

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Definition of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a field in linguistics concerned with how meaning is conveyed through context, examining the social and cultural factors that shape communication. According to Yule (as cited by Sapar, et.al, 2022), Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener, emphasizing the interaction between language and context. Yule (as cited by Ramdhani and Amalia, 2023:2) also argues that pragmatics is essential in understanding how language users interpret both spoken and unspoken meanings, going beyond literal words. He emphasizes that conversation often relies on shared assumptions and background knowledge, making it possible to grasp indirect meanings, such as sarcasm or implications, without explicitly stating them.

Leech (as cited by Ahmed, 2022:948) introduces the concept of politeness as a central component of pragmatics, stressing that communication is not just about transmitting information but also maintaining interpersonal harmony. In interactions, speakers carefully choose words to show respect or avoid conflict. For example, instead of issuing a direct command, people might soften their requests to minimize discomfort, reflecting a desire to protect the listener's "face" (social image). This highlights how pragmatic competence is necessary for smooth social interactions.

According to Crystal (as cited by Nurdiana, 2019:30), pragmatics is the study of language use that takes into account the perspectives of its users and the effect of language on communication. It explores how meaning goes beyond the literal sense of words by considering context, intentions, and the relationship between speakers. Pragmatics focuses on how people use language strategically to achieve social goals, manage relationships, and maintain politeness, reflecting the influence of cultural and situational factors.

Together, these perspectives demonstrate that pragmatics is fundamental to decoding human interaction. While Yule highlights the role of shared assumptions in interpreting implied meanings, Leech sheds light on the strategies used to avoid conflict, and Crystal emphasizes how language use is shaped by the perspectives of users and the impact it has on communication within various contexts.

In summary, pragmatics provides valuable insight into how language reflects both social relationships and situational demands. These theories are essential for my research, as they help uncover the nuances of politeness strategies employed by the characters in *"The Banshees of Inisherin"*. Understanding these strategies allows for a deeper exploration of how characters in the movie use language to express emotions, navigate relationships, and manage interpersonal tensions.

2.2. Context

Context is essential in understanding the meaning and intent behind an utterance. It provides various elements such as the setting, participants, shared background knowledge, and the relationships between those involved. These factors shape how a message is conveyed and interpreted. The meaning of an utterance can change when it is expressed in a different context, emphasizing the importance of situational relevance. According to Widdowson (as cited by Pranowo, 2020:257), context refers to the circumstances surrounding language use that are considered relevant to meaning.

Context refers to how linguistic codes align with pragmatic meanings. The speaker's utterance pattern determines the true context. On the other hand, according to Cook (as cited by Pranowo, 2020:257) research on discourse and literature, contexts refer to an individual's knowledge of the world in connection to their own experiences. Different recipients may understand the same remark differently in terms of its pragmatic meaning. The pragmatic perspective divides context into two categories: static and dynamic. While Cutting (as cited by Setiawan, 2017:16) states that context refers to the shared assumptions of knowledge between the speaker and hearer.

Cutting (as cited by Setiawan, 2017:16) categorizes context into three types: situational context, context of background information, and co-textual. Situational context refers to the situation in which speakers interact and learn about what they perceive around them. Background knowledge context refers to what they know about each other, whereas co-textual context refers to what they know about what they've spoken.

2.3. Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies are essential tools for managing social interactions, demonstrating respect, and maintaining harmony between speakers and listeners. They reflect the speaker's effort to avoid conflict and show consideration for the listener's social standing and emotions. According to Yule (as cited by Winerta and Sari, 2018), Politeness is about showing awareness and consideration for another person's face. Politeness can also be understood as the way people select their words and structure their communication to convey messages appropriately and tactfully. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987:91) revolves around the concept of face—an individual's public self-image. They distinguish between positive face (the desire to be liked and accepted) and negative face (the desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition). Based on this distinction, they propose two main types of politeness: positive politeness and negative politeness. Below is a detailed explanation of each strategy under these categories, with scholarly elaboration and examples.

