

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHOD

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This section explains the theories and concepts applied to analyse the data and answer the research questions of this study.

2.1.1 Speech Act

Speech act theory was first introduced by Austin (1962) based on the idea that language does not merely serve to describe reality. It also has another function, namely to perform actions. According to Austin (1962), when speakers utter a statement, they are also performing an action through language which classified as: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. However, the illocutionary act is important here because it refers to the speaker's intention in uttering the statement.

This theory was further developed by Searle (1969), who emphasised that illocutionary force plays a primary role in an interaction. Searle (1969) argued that utterances are not merely for the sake of saying something, they also serve to indicate an intention. As explained by Searle and Vanderveken (1985), who noted that illocutionary acts enable the speaker to achieve their intended purpose. There are different categories with distinct functions.

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) explains assertive speech acts are used when the speaker believes in the truth of a proposition, such as stating, claiming, criticising, or evaluating. Meanwhile, directive speech acts are used to direct the hearer through actions such as requesting, advising, commanding, warning, and

suggesting. These speech acts commonly found in Hannibal's interaction with his clients making this theory relevant to this study.

2.1.2 Face-Threatening Act (FTA)

The concept of face was first introduced by Goffman (1967), who defined face as the positive social value a person claims for themselves during interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987) further developed this concept by distinguishing face into two sides which are positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to an individual's desire to be approved of, appreciated, and accepted by others, while negative face refers to the desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition.

Based on this concept, Brown and Levinson (1987) define Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) as acts that potentially threaten the hearer's positive or negative face. FTAs directed toward positive face may undermine the hearer's self-image, such as criticism or disagreement, whereas FTAs directed toward negative face impose upon the hearer's freedom of action through requests, commands, or other forms of imposition.

When performing speech acts such as assertive or directive acts, speakers often create a potential threat to the hearer because these speech acts may contain evaluation, judgement or attempts to influence others, and may potentially threaten the hearer's face when the act is performed. Therefore, a strategy is required to reduce or mitigate this threat, known as the politeness strategy.

2.1.3 Politeness Strategies

The theory of politeness strategy was developed by Brown and Levinson (1987) to understand how speakers manage actions that threaten the hearer's face in

a social interaction. Building on Goffman's (1967) concept of 'face', which was discussed earlier, Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that speakers have a choice regarding how they perform speech acts based on factors of power, distance, and rank of imposition during an interaction. There are four categories of strategies, each with different levels and approaches to managing potential threats to the hearer. These range from the most direct, with no attempt to mitigate the which is bald on record to positive politeness, negative politeness, and the most indirect, off record, each with their own sub-strategies that serve as indicators.

2.1.3.1 Type of Politeness Strategies

These are four strategies explained by Brown and Levinson (1987) in managing the potential threat to the hearer's face.

a. Bald on Record

Brown and Levinson (1987) note that bald on record is evident when the speaker engages in FTA directly, clearly, efficiently, and without attempting to minimise the threat to the listener's face. Bald on record related to Grice's conversational maxims by focusing on clarity, relevance and efficiency in an interaction. In practice, bald on record is often found when the speaker decides that clarity is more important than the threat to their own face. They further explain that the use of bald on record could appear in an interaction that involve urgency or pressure that beneficial for the hearer. For example: "In future, you must add the soda after the whisky".

b. Positive Politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness is directed towards the positive face of the hearer, which wants to be considered, appreciated and accepted by others. The use of this strategy allows the speaker to reduce social distance by demonstrating closeness through shared understanding or by involving the hearer. This strategy can build solidarity and personal closeness even where there is significant social distance or a power imbalance between them. The use of positive politeness strategies in Hannibal's speech act, which threatens his client's face, may reduce the level of confrontation by creating an impression of closeness. For example: "Bring me your dirty clothes to wash, Johnny".

c. Negative Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that negative politeness is directed at the negative face of the hearer who wants freedom of action and freedom from imposition. By using negative politeness, the speaker can minimise the burden or pressure that the FTA has and serves to show boundaries, respect, and social distance. This strategy is characterised by the use of hedging, apologies and questions. The use of this strategy is often associated with professional relationships involving an imbalance of power or when discussing sensitive topics. For example: "You could perhaps pass the salt".

d. Off-record

Brown and Levinson (1987) also explain that off record can be observed when a speaker engages in FTA indirectly and no specific purpose can be clearly identified from the utterance. Through this strategy, the speaker avoids taking

responsibility for the meaning interpreted by the listener. Instead of saying what they mean directly, the speaker provides hints or clues that the listener can interpret for themselves. Using this strategy, the speaker can avoid or minimise FTA if the listener challenges them. Usually, this strategy is expressed through metaphors, hints, rhetorical questions, as well as ambiguity and other forms of indirectness. In an interaction, this allows the speaker to criticise, warn, and even influence and evaluate the listener with minimal FTA or to avoid responsibility of the face-threats. For example: “Harry’s a real fish” (c.i. He drinks/swims/is slimy/is cold-blooded like a fish).

