

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORY AND METHOD**

#### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

In this study, the researcher uses Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness strategy and its sociological factors to analyze how Annalise uses the politeness strategy in professional communication, also how the choice of politeness strategy can affect the effectiveness of her communication.

##### **2.1.1 Politeness Strategy**

In politeness framework, Yule (1996:59-60) defines politeness strategies as communication strategies employed to manage and enhance social interactions while minimizing potential threats to face, which refers to an individual's self-esteem and public image.

Additionally, the politeness theory by Lakoff (1973:56) described politeness from a gender perspective, politeness in women's language is described as leaving the decision open, not imposing mind, or views on anyone. Politeness involves an absence of a strong statement, and women's speech is devised to prevent the expression of strong statements. In a later publication, Lakoff (2004) suggests three rules; distance, deference, and camaraderie.

Furthermore, the politeness theory developed by Leech (1983) emphasizes on politeness principles. Leech (1983:81) suggests that the Politeness Principle involves minimizing impolite expressions, assuming constant variables, and highlighting the positive aspect (maximizing polite expressions with constant variables). This principle underscores the idea of restraining impolite language while giving emphasis to respectful statements, though to a lesser degree of importance. Leech (1983:132) expands politeness principles further to contribute to this framework by emphasizing six maxims that guide effective communication; tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy.

On the other hand, Brown and Levinson (1987:61) developed a model of politeness that encompassed a more comprehensive understanding of social interaction, in particular expanding upon the concept of face, theory by Goffman (1967). In practical terms, Brown and Levinson's theory focuses on face-threatening acts (FTAs) and the strategies of politeness that are utilized to redress or mitigate FTA. Brown and Levinson's theory offers a more comprehensive insight into sociological factors affecting politeness strategies because it considers social variables. Their model acknowledges power dynamics, social distance, and imposition rank as crucial factors. This theory's thorough examination of sociological factors enables a detailed analysis of politeness strategies across different social contexts. It serves as a valuable framework for comprehending the complexities of interpersonal communication and how societal dynamics shape language use.

### **2.1.2 Face**

Brown and Levinson. (1987:61) defined ‘face’ as desired public image or social value that individuals strive to maintain, based on Goffman’s (1967) conceptual framework and the English expression “losing face”. The concept of face carries emotions and can be lost, preserved, or enhanced, requiring constant attention during interactions consisting of two aspects:

#### **Negative face**

The concept of negative face is the fundamental assertion of individuals regarding authorities, personal boundaries, rights to undisturbed action, and freedom for imposition. This assertion highlights the importance of respecting individual freedoms and autonomy within society and interpersonal interactions.

#### **Positive face**

Positive face is referred to an individual's effort for a positive and consistent self-image or “personality”, which includes the desire for others to appreciate and approve of this self-image during interactions. This concept emphasizes the importance of fostering a sense of mutual respect, validation, and admiration in interpersonal interactions

### **2.1.3 Face Threatening Act (FTA)**

FTA is defined by Brown and Levinson (1987:65) as actions that have the potential to pose a threat to the face-wants of either the speaker or the addressee. These actions, whether verbal or non-verbal, run counter to the face wants of the participants involved. Recognizing and avoiding FTA are ways to make harmonious communication in various social contexts.

### **2.1.4 Types of Politeness Strategies**

Brown and Levinson (1987:68-70) categorized politeness strategies into four categories, namely: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record.

#### **2.1.4.1 Bald on Record**

Bald on record is expressed in the most direct, unambiguous, and clearest way. Brown and Levinson (1987:69) asserted that bald on record has no attempts to soften the face-threatening act and does not minimize threats to the hearer's face. There are two strategies for bald on record; Cases of non-minimization of the face threat and Cases of FTA-oriented bald on record usage. The use of bald on record is in the following examples.

1. **Come home right now!** (non-minimization of FTA)
2. **Sit down** (command, FTA-oriented)

### 2.1.4.2 Positive Politeness

Positive politeness is a strategy to provide satisfaction to the hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:70), positive politeness is aimed at the hearer's positive face by showing respect that the speaker expects to receive the same respect from the hearer. Positive politeness strategy has three sub-strategies of politeness strategies realization that can be seen in the following table.

Sub-strategies	Realization
Claim Common Ground	Notice, attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods), exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H), intensify interest to H, use in group identity marker, seek agreement, avoid disagreement, presuppose/raise/assert/ common ground, and joke.
Convey that S and H are co-operators	Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants, Offer or promise, be optimistic, include both S and H in the activity, give or ask for reasons, and assume or assert reciprocity.
Fulfil H's wants for some X	Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding)

Moreover, the examples of positive politeness are presented as follows.