2.3.1. Positive Politeness Strategies

Positive politeness, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:101) is focused on Hearer (H)'s positive attributes and the positive self-perception that he holds for himself. Positive politeness is approach-based and 'anooints' the addressee's face by showing that Speaker (S) shares some of Hearer (H)'s desires (e.g., by treating him as a friend, a member of an in-group, a person whose wants and personality features are known and loved). The assurance that, generally speaking, Speaker (S) wants at least some of Hearer (H)'s wants—for instance, that Speaker (S) views Hearer (H) as essentially "the same" as he is, with in-group rights and duties and expectations of reciprocity—or the suggestion that Speaker (S) likes Hearer (H) so that the Face-threatening Act (FTA) does not violate him reduce the potential face threat of an act

in this situation. There are specific strategies included in positive politeness, and they are: notice, attend to Hearer (H) (their needs, interests, or goods), exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy), intensify interest to Hearer (H), use in-group identity markers (addressed forms, dialect, jargon, or slang), seek agreement (safe topics, repetition), avoid disagreement, presuppose or raise or assert common ground, joke, assert or presuppose Speaker (S)'s concern for Hearer (H)'s wants, offer, promise, be optimistic, include both Speaker (S) and Hearer (H) in the activity, give (or ask for) reasons, assume or assert reciprocity, and give gifts (goods, sympathy, cooperation).

2.3.1.1. Notice, attend to Hearer (H) (their interests, wants, needs, or goods)

This strategy encourages the speaker to be observant and attentive to the hearer's condition, desires, or achievements. It involves recognizing and commenting on elements that the hearer likely values or wishes to be acknowledged, such as physical changes, new possessions, or personal efforts. By showing interest and acknowledging the hearer's wants or accomplishments, the speaker strengthens rapport and connection (Brown & Levinson, 1987:103). For example:

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

This utterance highlights the speaker's recognition of another person's condition and expresses interest in the hearer's efforts. Even though the observation is simple, it conveys attentiveness, which helps maintain a positive atmosphere in the conversation.

2.3.1.2. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy)

This strategy involves expressing interest, approval, or sympathy with heightened enthusiasm through exaggerated language. Speakers may use intensified adjectives, modifiers, intonation, or stress to communicate that they are exceptionally impressed or sympathetic. Brown and Levinson (1987:105) argue that exaggeration helps amplify positive politeness by making the hearer feel appreciated, valued, or understood beyond normal expectations. For example:

"What a fantastic garden you have!"

The speaker uses the adjective “fantastic” to exaggerate approval for the hearer’s possession, which may not be objectively remarkable but is portrayed as such to express positive regard. This heightened expression makes the hearer feel validated and appreciated, fostering a sense of closeness and connection between the speaker and the hearer.

2.3.1.3. Intensify interest to Hearer (H)

This strategy reflects the speaker’s desire to make their message more engaging by adding vividness, emotion, and narrative flair. Brown and Levinson (1987:106) argue that speakers often switch between past and present tense during storytelling to enhance vividness and immediacy, as if the events are unfolding in real-time. This technique adds liveliness to the interaction, making the listener feel as though they are experiencing the event with the speaker. For example from Brown and Levinson (1987:106):

“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 everywhere.”

In this example, the speaker narrates past events but uses present-tense verbs, drawing the hearer into the story and creating a sense of immediacy. This storytelling approach adds emotional intensity and interest to the interaction, encouraging the hearer to stay engaged.

It is also common to include multiple tenses within the same narrative to express personal involvement and convey emotional shifts. For example:

“Last night, I visited that shop and bought a few things from the man there. He was friendly, wasn’t he? Spoke so nicely. And today, I heard that he passed away—I couldn’t believe it!”

This narrative blends past and present tenses to highlight the surprise and emotional impact of the speaker's experience. The shift from describing a friendly encounter to the shocking news of the man’s death heightens the emotional appeal, keeping the hearer’s attention throughout the interaction.

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

This strategy builds solidarity by using language associated with a shared group identity. Brown and Levinson (1987:107) highlight that speakers utilize in-group identity markers—such as specific forms of address, dialects, jargon, or slang—when they want to imply familiarity or reinforce bonds with the hearer. These markers signal that both participants belong to the same community or social group, whether based on family, friendship, profession, or regional background. Example from Brown and Levinson (1987:108):

“Help me with this bag here, will you son?”

