

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I will conclude all the results of my research that has been done in the previous chapter.

CHAPTER 2 THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter discusses theoretical review, previous research, conceptual framework, and analytical construction. I chose politeness strategy to conduct this research. Thus, Pragmatic approach is taken as the way of analysis. References related to pragmatics are needed to guide researchers in interpreting and describing the meaning of the data. Theoretical Description of the concepts and terms used will be presented in the following description.

2.1 Theoretical Description

2.1.1 Pragmatics

According to Yule (as cited by 1996: 3) states that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. Based on this definition, pragmatics requires thinking about how speakers structure what they want to say by considering who they are talking to, where they are talking, when they are talking, and under what conditions. Therefore, it is more concerned with analyzing what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in the utterances mean. Yule (1996:3) defines pragmatics as the study of how more is communicated than is said. Based on the definition, this means that the interpretation of what individuals mean in each situation and how context affects what is said is an important component of this type of research.

Pragmatics is the study of the listener's attempts to interpret the speech of the speaker. interpreting the speaker's utterance in a particular context In this case, both the speaker and the listener must be aware of the context that follows the speaker's utterance. And recognize how the implied meaning of the speaker's utterance will focus on the expression of closeness between the speaker and the listener. According to Green (as cited by Archia: 2014: :11), the largest meaning of pragmatics is that it is a study that focuses on deliberate human acts. This means that pragmatics

requires the interpretation of actions to get the correct meaning of speech. Therefore, paying attention to the context of the utterance to achieve the correct interpretation is important.

In the study of pragmatics, context has a significant role. Context determines the meaning of language performed in a particular society or community. As for the advantages and disadvantages of studying language through pragmatics, according to Yule (1996: 4) the advantages of studying language through pragmatics are that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their intentions or goals, and the types of actions (e.g. requests) they perform. The big disadvantage is that all the concepts that people mean, their assumptions, their intentions or purposes, and the types of actions (e.g. requests) they perform when they speak. The big disadvantage is that all these very human concepts are very difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way. In other words, pragmatics is useful because it focuses on how people communicate with each other linguistically, but it can be tricky to study because it requires us to understand other people and their intentions.

Therefore, pragmatics is an interesting study to study because it is about how one tries to understand other people linguistically through utterances. However, it is also a complicated study because it is about deep understanding of what is going on in the other person's mind when communicating. From the above opinion, I can describe pragmatics as a branch of linguistics that studies how people use language in their conversations. As a branch of linguistics, pragmatics covers several areas, such as the principles of cooperation and politeness.

2.1.2 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.

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.

There are four politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) to show people's awareness of other people's faces. They are bald on-record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and bald off-record.

2.1.1.1 Bald on Record Strategy

According to Brown and Levinson, being bald on record is a maximally effective way of communication (1987). The speaker primarily employs this tactic in order to complete the FTA quickly and effectively, as opposed to trying to win over the listener. This tactic is applied without lessening the listener's imposition. This tactic is typically applied in situations where the listener and the speaker are previously acquainted. The other individual will feel taken aback, ashamed, and mildly angry as a result of this tactic. This tactic speaks about expressing actions in the most precise possible manner. The speaker has the option to request the audience.

2.1.1.2 Positive Politeness Strategy

The positive politeness strategy is usually seen in groups of friends, is used to show to the familiarity to the interlocutor who is a close friend of the speaker. According to Yule (1996:60) politeness can be characterized as showing consciousness of someone else's public mental self-view. Based on the definition, it means it usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected (minimize the FTA). According to Brown and Levinson (as cited by Mujahidah: 2022: 70) it is expressed that face is something that is sincerely contributed and that can be lost, kept up or improved and should be continually taken care of cooperation. It means, positive politeness is focused on the hearer's

positive appearance and the positive self-perception that he holds for himself. According to Brown and Levinson there are fifteen sub-strategies that are used in positive politeness strategies:

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

This strategy suggests that the speaker should be aware of or pay attention to a certain aspect of the listener's situation. This can be seen as affection, concern, or even praise. The following is an illustration of this strategy:

"We ate too many beans tonight, didn't we?"

