CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter I will discuss about some theories by experts that will support this research. The theories are about pragmatics, context, politeness strategies, factors influencing the use of strategies, and also previous of related studies to compare this study and the previous studies by other researchers that are related.

2.1. Pragmatics

Discussing about pragmatics means discussing about the use of language. The use of language in human communication is important, and the context of human language and its use are closely related. According to Mey (as cited by Silalahi, 2016:84), pragmatics is the study of the condition of human language uses as this is determined by the context of society. If we want a more through, in-depth, and all-around more rational explanation of human language behaviour, pragmatic is required.

According to Yule (1996: 3), pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in the particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances.

Levinson (1983: 5) defines pragmatics as the study of language use, that is the study of relation between language and context which is basic to an account of language understanding which involves the making of inferences which will connect what is said to what is mutually assumed or what has been said before. Pragmatics can also solve the problem between the speaker and the hearer, especially the problem about point of view.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the study of language that is influenced by context is known as pragmatics. Pragmatics is also the study of the connections between language, meaning, and situation. The key of pragmatics is context and how humans understand each other. The study of pragmatics is helpful in facilitating human interaction, it is useful to humans grasp

the meaning of an utterance and how to use language itself to communicate and deliver each other's messages.

2.2. Context

Context is one of the elements that influences how people use language. Context is also crucial for understanding both the ambiguous meanings of words as well as their true meanings. According to Yule (1996: 21), context is simply means the physical environment in which a word is used.

Context refers to the words and sentences that surround any part of a discourse, and that helps to determine its meaning. Mey (1993:38) state that context is a dynamic not a static concept. It is to be understood as the surroundings in the widest sense that enable the participants in the communication process to interact and that make the linguistic expressions of their interaction intelligible.

Context is more than simply knowing what something is about. Cutting (2002:3) state that there are sorts of context, the situational context refers to what speakers know about what they can see around them, and the background knowledge context refers to what the speakers know about each other and the world. The situational context is where we have conversation, where we are when we use that language. The background knowledge context more about our own background knowledge. It is about what we know, for example what knowledge or what information do we know about something.

Finally, when we are talking, there is always context in our utterances. If we want to analyse a dialogue, we must understand that there will always be context that will help us find out what it means. If there is no context in conversation, the listener will have trouble understanding the speaker's meaning. The speaker and the listener will not have misunderstanding if there is context in their conversation. In addition, context helping us understand what things are about, and also makes the utterances more meaningful.

2.3. Positive Politeness Strategies

In terms of language use, politeness refers to the expressions we choose to employ that allow other people to interact with us in a friendly attitude. Politeness is typically understood to be social propriety, or acting in a way that respects other people. The culture plays a key role in politeness strategy. According to Yule (1996:60), politeness is a concept of polite social behaviour in a particular culture. It can be shown by showing good manners towards others. Politeness and the concept of face are related.

Politeness strategy is the strategy of communication which stress the polite utterances and behaviour. Brown and Levinson (1987:60) identifies four politeness strategies, there are bald-on record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, and off-record strategy. Bald-on record used when speaker does nothing to minimize the threat to the hearer face. Positive politeness is the strategy that deal with how to satisfy hearer's desire to be appreciated, approved of, and respected by others. Negative politeness is the strategy that deal with how to satisfy hearer's negative face. Off-record is used to let the speaker's utterances ambiguous and consequently leaves the speaker without responsibility to the act that he does.

Positive politeness is used to show intimacy to the interlocutor, someone who is not a close person to the speaker. Brown and Levinson (as cited by Cutting, 2002:48) claims that the aim of positive politeness strategy is to save the hearers' desire to be appreciated, approved of, and respected by others by expressing intimacy, engaging to friendship, making the hearers feel good, and showing that the speakers have a common purpose with the hearers.

Brown and Levinson (1987:70) define positive politeness as the strategy which is oriented by a speaker towards the positive face or the positive self-image of hearers that the speaker claims for himself. Positive politeness attempts to attend the hearer's interest, wants, and goods. This strategy facilitates social interactions with other people.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:101), positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants (or the actions/acquisitions/values resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable.