2.1.4 Power, Distance, and Rank of Imposition

Brown and Levinson (1987) describe three variables that influence the choice of politeness strategies in an interaction, as follows:

a. Power

Power is an asymmetrical social dimension in which one participant in an interaction has the ability to impose their plans and judgements on the other. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), there are two main sources of power: material control, which includes economic resources and physical strength; and metaphysical control, which comes from authority recognised by others.

b. Distance

Distance is a symmetrical dimension that reflects the proximity between the speaker and the hearer. Social closeness tends to be seen when there is mutual giving and receiving of positive face, meaning that if participants are close, they will take each other’s face-saving needs into consideration.

c. Rank of Imposition

Rank of imposition refers to the extent to which an action is perceived as interfering with the other party's desire for freedom in making choices or carrying out actions. There are two types of imposition: the spending of time and energy, and the giving of information and expressions of appreciation. The degree of imposition may also be influenced by whether the speaker has specific rights or obligations to perform the action.

2.1.5 Characterization

According to Kenney (1966), one of the primary methods of characterization in fiction is the dramatic method, in which characters reveal themselves through their own speech and actions and not by direct explanation by the narrator. Through this method, readers infer personality traits, attitudes, and motives from the character's observable behaviour.

2.2 Research Method

This section outlines the research methodology employed by the author to analyze Hannibal Lecter's speech acts which threaten his clients' face and politeness strategies to mitigate the FTAs, as well as the power relations reflected in the use of these politeness strategies and the pattern of strategies that construct Hannibal Lecter's character.

2.2.1 Types of Research

This study uses a qualitative research design (Creswell, 2014) to explore how Hannibal uses politeness strategies with his clients and how these strategies reflect power dynamics and characterization. The research design is suitable

because this study relies on utterance interpretation by the context and not by numerical measurement.

2.2.2 Data

The data for this study were collected by the author from the season 1 of the TV series *Hannibal* which consists of 13 episodes and was produced by Fuller (2013). Only the first season was selected as the data source because therapy sessions occur more frequently in the first season. The data consist of Hannibal Lecter's speech acts during therapy sessions with his clients which are Will Graham, Franklyn Froideveaux and Bella Crawford and the context in which these interactions took place and situations. The unit of analysis is the speech acts performed by Hannibal and the FTAs he made to his clients during the therapy sessions. Each datum is marked with a number, season, episode, and timestamp to ensure accuracy.

2.2.3 Sampling Technique

This study employed purposive sampling to select the data. The utterances selected were limited to those made by Hannibal Lecter during therapy sessions with his clients in season 1 of the series *Hannibal*. These clients are Will Graham, Franklyn Froideveaux and Bella Crawford. The utterances were then classified according to the type of speech act whether threatening the positive or negative face of the three clients based on the context in which the utterances were made. Although the clients' utterances were not the primary data, they were used as supporting data for the analysis of Hannibal's utterances.

2.2.4 Method of Collecting Data

The author collected the data using observation method by watching the season 1 of Hannibal TV series carefully and repeatedly. All utterances spoken by Hannibal during therapy sessions with his clients were then systematically noted in Microsoft Excel. After that, each utterance identified as containing face-threatening acts (FTA) was classified and categorised based on the speech act performed (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985) and the politeness strategy indicators proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

2.2.5 Method of Analyzing Data

The data were analysed by the author in several steps. First, the speech acts performed by Hannibal in his therapy sessions with each client were identified using Searle and Vanderveken's (1985) illocutionary act framework, assertive and directive acts. Second, these speech acts were examined to determine whether they threatened the positive or negative face of Hannibal's clients. Third, the speech acts were classified according to the attempts at mitigation proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), which are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, or off record.

The patterns shown from the use of these politeness strategies are then interpreted in relation to power relations, social distance, and the rank of imposition between Hannibal and each of his clients. The analysis continues to discuss how these patterns contribute as tools in the construction of Hannibal Lecter's character.