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 103)

The example above shows that the speaker is paying attention to the listener. It indicates that the speaker is aware of the listener's condition.

Strategy 2: Exaggerating (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer)

Using inflated adjectives to convey a sense of importance beyond what it actually is is one approach to employing this tactic. This tactic is demonstrated by the following:

"What a fantastic car you have!"

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 104)

The example above that the speaker exaggerated his or her praise for the hearer's car. The word "fantastic" suggested that the speaker has a good car.

Strategy 3: Intensifying interest to the hearer in the speaker's contribution

To increase the listener's interest, the speaker can tell an interesting story, to capture the listener's interest. The speaker can also use questions to draw the listener into the conversation. The following is an illustration of this strategy:

"You'll never guess what Bob told me last night. This is right up your street."

(Brown and Levinson 1978: 106)

The speaker tries to get the audience's attention before beginning the anecdote by stating, "You'll never guess what Bob said to me last night." The listener becomes intrigued by the story

after reading this statement. Because the listener is now actively participating in the debate, it is evident that the speaker has maintained the listener's goodwill. Because the speaker has acknowledged them, the listener is satisfied.

Strategy 4: Using in-group identity markers in speech

Using identification markers as greeting words in groups allows the speaker to demonstrate camaraderie and familiarity with the listener. The application of personal pronouns like you, I, we, and so forth. These identifying indicators reinforce the intimacy between the speaker and the listener. This tactic is demonstrated by the following:

“Come here, guys”

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 108)

Using the word "guys" to refer to the hearer, the speaker in the example above employed in-group identity cues.

Strategy 5: Seeking agreement in safe topics

This strategy is to seek for hearer's agreement by raising safe topics that the hearer will agree with. The following is an illustration of this strategy:

"Isn't your new house has a beautiful color?"

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 113)

The aforementioned example demonstrated how the speaker made a remark about a neighbor's new home. Rather than stating the dangerous issue, the speaker brings up the safer topic.

Strategy 6: Avoiding disagreement

This tactic demonstrated how to avoid conflict by using hedging, white lies, indirect agreement, and fake statements of agreement. In contrast to the preceding tactic, this one is typically employed in reaction to a beginning act that needs approval. At the same time, the people who granted that consent have a different viewpoint or stance. This tactic is demonstrated by the following:

A: "That's where you live, Switzerland?"

B: "That's where I was born."

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 114)

Whether the hearer lived there or not, the speaker sought for information. The speaker says that he was born there to avoid conflict rather than calling what he says incorrect.

Strategy 7: Presupposing, raising, asserting common ground

The interlocutors can use this tactic by having similar interests, convictions, and viewpoints. In this tactic, the speaker initiates a casual conversation to draw the hearer into the conversation. The speaker can use pronouns to involve the hearer in the discourse. This tactic is demonstrated by the following:

A: "People like me and you do not like to eat any junk-food. Isn't it?"

B: "Yes, we are."

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 119)

By demonstrating a point of agreement with the other person, B demonstrates positive politeness in the case above.

Strategy 8: Joking

This tactic, which reduces face-threatening acts (FTAs), is a fundamental example of good politeness. As a result, if you disguise this straightforward directive as a joke, it will come across as more kind and courteous. The reason for this is that jokes have the power to reduce the amount of face-threatening behaviour that voice commands require. An example of this tactic would be the following:

"OK if I tackle those cookies now?"

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 124)

The example is classified into make a joke because as we know that something that can be tackled is fish not the cookies.

Strategy 9: Asserting or presupposing speaker's knowledge of and concern for hearer's wants

This strategy is used to assert or imply knowledge to fit the listener's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants, and a way of showing that the speaker and the listener a cooperator who can potentially pressure listeners to cooperate. The following is an illustration of this strategy:

"Look, I know you want me to be good in mathematics, so shouldn't I do my homework now."

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 125)

This sentence shows the expression emphasized by the speaker. The speaker knows that the listener wants the speaker to be good at math. Thus, the listener's positive face has been satisfied because he has been appreciated and accepted by the speaker.