This utterance illustrates how the speaker uses the familial term “son” to show closeness and reduce the weight of the imperative request. By framing the command as part of a familial relationship, the speaker avoids making the request sound like a strict order. The use of an in-group identity marker conveys warmth and downplays any sense of superiority or authority in the interaction.

2.3.1.5. Seek agreement (safe topics, repetition)

Seeking agreement is another strategy identified by Brown and Levinson (1987:112) that fosters solidarity and satisfies the hearer's positive face, the desire to be validated or approved. This strategy involves using safe topics and repetition to align the speaker's views with those of the hearer, which helps to maintain rapport and smoothen interactions.

a) Safe Topics

Safe topics, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:112) are subjects unlikely to provoke disagreement or controversy, often chosen to establish or maintain a connection. When speakers select these non-contentious topics—such as the weather, sports, or shared experiences—they emphasize their alignment with the hearer's views. For example:

“It's such a lovely day, isn't it?”

Here, the speaker makes a neutral observation, encouraging agreement from the hearer without inviting conflicting opinions.

b) Repetition as a Marker of Agreement

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:112-113), repetition involves restating part or all of what the hearer has just said to convey emotional agreement, attention, or surprise. This tactic also signals that the speaker is actively listening and shares the hearer's feelings or opinions. For example:

John: *"I went to London this weekend."*

Damian: *"You went to London this weekend?!"*

In this example, Damian repeats part of John's statement with an added tone of surprise, underscoring his emotional involvement. This repetition serves as a way to empathize with John and validate his experience, building solidarity between the two.

2.3.1.6. Avoid disagreement

This strategy allows speakers to agree superficially with the hearer to preserve the hearer's positive face. Brown and Levinson (1987:113) highlight that speakers may twist their words to hide disagreement, offering subtle cues of dissent without damaging the hearer's self-esteem. This strategy consists of four main components: token agreement, pseudo-agreement, white Lies, and hedging opinions.

a) Token Agreement

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:113-114), Token agreement occurs when the speaker creates the illusion of agreement while subtly introducing a conflicting perspective. Rather than saying "no" directly, the speaker responds with a qualified or conditional "yes" to avoid confrontation and protect the hearer's positive face. Example:

John: *"You hate your friends."*

Rey: *"Oh, sometimes."*

In this example, Rey is not fully agreeing with John's observation but softens his disagreement by acknowledging part of the statement with a "yes."

b) Pseudo-agreement

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:115), pseudo-agreement refers to a strategic closure of conversations using concluding markers like "then" or "so." This technique helps the speaker end a conversation smoothly without explicitly rejecting the hearer's ideas or opinions. The focus here is on politeness through non-contentious closure. Example:

"I'll be seeing you tomorrow, then."

In this instance, the use of "then" signals an end to the conversation while maintaining politeness. The speaker avoids any potential disagreement by wrapping up the interaction without directly opposing the hearer's suggestion.

c) White Lies

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:115-116), white lies are polite fictions employed to avoid hurting the hearer's feelings or to refuse a request without being blunt. Speakers may invent reasons to soften a refusal, prioritizing the hearer's positive face over truth. This strategy is particularly useful in social situations where honesty could cause discomfort. Example:

"I can't come with you; my stomach hurts."

Here, the speaker fabricates an excuse rather than outright rejecting the invitation, preserving the hearer's face. Both parties may understand that the reason is untrue, but the courtesy of the white lie maintains social harmony.

d) Hedging Opinions

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:116), hedging occurs when the speaker intentionally uses vague or ambiguous language to soften their stance, avoiding direct disagreement. This strategy involves linguistic

devices such as hedges (e.g., “maybe,” “sort of,” “I guess”), which allow the speaker to express opinions cautiously. Example:

“It’s kind of tasty, but maybe not everyone would like this soup.”

In this case, the speaker introduces hedges to avoid a firm opinion, which could contradict the hearer’s view. Hedging reflects an attempt to reduce the force of disagreement, ensuring the interaction remains polite and cooperative.