Redress consists in partially satisfying that desire by communicating that one's own wants (or some of them) are in some respects similar to the addressee's wants. Brown and Levinson (1987:103) state that positive-politeness utterances are used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy, to imply common ground or sharing of wants to a limited extent even between strangers who perceive themselves, for the purposes of the interaction, as somehow similar. For the same reason, positive-politeness techniques are usable not only for challenging the face wants of interlocutor redress, but in general as a kind of social accelerator, where speaker, in using them, indicates that he wants to 'come closer' to hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:103-129), there are fifteen strategies of positive politeness.

2.3.1. Strategy 1: Notice, attend to Hearer (his interests, wants, needs, goods)

Brown and Levinson (1987:103) state that in this strategy, speaker should take notice or pay attention of aspects of hearer's condition (anything that seems like it would be something hearer would want speaker to notice and approve of). Finally, strategy 1 is used when speaker pay attention to hearer.

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

Brown and Levinson (1987:104) state that in this strategy, typically done with stress, exaggerated intonation, and other prosodic features, as well as with intensifying modifiers. Finally, strategy 2 is used when speaker exaggerated their intonation when speaks to hearer about something.

2.3.3. Strategy 3: Intensify interest to Hearer

Brown and Levinson (1987:106) define this strategy as another way for speaker to communicate to hearer that he understands some of his desires by increasing the interest in his own (Speaker's) contributions to the conversation by telling a compelling story. The "vivid present" can be used for this. Finally, strategy 3 is used when the speaker telling about story by intensifying interest to hearer.

2.3.4. Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers

Brown and Levinson (1987:107) define this strategy as speaker can implicitly claim the common ground with hearer that is carried by that definition of

the group in any of the countless ways that exist. These include the in-group use of ellipses, address forms, language or accent, jargon, or slang. Finallly, strategy 4 is used as an identity marker for someone to show the friendliness between the speaker and interlocutor.

2.3.5. Strategy 5: Seek agreement

In this strategy, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:112), by bringing up 'safe topics' allows speaker to emphasize his agreement with hearer and therefore to satisfy hearer's desire to be 'right', or to be corroborated in his opinions. Then, by repeating some or all of what the speaker before you said can also be used to stressed agreement during a conversation. Repeating emphasizes the emotional content of the statement in addition to proving that one understood it correctly (or to stress interest and surprise). Finally, strategy 5 used by speaker to satisfy hearer's desire to be 'right', or to stressed agreement in the conversation by safe topics or repeating what the speaker says before.

2.3.6. Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

In this strategy, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:113), speaker avoiding disagreement with three ways, those are the token agreement, pseudo-agreement, and hedging opinions. Finally, strategy 6 is used by speaker to avoiding disagreement between speaker and hearer with one of three ways, they can use token agreement, pseudo-agreement, or hedging opinions.

2.3.7. Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert common ground

Brown and Levinson (1987:117) state that in this strategy, small talk and gossip are fit. This strategy purpose to presuppose what the hearer's want in accordance with the speaker's knowledge toward what the hearer's wants. Finally, strategy 7 is used by speaker to assume what the hearers wants based on the speaker's understanding of what the listener wants.

2.3.8. Strategy 8: Joke

Brown and Levinson (1987:124) state that in this strategy, jokes can be used to stress a shared background or set of beliefs because they are founded on shared knowledge and values. Joking is a basic positive-politeness technique for putting

hearer 'at ease'; for instance, in reaction to a faux pas of hearer's, speaker may joke. Finally, strategy 8 is used when the speaker can make a joke in response to the other person's faux pas.

2.3.9. Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose Speaker's knowledge of and concern for Hearer's wants

Brown and Levinson (1987:125) define this strategy as speaker affirming and implying knowledge of the hearer's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants in with them. Finally, strategy 9 is used as a readiness to accommodate hearer's wants.