Strategy 10: Offering, promising

According to this tactic, the hearer will be offered or promised something when the speaker can. The speaker can say that they undoubtedly take action to benefit the listener. By using this tactic, the speaker demonstrates their sincere desire to meet the hearer's needs. An example of this tactic would be the following:

"I will treat you tomorrow."

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 125)

The offer and promise are the natural outcome of the dialogue above, which shows that the speaker fulfills the positive wishes of the speech partner.

Strategy 11: Being optimistic that the hearer wants what the speaker wants

In this strategy, the speaker grows hopeful that the listener will be receptive to their requests and will wish to assist them in some way. Particularly when the speaker expresses optimism to the listener, these circumstances might give the listener a sense of attention and positivity. This tactic is demonstrated by the following:

"You'll lend me your motorcycle, right?"

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 126)

The example above shows that the speaker was optimistic that hearer would lend her or him a motorcycle.

Strategy 12: Including both speaker and hearer in the activity

This strategy seeks to engage both the hearer and the speaker in the task at hand, leading to eventual cooperation. The pronoun "we" may be used by the speaker. As a result, the speaker has respected the hearer for belonging to the same group and preserved the hearer's good reputation. This tactic is demonstrated by the following:

"Let's have a ice tea, then."

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 127)

The example above demonstrates the speaker's true desire for the hearer to have an iced tea. In her request, the speaker utilized the inclusive "we" version of "let's".

Strategy 13: Giving and asking for reasons

This strategy use the act of asking and providing reason to demonstrate cooperation between the speaker and hearer. In order for the hearer to grasp the speaker's wish, this is done. The hearer thereby consents to assist the speaker in fulfilling their desire. A demonstration of this tactic is provided below:

"Why don't we go to the seashore!"

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 128)

Strategy 14: Asserting reciprocal exchange or tit for tat

The existence of cooperation between the speaker and the hearer can also be shown by stating mutual exchange. The following is an illustration of this strategy:

"Yesterday I have washed the dishes, so today it's your turn"

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 129)

By showing the existence of reciprocal rights in carrying out FTAs with each other, Speakers can soften their FTAs to speech partners.

Strategy 15: Giving gifts to hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

The last strategy of positive politeness is giving gifts to the hearer. The speaker may save the hearer's positive face by satisfying some of the hearer's wants. This strategy is given not only to real objects but also the desire to interact to be noticed, understood, heard, and others. The following is an illustration of this strategy:

“I know that you love the script, by buy this poster will make you happy”

(Brown and Levinson 1987: 130)

The provided example shows that speaker decides to save hearer's positive face by giving gift to the speaker.

2.1.1.3 Negative Politeness Strategy

Negative politeness is defined by Brown and Levinson (1987) as corrective behavior aimed toward the recipient's negative face, without impeding his attention or desire for freedom of action. Stated differently, compensation pertains to the listener's autonomy and freedom of action. The goal of negative politeness is to make an FTA less restrictive. This tactic is predicated on the speaker's intention to impose their opinions on the audience. The longing for autonomy is the negative face of this.

2.1.1.4 Bald Off Record Strategy

Off record is a communicative act that does not only contain one particular thing, Brown and Levinson (1987). This indicates that the speaker has multiple purposes in mind when they make it. Then, in order to decipher the utterance's true meaning, the listener must interpret it. Off record is frequently referred to as an indirect strategy as a result. When a speaker speaks off-the-record, communication is inefficient because the speaker does not express what is truly intended. Holtgraves (as cited by NS Aryani:2002:49) states that the off-record strategy is indirect communication. The indirect nature of this strategy gives speakers the chance to engage in FTAs without taking responsibility for doing so. In other words, the off-the-record strategy is a form of indirect politeness in which the speaker makes a statement that the listener may interpret in a variety of ways.

2.1.3 Factors Influencing the Use of Positive Politeness Strategies

This research also examines the factors influencing the use of positive politeness strategies in Luca movie. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:318) there are two factors that influencing the speaker to use positive politeness strategies, which is payoff and circumstances.

2.1.3.1 The payoffs

Positive politeness techniques can reduce FTAs by reassuring the hearer that the speaker understands their desires and interests. As a result, the speaker does not project a negative image on the hearer because their shared interests and values are obvious. Positive politeness leads to unity, equal participation, and mutual friendship as a result.'