2.3.1.7. Presuppose or raise or assert common ground

This strategy involves fostering a sense of shared knowledge, beliefs, or perspectives between the speaker and the hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:117), the goal is to reduce social distance and enhance positive politeness by presuming that the speaker and hearer share a common understanding. There are three main components of this strategy: small talk, point-of-view operations, and presupposition manipulation.

a) Small Talk

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:117-118), small talk serves as a tool to mitigate face-threatening acts (FTAs) by establishing friendliness. The speaker engages the hearer with casual, unrelated topics to strengthen social bonds and ease into more serious or relevant discussions. Example:

“How was your weekend? Oh, by the way, about that report...”

In this example, the speaker briefly asks about the hearer's weekend, initiating small conversation, before immediately transitioning to a serious topic for discussion. This approach signals that the interaction is not solely focused on business or requests, contributing to a more positive and cooperative atmosphere.

b) Point-of-View Operation

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:118), point-of-view operation makes communication feel more personal by changing how

events, time, or space are framed. It includes switching perspectives, such as when the speaker talks from the listener's point of view (e.g., using "you" instead of "I"). It also involves shifting tenses between past and present to make stories feel more immediate. Additionally, using words like "here" or "this" instead of "there" or "that" helps create a shared sense of space, bringing the speaker and listener closer. Example:

“I really had a hard time learning this subject, you know.”

This example showcases the speaker speaks as if the hearer were the speaker or the hearer's knowledge were equal to the speaker's knowledge by using the phrase “you know” also using a word like “this” and by switching the perspectives and frames makes the communication feel inclusive and engaging, pulling the hearer into the narrative.

c) Presupposition Manipulation

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:122), presupposition manipulation aspect focuses on building smoother communication by assuming shared knowledge or beliefs between the speaker and listener. The speaker might act as if the listener already knows or agrees with certain points to avoid stating them explicitly. Examples include asking rhetorical questions that imply an expected response (e.g., “You wouldn't want to miss this, would you?”) and assuming shared values (e.g., “As usual, we aim for the best result, right?”). Familiarity can also be shown through informal terms like “honey” or “buddy” to create closeness (e.g., “What's going on, pal?”). Additionally, the speaker may refer to information with the assumption the listener is already aware (e.g., “You know how busy Mondays are.”). These strategies help maintain positive politeness, making conversations more comfortable and engaging while reducing the chance of confrontation.

2.3.1.8. Joke

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:124), this strategy uses humor to ease tension and reduce the face-threatening act (FTA). Humor can build rapport by creating a sense of shared understanding and putting the hearer at ease. Example:

“Since you’re such a coffee expert, can I trust you to make me the best cup ever?”

The humor in this example lies in the playful teasing of the hearer while subtly embedding a request. By calling the hearer a “coffee expert,” the speaker creates a light, joking tone that flatters or mildly pokes fun at them. This humor serves as a positive politeness strategy by making the request feel less imposing.

2.3.1.9. Assert or presuppose Speaker (S)’s concern for Hearer (H)’s wants

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:125) this strategy shows the speaker’s awareness of the hearer’s preferences and demonstrates concern by acting as if they know what the hearer wants. This can increase the hearer’s willingness to cooperate, as it signals empathy and attention. The speaker subtly implies they are acting in alignment with the hearer’s interests, reducing potential conflict. Example:

“I know you’ve had a long day, so I brought dinner for you.”

This example reflects a positive politeness strategy by demonstrating the speaker's concern for the hearer’s well-being and desires. The act of recognizing the hearer’s fatigue and providing dinner conveys empathy, which fosters rapport and strengthens the hearer's positive face—their desire to be appreciated and cared for.

2.3.1.10. Offer, promise

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:125), this strategy emphasizes cooperation and goodwill by making offers or promises to help the hearer. Even if the offer or promise is exaggerated or unrealistic, the intention is to signal a willingness to assist and cater to the hearer’s needs, reinforcing their positive face. This creates a sense of commitment to the hearer’s goals, regardless of whether the speaker will follow through. Example:

“I’ll take care of it for you, don’t worry.”