2.3.10. Strategy 10: Offer, promise

Brown and Levinson (1987:125) define this strategy, offers or promises are the natural outcome. As the time when the speaker makes an offer and promise to the hearer, the speaker has demonstrated the speaker's good intentions to satisfy hearer's wants. Finally, strategy 9 is used when the speaker offers or promises to the hearers about something to satisfy their desire to be respected by speaker.

2.3.11. Strategy 11: Be optimistic

In this strategy, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:126), speaker becomes optimistic about the hearer's willingness to do something or satisfy the speaker. Finally, strategy 11 is used when the speaker optimistic about the willingness of the hearer to satisfy the hearer's desire to be appreciated, and approved of by speaker.

2.3.12. Strategy 12: Include both Speaker and Hearer in the activity

In this strategy, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:127), speaker and hearer become cooperators involved in the activity, by using an inclusive 'we' form, when speaker really means 'you' or 'me. Finally, in strategy 12 by utilizing an inclusive "we" form when the speaker genuinely means "you" or "me," speaker and hearer become collaborators engaged in the activity.

2.3.13. Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons

Brown and Levinson (1987:128) state that in this strategy, speaker give a reason about what to do and what the speaker want to do, it can be used to complain and criticize by claiming a reason. The hearer has to know if there is a good reason, why hearer have to be able to cooperate or not. Finally, strategy 13 used to satisfy the hearer's desire to be appreciated and respected by speaker with giving or asking about the reason in the conversation.

2.3.14. Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

Brown and Levinson (1987:129) state that in this strategy, there is cooperation between speaker and hearer may also be claimed by giving proof of reciprocal rights or obligations obtaining between speaker and hearer. Finally, strategy 14 used by speaker to satisfy the interlocutors desire to be appreciated by speaker about they will do something that interlocutors wants if the interlocutors do it for them too.

2.3.15. Strategy 15: Give gifts to Hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

Brown and Levinson (1987:129) define this strategy as speaker may satisfy hearer by giving the hearer sympathy or attention, then the hearer can feel understood and listened. Finally, strategy 15 used by a speaker to appreciate and respect the interlocutor about something.

In conclusion, positive politeness is the strategy when we convey friendship and concern that aims to minimize the distance between speakers and hearers. In this strategy, friendly forms of address and compliments are things that include of reveal awareness of the hearer's needs. Then, the goal of positive politeness strategy is to satisfy hearer's desire to be appreciated, approved of, and respected by others.

2.4. Factors Influencing the use of Positive Politeness Strategies

In communicating with interlocutor, speaker not only apply and use the strategies, there are also factors that influence them to use the strategies. Brown and Levinson (1987:71) claims that there are two factors that influence the speaker to

use politeness strategies; they are payoffs and relevant circumstances. Payoffs is the priori consideration that influence the speaker decided to use politeness strategies in exchange for certain advantages. Relevant circumstances are sociological variables that involves some factors. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:75), there are three factors that influence the speaker used politeness strategies. First, social distance (D) of speaker and hearer. Second, relative power (P) of speaker and hearer. Third, absolute ranking (R) of impositions in the particular culture.

a) Social Distance

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:76), social distance (D) is a symmetric social dimension of similarity or difference within which speaker and hearer stand for the purposes of this act. Social distance (D) can be observed as the combination of some psychological factors; they are age, sex, social class, degree of intimacy, and so on. The closer speaker and the hearer are, the speaker is more likely to choose the politeness strategy.

b) Relative Power

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:77), relative power (P) is the degree to which hearer can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (face) at the expense of speaker's plans and self-evaluation. There are also two sources of relative power (P), either of which may be authorized or unauthorized. Material control (over economic distribution and physical force) and metaphysical control (over the actions of others, by virtue of metaphysical forces subscribed to by those others). This type of factor is mostly seen in clearly hierarchical rules, those are in workplace, military, and courts.

c) Rank of Imposition

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:77), rank of imposition (R) is a culturally and situationally defined ranking of impositions by the degree to which they are considered to interfere with an agent's wants of self-determination or of approval (his negative- and positive-face wants). This type of factor is can be affected by an urgent condition.