1. **How absolutely incredible!** (Exaggerate)
2. **Come here, buddy** (Address form in-group identity)

### 2.1.4.3 Negative Politeness

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:70), the purpose of the off record strategy is primarily to address the hearer's negative face. Negative politeness is characterized by the speaker's tendency to respect authority and express formality. The speaker pays attention to the hearer's self-image and their desire for freedom of action. It could be expressed through sub-strategies in the following table.

Sub-strategies	Realizations
Be direct	Be conventionally indirect
Don't presume/ assume	Question and hedge
Don't Coerce H	Be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, and give deference.
Communicate S's want to not impinge on H	Apologize, impersonalize S and H, state that FTA as a general rule, and nominalize.
Redress other wants of H's	Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H.

Some examples of negative politeness are provided as follows.

1. Do me a favor, **will you?** (Question, Hedges)
2. **Perhaps** you'd care to help me (Hedges)

#### 2.1.4.4 Off Record

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:69), off record utterances involve the indirect use of language to convey a message. The use of off record strategies allows a speaker to avoid direct responsibility for committing a face-threatening act (FTA) and instead leave it up to the listener to interpret the message. The following table provides the sub-strategies and the realization of off record.

Sub-strategies	Realization
Invite conversational implicature	Give hints, give association clues, presuppose, understate, overstate, use tautologies, use contradiction, be ironic, use metaphors, and use rhetorical questions.
Be vague or ambiguous	Be ambiguous, be vague, over-generalize, displace H, and be incomplete, use ellipsis.

There are Examples of off record strategy usage are provided as follows.

1. **What a boring movie!** (let's leave! (give hints))
2. **It's pretty good.** (I don't really like it (understate))

#### 2.1.5 Factors Influencing The Choice of Politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987:74-76) argue that individuals might be considered by some sociological factors; power, distance, and rank of imposition.

### **2.1.5.1 Relative Power (P)**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:76), relative power refers to the degree of power one individual has over another. It involves the ability to impose an individual's plans and self-evaluation at the expense of the interlocutors. Power differentials often result in deference, a behavior of showing respect or submission.

### **2.1.5.2 Social Distance (D)**

Social distance according to Brown and Levinson (1987:76) is a symmetric social dimension that involves evaluating the similarities or differences between individuals. It is influenced by the frequency of interaction, exchange of goods, and stable social attributes. The extent of social closeness is manifested through the exchange of positive faces.

### **2.1.5.3 Rank Of Imposition (R)**

The rank of imposition according to Brown and Levinson (1987:76) refers to the culturally and situationally defined ordering of impositions based on the degree to which they are perceived to interfere with an individual's self-determination or approval. Typically, there are two ranks for negative-face FTA: based on the expenditure of services and goods, such as information and expressions of regard.



## **2.2 Research Methodologies**

The research method section provides an overview of how the study was conducted. This section outlines the methods used by the researcher and how the data was processed until the conclusion was drawn.

### **2.2.1 Type of Research**

This study utilizes a descriptive qualitative research design that involves observational techniques to explore the series HTGAWM as the subject of the research, aims to identify patterns within the use of politeness strategy and gain a comprehensive understanding of the politeness strategy employed by Annalise Keating in professional communication.

### **2.2.2 Data**

The data in this study is Annalise Keating's utterances in the HTGAWM series and contains politeness strategies in her professional communication. Data is gathered from the script as well as the contextual situation from observing the series.

### **2.2.3 Method of Collecting Data**

The data collection in the form of Mrs. Keating's utterances in the HTGAWM series is conducted in several stages as follows:

1. The data collection begins by observing 15 episodes from a single season of HTGAWM. Choose episodes that showcase professional interactions and exclude those where Mrs. Keating is not involved in such interactions.
2. Access transcripts from the Sublikescript website.
3. Employ the note-taking method while watching the selected series episodes. Identify and annotate utterances in the transcript that demonstrate politeness strategies.

#### **2.2.4 Method of Analysing Data**

The process of data analysis aimed at identifying types of politeness strategies within the scope of Mrs. Keating's professional interactions, along with the examination of sociological factors influencing the choice of these strategies, is systematically carried out through a sequence of steps as presented below:

1. The data analysis begins with the transfer of raw data from the annotated transcript into a table.
2. Additionally, the information in the table is examined based on politeness strategies, sub-strategies, and their expressions. This involves understanding the context and taking notes as descriptions. Moreover, annotations like interlocutor, level of power, distance, and rank of imposition are taken into account to analyze sociological factors.
3. Lastly, accumulate the utterances for each politeness strategy with percentages in a table, which will be elaborated in the results and discussion section.