This examples shows the promise serves to ease the hearer's concerns, showing that the speaker acknowledges and values the hearer's potential stress or burden. This expression not only provides reassurance but also strengthens the social bond between speaker and hearer by signaling care and reliability. By taking responsibility, the speaker enhances the hearer's positive face—their need to feel supported and understood—while promoting a cooperative relationship.

2.3.1.11. Be optimistic

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:126), this strategy involves assuming that both the speaker and hearer share common desires or goals. The speaker acts optimistically, believing that the hearer will naturally be inclined to help or cooperate. This shared optimism strengthens the bond between the speaker and hearer, as it suggests mutual understanding and collaboration. Example:

“I know you're on board with this plan—it'll be great!”

In this examples shows the speaker assumes the hearer's agreement and enthusiasm, fostering a sense of unity and alignment. This presumption not only encourages cooperation but also reduces the likelihood of disagreement by implying shared goals or mutual understanding. By conveying confidence that the hearer is supportive, the speaker strengthens the hearer's positive face, addressing their desire to be appreciated and valued.

2.3.1.12. Include both Speaker (S) and Hearer (H) in the activity

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:127), this strategy utilizes the inclusive pronoun "we" to involve the hearer directly in the speaker's action or request. By doing so, the speaker reduces the distance between them, emphasizing collaboration and shared effort. The use of "we" creates a sense of unity and makes the request seem like a mutual activity, which helps mitigate the face-threatening act (FTA) by implying that both parties are equally responsible. Example:

“Let's work on this report together, shall we?”

This example reflects the strategy of including both the speaker and hearer in an activity, which serves as a positive politeness tactic. By framing the task as a

collaborative effort, the speaker reduces the sense of imposition that might arise from a direct request. This inclusive phrasing promotes a sense of partnership, making the hearer feel involved and appreciated rather than burdened.

2.3.1.13. Give (or ask for) reasons

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:128), this strategy involves providing explanations for actions or requests to foster cooperation. The speaker appeals to the hearer's sense of reason by making the request appear logical or justified, which encourages agreement. Example:

“Can you help me wash the dishes? I need to finish my assignment, the deadline is tonight.”

By providing a reason for the request, the speaker reduces the potential imposition on the hearer. It makes the request seem more reasonable and justifiable, as it appeals to the hearer's understanding and empathy. The added explanation also shows the speaker's acknowledgment of the hearer's autonomy while framing the task as a necessity driven by the speaker's urgent need.

2.3.1.14. Assume or assert reciprocity

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:129), this strategy is based on the principle of reciprocal obligations—an exchange of favors between the speaker and hearer. It involves reminding the hearer of past help or suggesting future cooperation. This approach strengthens mutual commitment and fosters a sense of obligation between both parties. Example:

“I did your homework last week, so could you give me a hand with mine today?”

This approach leverages the concept of mutual exchange to make the request more palatable, framing it within a context of fairness and balance. By reminding the hearer of a previous favor, the speaker subtly implies that helping in return would be a reasonable and expected action, thereby reducing any sense of imposition.

2.3.1.15. Give gifts (goods, sympathy, cooperation)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:129), this strategy refers to offering intangible gifts, such as sympathy, understanding, or encouragement, rather than material presents. People enjoy feeling valued and understood, and expressing care can strengthen social bonds while reducing the impact of FTAs. Example:

“I know you look sad these days, so I just wanted to check in and see how you’re feeling.”

By expressing concern and offering emotional support, the speaker acknowledges the hearer’s emotional state, thereby enhancing the bond between them. This approach builds rapport and trust by showing that the speaker values the hearer’s well-being. Such gestures reinforce the positive face of the hearer, emphasizing the importance of connection and empathy in maintaining strong interpersonal relationships.