In conclusion, there are two factors that influence the speaker to use politeness strategies; they are payoffs and relevant circumstances. Payoffs are the anticipated outcome or the benefits from the politeness strategies that are selected. Circumstances divided into 3 categories. Social distance (D) is factor that related to distance between different group in society, like status. Relative power (P) is factor that related when a person has authority to the hearer, like leader and employee. Rank of imposition (R) is factor that related according to the rank or degree that can influence the choice of strategy by the speaker.

2.5. Previous of Related Studies

In assisting with this research, I will attach a review of several previous researches that have different and comparable with this research as the source of inspiration that will help to carry out the research. Herewith, I will explain and attach a review of research studies that use some theory and same approach to this research with different object that will help me carry out this research.

The first similar research is journal written by Aryani (2019) entitled "*Strategi Kesantunan Yang Digunakan Presenter Amerika dan Indonesia Dalam Suatu Acara Talkshow*". The purpose of this research is to find out and compare the forms of politeness use by presenters in talk shows. The object of this research are the utterances use by presenters in Ellen talk show and *Ini* talk show. The result of this research is that the two presenters have similarities, they use positive politeness more frequently. The presenters use the strategies of positive politeness to maintain their social relationship.

The second similar research is thesis written by Archia (2014) entitled "A Pragmatic Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies as Reflected by The Characters in Carnage Movie". The purpose of this research is to identify the positive politeness strategies that character in Carnage Movie expresses, as well as the types of maxim violations use by characters in Carnage movie who express positive politeness strategies. There are two points of result of this research. First point, the strategy of noticing, attending to H is the highest result of the strategy, and all fifteen strategies are applied, except the strategy of asserting reciprocal exchange.

Second, the maxim most violated by characters is the maxim of relation, and violation of quantity maxim does not appear because the characters tend to give more information than less information, by 67 utterances of positive politeness strategies, only 21 utterances are violated. It can be concluded that positive politeness use in this research object does not always influence the maxims of cooperative principles.

The last similar research is thesis written by Mawaddah (2021) entitled "The Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies Used by The Characters in "Let It Snow" (2019) Movie Script". The purpose of this research is to give an understanding of two politeness strategies, positive politeness and negative politeness which are used by the main characters in "Let It Snow" movie. The result of this research shows that the main characters in "Let It Snow" movie more frequently use positive politeness than negative politeness; there are 37 utterances that use positive politeness strategies, and 23 utterances that use negative politeness strategies. The use of positive politeness strategies is found to minimize the distance between each speaker, while negative politeness strategies use as a form of respect.

Based on the review and explanation provided above, it is possible to conclude that this research differs from previous researches. The difference between this research and first previous research that I reviewed above is that the first previous research and this research used different objects, this research using video series *Kids Meet* from YouTube and the first previous research using Ellen and *Ini* talk shows as objects, and the first previous research focuses on finding out and comparing the forms of politeness strategies, whereas this research focuses on only positive politeness strategies. Then, the difference between this research and the second previous research that I review above is that the second research using objects from movies, whereas this research using object from YouTube videos. The second previous research discusses the positive politeness strategies, and also identify types of maxim violation terms that expresses positive politeness strategies; this research, on the other hand, discusses the positive politeness strategies and factors influencing the use of positive politeness. After that, the third previous research that I review use a movie script as the object and discusses two strategies of politeness, positive politeness and negative politeness, whereas this research uses

YouTube videos as the object and focuses only on positive politeness. The three researches also have similarities with this research in the theory use, namely the Brown and Levinson theories. Finally, this research has some similarities with previous researches that discuss politeness strategies, but this research also has some differences with those previous researches in terms of the object and the politeness strategies use in each research. This research is important because it will lead to new knowledge or discoveries, as the development of knowledge in an existing scientific field.