directly by delivering hedges or facial expressions.

*Example: You've never bothered me, I know, but...*

3) Give Overwhelming Reasons

Speaker can claim that he has compelling reasons for doing the FTA (for example, his own incapacity), thereby implying that normally he wouldn't dream of infringing H's negative face.

*Example: Can you possibly help me with this, because there's no one else I could ask.*

#### 4) Beg Forgiveness

Speaker begs hearer's forgiveness.

The example of this strategy is commonly signaled with the word 'excuse me', 'sorry', and 'forgive'.

*Example: Would you forgive me if...*

#### g) Strategy 7. Impersonate Speaker and Hearer

One way of indicating that speaker doesn't want to impinge on hearer is to phrase the FTA as if the agent were other than speaker or at least possibly not speaker or not speaker alone, and the addressee were other than hearer, or only inclusive of hearer. There are several ways to show this strategy such as by using performatives, imperatives, impersonal verbs, passive and circumstantial voice, indefinites as the replacement of the pronouns 'I' and 'you', pluralization of the 'you' and 'I' pronouns, and reference terms as 'I' avoidance, point of view distancing.

*Example: Do this for me.*

#### h) Strategy 8. State the FTA as a General Rule

In this strategy, the speaker shows that he/she actually does not want to impinge the hearer's face, but he/she has to do it because of the circumstances or the general rule.

*Example: I am going to spray you with DDT to follow international regulations.*

#### i) Strategy 9. Nominalize

Nominalization is when an adjective, verb, or adverb is transformed into a noun. By using this strategy, speaker makes their utterances sound more formal and meet the negative-face desires of the listener.

*Example: You performed well on the examinations and we were favourably impressed.*

j) Strategy 10. Go on Record as Incurring a Debt, or as Not Indebting Hearer

This strategy allows the speaker to minimize the imposition by presenting something to the hearer as a debt in exchange for the hearer's assistance to benefit the speaker.

*Example: I'd be eternally grateful if you would . . .*

#### **2.2.4. Off-Record Strategy**

Off-record strategy is the last politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson. This strategy enables speakers to indirectly engage in face-threatening acts while avoiding complete responsibility. This strategy is commonly employed by individuals who wish to perform such acts without assuming full accountability. Within this strategy, the speaker intentionally violates the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner.

#### **2.3. Factors Influencing the Use of Politeness Strategies**

This research also examines the factors influencing the use of positive and negative politeness strategies in Pinocchio movie. Brown and Levinson (1978: 71) state that there are two factors which influence a speaker to deliver certain politeness strategy. Those two factors are payoffs and relevant circumstances.

##### **1. Payoff**

According to Brown and Levinson, speakers can gain certain benefits or advantages from the communication strategies they employ. For instance, when a speaker goes on record and openly expresses their intentions, it can establish trust and credibility with the listener while minimizing misunderstandings. Conversely, when a speaker goes off record and hints at their true intentions, they allow the listener to interpret their message and avoid direct responsibility for any potential face-threatening implications. Additionally, going off record can also create an impression of the speaker as considerate and caring.

By employing positive politeness strategies, speakers can reap the benefits of satisfying the listener's need for positive social interaction. They can achieve this by minimizing potentially offensive actions and emphasizing their shared group

identity with the listener. Furthermore, using positive politeness strategies allows speakers to avoid potentially face-threatening acts like making requests or offers.

Using negative politeness strategies can be advantageous for a speaker as it helps satisfy the listener's desire for autonomy and avoidance of imposition. By employing this approach, speakers can avoid creating a sense of indebtedness for future face-threatening actions, demonstrate respect towards the listener, and maintain a certain level of social distance between both parties.

## 2. Relevant circumstances

Besides payoff, the choice of a certain politeness strategy is also influenced by relevant circumstances. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:74) Brown and Levinson propose that there are three key factors that impact how individuals employ politeness strategies in response face-threatening act. The factors as follow:

### 1) The Social Distance

Brown and Levinson define social distance as a symmetric relation between the speaker and the hearer. Factors such as gender, age, and intimacy can influence the determination of social distance.

### 2) The Relative Power

This factor is an asymmetric relation between the speaker and the hearer. The power of a person, in this term, can be defined as the role of a person in society.

### 3) The Rank of Imposition

According to Brown and Levinson, the rank of impositions occurs in specific circumstances. Additionally, they state that the absolute ranking of impositions is influenced by the level of positive-face and negative-face desires of the individuals involved.

#### **2.4. Previous Related Studies**

In this study, I choose three previous studies written by some writers in order to support this research. Hereby proves the existence of research that uses same theory and approach with different objects.

In the journal by Joys et al., (2022) they have conducted the research entitled "Language Politeness Strategy in Buying and Selling based on Gender". This research focuses on the utterances delivered by sellers and buyers to find out how gender differences can affect politeness strategies in transactions in the market. This research was conducted to explore the language politeness strategies contained in the speech between sellers and buyers by looking at the gender differences in Pasar Pagi, Bugis village, Samarinda. The results of this research are analyzed based on Brown and Levinson politeness strategies (1987), they are: (1) bald on record (3 utterances); (2) positive politeness (3 utterances).

Another research about politeness strategy analysis is conducted in a journal by Selfia and Marlina (2016) entitled "An Analysis of Politeness Strategies Used by Deddy Corbuzier in Hitam Putih Talk Show". The research data in this journal is taken from Hitam Putih, every Friday in September 2013. The last journal is written by Rosari (2016) entitled "Politeness Strategies Applied by the Characters of The Great Debaters Movie". The analysis in this research is based on Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies and Spolsky's factors affecting someone's politeness in speaking. The data used in this research were collected from 166 pages of The Great Debaters movie transcription.

The three previous studies above have similarities regarding politeness strategies with different research objects. I will give a review about the researches above, the first is a journal by Joys et al., (2022) entitled "Language Politeness Strategy in Buying and Selling based on Gender". This research employed a descriptive qualitative approach with recording and note-taking techniques for data collection. Additional analysis is conducted to gain an understanding of how language politeness strategies are expressed in speech acts in Pasar Pagi.

The second journal is written by Selfia and Marlina (2016) entitled "An Analysis of Politeness Strategies Used by Deddy Corbuzier in Hitam Putih Talk

Show". In this research there are four videos that writer has to be analysed, and the result of this research shows in a percentage with the most dominant politeness strategy used was Positive Politeness with 58 %. Another dominant politeness strategy used was Bald on Record (18 %), Negative Politeness (15 %) and Off Record (9 %).

The last is a journal by Rosari (2016) entitled "Politeness Strategies Applied by the Characters of The Great Debaters Movie". This research not only showed the politeness strategies that applied by the characters but also focused on the factors that affecting the characters' politeness in speaking, they were language and styles, registers and domains, and slang and solidarity.