2.3.2. Negative Politeness Strategies

On the other side, negative politeness, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:129-130) is primarily focused on partially addressing H's negative face, which is his fundamental desire to uphold territorial and self-determination assertions. Therefore, negative politeness is mostly avoidance-based, and realizations of negative-politeness techniques include promises that the speaker will not (or will only minimally) interfere with the addressee's freedom of action and will acknowledge and respect the addressee's negative-face demands. Therefore, negative politeness is defined by self-effacement, formality, and restraint, focusing on very specific parts of H's self-image, primarily his need for unhindered access. Face-threatening behaviors are addressed with apologies for interfering or violating, with courtesy in language and non-language, with hedges against the act's illocutionary force, and with impersonalizing techniques (like passives) that put S in a distance. The strategies included in negative politeness are: be direct or conventionally indirect, question, hedge, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, give deference, apologize, impersonalize Speaker (S) and Hearer (H) (avoid

pronouns), state the FTA as a general rule, nominalize, and go on record as incurring a debt or not indebting Hearer (H).

2.3.2.1. Be direct or conventionally indirect

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:130-132), this strategy involves using indirect language to address the listener's negative face (the desire to act freely and without pressure). The speaker uses phrasing that, while understandable in context, avoids the literal and direct meanings that could impose on the hearer. This offers the listener an "out," giving them a choice to decline without feeling pressured. Example:

"Could you possibly clean the bookshelf?"

This phrasing, although technically a question, functions as a polite request. It softens the imposition by giving the hearer the option to decline, aligning with the norms of polite speech. Using indirect language in this way minimizes potential face-threatening acts by reducing the speaker's imposition. The inclusion of "possibly" adds a tone of uncertainty, which further emphasizes politeness and consideration, creating a more cooperative and respectful interaction.

2.3.2.2. Question, hedge

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:145), this strategy involves using questions or hedges to mitigate the impact of an FTA. A hedge is a linguistic device used to soften the force of a statement or request. Speakers often hedge when they anticipate resistance or non-compliance. Example:

"I suppose that Harry is coming, won't you just finish this task first?"

In this case, the speaker introduces uncertainty with the phrase "I suppose," softening their assertion. This hedge makes the statement less forceful, giving room for the hearer to interpret or correct the assumption. Additionally, the question at the end shifts the focus towards a polite suggestion rather than an outright command. By using both a hedge and a question, the speaker reduces the potential face-threatening nature of their request, promoting a cooperative interaction while still subtly guiding the hearer toward completing the task.

2.3.2.3. Be pessimistic

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:173), the pessimistic strategy expresses doubt about the hearer's willingness or ability to comply, addressing the hearer's negative face by acknowledging potential inconvenience. This lowers the expectation of compliance and reduces the pressure on the hearer to agree. Example:

"I don't suppose you'd have money to buy this book for me, would you?"

The speaker employs a pessimistic tone by expressing doubt about the hearer's ability or willingness to fulfill the request. This phrasing minimizes the imposition, as it subtly implies that the speaker expects a negative response. The rhetorical structure also distances the speaker from making a direct demand, reducing potential face-threatening effects.

2.3.2.4. Minimize the imposition

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:176), this strategy involves downplaying the seriousness of the request to make it less burdensome for the hearer. Words like "just" or "a little" are often used to reduce the perceived size or importance of the request. This helps protect the hearer's negative face by reducing the sense of obligation. Example:

"I just dropped by for a minute to ask if you have time to accompany me tomorrow?"

The phrase "just dropped by for a minute" downplays the speaker's request, making it seem small and unintrusive. This approach reduces the potential burden on the hearer, signaling that the favor being asked is not too demanding. Additionally, by softening the request, the speaker maintains politeness and preserves the hearer's positive face, giving them the freedom to decline without guilt.

2.3.2.5. Give deference

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:178), this strategy emphasizes respect toward the hearer, often using honorifics or respectful language. By showing

deference, the speaker acknowledges the hearer's higher status or autonomy, which satisfies their negative face. This strategy increases politeness by recognizing social hierarchies or personal boundaries. Example:

"Excuse me, sir, but would you mind if I ask you a question regarding this topic of our today's lesson?"

By using honorific language like "sir" and polite phrases such as "would you mind," the speaker shows respect toward the hearer, especially acknowledging a higher social or authority status. This deference minimizes any potential face-threatening act by framing the question in a way that allows the hearer to comfortably accept or refuse without feeling imposed upon.