“Let’s get on for lunch.”

(Brown and Levinson 1987:318)

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

2.1.4 The relevant circumstances: sociological factors

This section categorizes sociological variables into multiple sorts, including the absolute rank of coercion in a particular culture, relative "power" (asymmetrical relationship) between speaker and hearer, and "social distance" (symmetrical relationship) between speaker and hearer. The use of politeness by a speaker can be influenced by various factors, such as absolute status, relative authority, and social distance. The gap that exists between various social groups—such as those based on social class, race, or gender—can have an impact on decisions about civility. The strength and authority of the listener, such as superiors and subordinates, is determined by their relative power. Absolute rank is a degree- or rank-based factor that can affect the speaker's decision.

2.1.4.1 Social Distance

“Distance is a symmetric social aspect of resemblance or distinction that speakers and hearers represent the objectives of this act" states Brown and Levinson (1987:320). Thus, social distance can be defined as a confluence of psychologically legitimate attributes (status, age, sex, level of intimacy, etc.) that together impact the overall respect level in a given speaking scenario. For instance, the distance rating will decrease, and

you will feel closer to someone if you know her well or feel that you are of the same age or gender. Thus, when you ask her to do something, you will not apply polite language. In contrast, you will use polite language when interacting with strangers, such as someone older than you.

2.1.4.2 Relative Power

Power is the basic idea that we generally treat individuals who have authority over us with more respect than those who do not. It is another aspect of the speaker-hearer interaction that affects someone's capacity for polite speech. The places with the clearest hierarchies, like the courts or the workplace, are where these types of power are most prevalent. For instance, you would likely be more courteous when communicating with your employer because he or she frequently forgets things than when communicating with your sister. This is because your employer may have a favorable or unfavorable effect on your career.

2.1.4.3 Size of imposition

The relative status of one speech act to another in a context can reveal a measure of coercion; the value of coercion can still vary depending on the situation. For example, borrowing a laptop under normal circumstances would make us reluctant, but in an emergency, it would be natural. As a result, in the first context, we would use polite speech. Meanwhile, since the matter is urgent, there is no need to use polite language in the second context.

2.1.5 Previous of Related Studies

In supporting this research, several previous studies have similarities and differences with this research. This demonstrates the presence of studies using the same theory and approach with different objects.

The first preliminary research that was researched by previous researchers was developed by Nurmawati et al. (2019) with the title "Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies to Encourage Effective Interaction in the Classroom". This research concentrated on students participating in debates. Data was collected by researchers using observational studies and recorded conversations. Researchers will then examine and analyze the data to understand their ideas regarding effective

politeness techniques. The results of the types of conversations the researchers studied came from the use of positive politeness practices by teachers and students.

The second previous research was written by Tantri (2020), and the title of this research is "Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies in the Ellen Show: A Pragmatic Approach". In his research, it was concluded that his research only focused on one positive politeness strategy, namely joking. Because everyone uses humour frequently, some people sometimes use it negatively. This strategy aims to minimize face-threatening behaviour while making the listener feel comfortable during the conversation.

The last previous research was written by Nisrina Mujahidah (2022), and the title of this research is "Positive Politeness in the Enola Holmes Film Script". This research focuses on analyzing the types of positive politeness strategies that are most widely used and the context behind the use of these strategies. The author found 107 data that Enola Holmes, the youngest character in the story, most widely applied. The author uses Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy. It is hoped that this research can be used as part of a positive politeness learning strategy and provide a reference for further research.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the research method and is divided into six sections. The sections of the research method are explained as follows. The first section discusses time and location of data collection in this study. The second section refers to the research approach research approach chosen (quantitative or quantitative) and the research method used in conducting the thesis analysis. used in conducting the thesis analysis. The third section contains complete information about the research object used as a source of data to be analyzed. The fourth section is the data collection methods or techniques that researchers can use to collect data. The fifth section is the process of processing data into new information to make it more understandable and useful as a solution to a problem. easier to understand and useful as a solution to a problem, especially those related to research.