2.3.2.6. Apologize

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:187), apologies are employed as negative politeness strategies to acknowledge and redress an imposition. This strategy signals the speaker's awareness of the potential harm or inconvenience caused to the hearer's negative face and seeks to repair or mitigate it. There are four main ways to apologize: Recognizing pressures or distractions on the hearer's autonomy, Expressing reluctance to impose, Explaining the necessity for the FTA, Begging forgiveness or requesting a delay in imposing. Example:

"I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt your presentation."

By saying "I'm sorry," the speaker directly addresses the disruption and shows awareness of the impact on the hearer's negative face, which reflects their desire to be free from interruptions. The phrase "didn't mean to" softens the apology, signaling that the interruption was unintentional. This strategy helps maintain politeness by mitigating the severity of the act and restoring social harmony, ensuring the hearer does not feel disrespected or slighted.

2.3.2.7. Impersonalize Speaker (S) and Hearer (H) (avoid pronouns)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:190), this strategy minimizes the imposition by avoiding personal references such as "I" or "you." By impersonalizing the speaker and hearer, the FTA becomes less direct, softening the

impact. It gives the impression that the situation or action involves external circumstances, not just the individuals involved. Example:

“It seems the files need to be revised by tomorrow.”

This phrasing creates emotional distance, focusing attention on the task rather than on the individuals involved. By using expressions like “it seems” and emphasizing the files rather than “you” or “I,” the speaker mitigates any potential imposition, making the request appear less forceful. This approach helps maintain politeness, particularly in professional or formal settings, by softening the directive and avoiding personal confrontation.

2.3.2.8. State the FTA as a general rule

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:206), stating the FTA as a general rule or regulation distances the request from the personal intentions of the speaker. This frames the imposition as a matter of policy or obligation, reducing its impact on the hearer’s autonomy. Example:

“All passengers are expected to follow all the safety regulations and remain calm.”

By depersonalizing the message, the speaker minimizes any potential offense or imposition on individual passengers. This strategy is effective in situations requiring compliance, such as public safety instructions, where the goal is to maintain order and ensure that directives are accepted without resistance. It also conveys a sense of authority and neutrality, as the rule is presented as a standard expectation rather than a personal demand.

2.3.2.9. Nominalize

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:207), nominalization involves converting verbs or adjectives into nouns to increase formality and distance. This strategy abstracts the message, giving it an official or detached tone. Nominalizing reduces the immediacy of the FTA, helping the speaker address the hearer’s negative face. Example:

“You performing well on the examinations impressed us favourably.”

“We are impressed because you performed well,” the sentence nominalizes the action by turning it into “You performing well,” shifting the focus from personal agency to the outcome. This formality increases distance between the speaker and the hearer, reducing the directness of the praise while still maintaining politeness. Nominalization is often used in professional, academic, or institutional communication, where creating a neutral or objective tone is preferred.

2.3.2.10. Go on record as incurring a debt or not indebting Hearer (H)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:210), this strategy involves the speaker explicitly acknowledging their indebtedness to the hearer or denying any obligation on the part of the hearer. By doing so, the speaker addresses the face threat (FTA) by Expressing indebtedness that indicates that the speaker recognizes the burden their request places on the hearer and appreciates their cooperation and Disclaiming any debt on the hearer's part that reassures the hearer that they are not obliged to reciprocate or feel burdened by the speaker's request. Example:

“It wouldn’t be any trouble since I also want to go there as well.”

Here, the speaker positions the favor not as an obligation but as something they are doing for themselves, reducing the hearer's sense of indebtedness. This approach strengthens the relationship by avoiding the impression that the speaker is incurring a debt or burden on the hearer. It creates an atmosphere of mutual convenience and politeness, where the act becomes collaborative rather than a favor requiring reciprocation.

2.4. Factors on Using Politeness Strategies

Most people do not act just for personal gain, regardless of the benefits. Certain factors can impact the usage of politeness techniques during FTAs. Brown and Levinson (1987:71) identified two characteristics that encourage speakers to use politeness techniques. There are payoffs and relevant circumstances.

2.4.1. Payoffs

Payoffs in politeness strategies, according to Brown and Levinson (1987:71), refer to the benefits speakers can gain by using specific strategies to

manage face-threatening acts (FTAs). When going on record, speakers ensure clarity, avoid misunderstandings, and gain credit for honesty or outspokenness.

Redressing the act with positive politeness fosters closeness by satisfying the listener's positive face needs, such as showing approval or shared interests. Negative politeness, on the other hand, respects the listener's desire for autonomy, offering politeness that mitigates the imposition. Going off record allows the speaker to appear tactful while avoiding direct responsibility. The ultimate strategy—opting not to perform the FTA—ensures no face threat but also limits communication. Each strategy offers distinct advantages depending on the level of risk associated with the FTA and the speaker's relational goals.

2.4.2. The Circumstances

According to Brown and Levinson's theory (1987:74), the "relevant circumstances" refers to contextual factors that influence the choice and use of politeness strategies in social interactions. These factors shape the degree to which speakers employ either positive or negative politeness to maintain face. There are three core variables within these circumstances:

a) Social Distance (D)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:74), this refers to the level of familiarity or intimacy between the speaker and the listener. When people are socially distant, more formal or indirect strategies (often negative politeness) tend to be used. For close relationships, positive politeness strategies are more appropriate to express camaraderie.

b) Relative Power (P)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:74), power dynamics play a role in politeness. A speaker is more likely to use polite, deferential language when addressing someone of higher status or authority. Conversely, when speaking to someone of equal or lower status, the speaker might feel less need to employ elaborate politeness.

c) Degree of Imposition (R)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:74), this relates to how demanding or intrusive the speech act is. A request or action with a high imposition (e.g., asking for a large favor) requires more politeness, while a low-imposition act (e.g., asking for something small) may call for less.

These three factors—D, P, and R—interact to determine how speakers manage face-threatening acts (FTAs). The higher the social distance, power difference, or imposition, the more likely speakers are to rely on negative politeness strategies to avoid offending or imposing on the listener.

2.5. Previous Related Studies

In supporting this research, various previous studies share similarities and differences. This shows the application of the same idea and approach in research on this topic. The first study, conducted by Maharani et al. (2023) and titled “The Analysis of Politeness Strategy Used by The Main Characters in “Gifted” Film”, focuses on politeness strategies in the context of parenting and education. The study aims to explore how politeness is applied in communication and its relevance to various aspects of life, using the movie as a learning medium. The results reveal both positive and negative politeness strategies, emphasizing that politeness helps maintain effective communication and self-image in interpersonal interactions.

The second study, by Sari and Sutopo (2024), titled “An Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies in Spiderman: Far From Home Movie”, focuses on identifying positive politeness strategies used by characters in the movie. The aim is to explore how these strategies reflect the characters’ personalities and improve communication. The findings highlight the variety of techniques used to minimize face-threatening acts and foster smooth interactions, with factors such as power dynamics and social distance influencing the level of politeness.

The third study, by Syifa et al. (2021), titled “An Analysis of Negative Politeness Strategy Used by Anna in Anna and The King Movie (A Sociolinguistics Approach)”, examines how social settings and interactions influence language choices. The study focuses on how formality, power, and social distance affect the

use of negative politeness strategies by Anna. It analyzes Anna's speech based on sociolinguistic factors such as status and cultural context to enhance the understanding of negative politeness. The research also aims to promote these strategies to reduce racist remarks in social interactions.

My research differs itself from previous studies in several key ways. Maharani et al. (2023) explored all politeness strategies in the movie *Gifted* within parenting and education contexts, while my study focuses only in examines positive and negative politeness strategy within different relational dynamics. Then, Sari and Sutopo (2024) focused solely on positive politeness in *Spiderman: Far From Home*, but I address both strategies to analyze behavior more comprehensively. And then, Syifa et al. (2021) only emphasized negative politeness in *Anna and the King* through a sociolinguistic lens, whereas my study takes a pragmatic approach, focusing on interpersonal conflict and character development and also examines both politeness strategies; positive and negative.

Overall, while these studies contribute valuable insights into politeness strategies in movie, my research offers a fresh perspective by integrating a broader analysis of both positive and negative strategies in a narrative that emphasizes interpersonal friendships.