



THE POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN THE *MOVIE THE CHRONICLES OF NARNIA*

Mac Aditiawarman, Renita Putri Elba

Fakultas Sastra Universitas Ekasakti
mac_aditiawarman@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research is a pragmatic study on politeness strategies employed by the characters in The chronicles of Narnia movie in the context of family discourse. This research using Brown and Levinson theory about the types of politeness strategies. The objectives of this research are (1) To identify the types of politeness strategies in the chronicles of Narnia movie (2). To analyze the way politeness strategies utterance the chronicles of Narnia movie. (3). To describe the function of the politeness strategies used in the chronicles of Narnia movie.

This research used descriptive qualitative approach. The data were in the form of utterances which contain politeness strategies. The data source was The Chronicles of Narnia movie script. The data were collected by note-taking technique then they were classified and analyzed. The trustworthiness was attained by using credibility through two kinds of triangulation: by observers and theories.

Keywords: Politeness Strategies, Politeness, Face

© 2018 Jurnal JILP

I INTRODUCTION

Politeness played an important role in human life. Politeness is an important subject matter in a communication. Politeness is behaving in a way that attempts to take into account the feelings of the people being addressed. In this case, the speakers try to avoid embarrassing other person, or making him feel uncomfortable. Thus, politeness refers to the situation where we respect the others to whom we speak. It is truly significant in our daily communication in order to make a good relationship with our society.

In addition, politeness is also a universal matter. Mostly language build their own politeness rule. This relates to the social and cultural values of the community. Certain languages seem to have built into them a very complex system of politeness. For example, Javanese people, before they speak to the others, must decide on an appropriate speech style: high,

middle, and low Wardhaugh (1993:277). In this case, Javanese really considers politeness as a must in daily as a form of honorifics, and the rule is clear. Another case of politeness is also shown in French. Longer utterances are considered more polite than shorter ones in certain circumstances Wardhaugh (1993:280-281). Some of these differences of languages system of being polite show us the various politeness strategies in some languages as a serious subject matter that truly exists in the society.

The politeness was not only for one group society, but also it was for everyone in all conditions that using language as their tools in daily conversation in order to make a good social interaction with other people in their life. Thomas (1995: 150) stated that "politeness was a real-world goal (politeness interpreted as a real desire to be pleasant to others or as the

doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2405087

Jurnal JILP (Langue and Parole) Vol. 2 No. 1 (2018) ISSN : 2579-5449

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

underlying motivation for an individual's linguistic behavior)".

Using politeness made listeners could give a good response to speaker's question or request. According to Yule (1996: 60), politeness was showing awareness of another person face; it was related to social distance or closeness. Politeness referred to the emotional and social sense of self that everyone else to recognize. In this case, politeness was really needed to build a good relationship and to have a good social interaction with other people. In other word, politeness was the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another.

One way to maintain one's face is using politeness. In every society there is a rule called politeness, which serves as the basic to the production of social order and qualification of human cooperation. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:17), "politeness is how people behave in a way that attempts in considering of the feelings of their addressee". Politeness also means that being polite is not simply way like

saying, thank you or please in the right place. It is the matter of how people can use their language correctly toward their receiver (Holmes, 2001:267). Politeness is an important point to maintain a good relationship with other people

According to Yule (1996:60), it is possible to threat politeness as a fixed concept, as in the idea of "polite social behavior" or politeness, within a culture. It is also possible to agree a number of different general principles for being polite in social interaction within a particular culture. Some of this might include being tactful, generous, modest, and sympathy toward others. Within an interaction, however, there is a more hardly specified type of politeness at work. Politeness, in an interaction, can defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face. Politeness can be talented in situations of social distance or familiarity. Showing awareness for another person's face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference.

II RESEARCH METHODS

Politeness is a very important principle in a language use and in communication. It can be defined as a means to show awareness of another person's face (Yule, 1996:60). It is concerned with how language is employed in a strategic way to achieve such aims as supporting or maintaining interpersonal relationships. Politeness involves how one can make other feel more pleasant. It also includes the appropriate linguistic choice in accordance with a certain social and situational context. The discussion of politeness cannot be separated from the discussion of face.

Face means a public self-image. It refers to the emotional and social sense of self that every person has and expects to be recognized by everyone (Yule, 1996:60). Brown and Levinson (in Watts, 2003:86) state that there are two kinds of face, negative and positive face. Negative face refers to the individual's desire for freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Positive face refers to the individual's desire that his wants be appreciated and approved of in social interaction.

For example, when someone asks to get a pen from someone else, he can use two ways. Firstly, if he wants to apply negative face, he can say '*could you lend me a pen?*'. In this case, the speaker prefers to give a freedom action to the hearer by using the word *could you*. Secondly, if he applies positive face, he can say '*How about letting me use your pen?*'. In this case, the speaker wants be approved by using the word *letting* to the hearer.

In one case, when the speaker says something to lessen the possible threat from another's face, it is called a face saving act. There are two types of face saving act, negative and positive face saving acts. A face saving act that emphasizes a person's negative face will show concern about imposition, for example, '*I'm sorry to bother you, could you lend me a pen?*'. A face saving act that emphasizes a person's positive face will show solidarity and draw attention to a common goal (Yule, 1996:61-62), for example, '*You and I have the same problem, so we can solve it together*'.

doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2405087

The utterances or actions to lessen the threat of another's face are called face saving act, while the threat is given to another individual's self-image is called face threatening act or FTA (Yule, 1996:61). The acts that appear to avoid the hearer's independence of movement and freedom of action called as negative FTA. Negative face threatening act could be seen when a person is given order, request, suggestion, advice, reminder, threat, warning, offer, promise, and anger to the interlocutor. For example when the speaker says "*You had better take a taxi*", it means that the speaker threatens the listener's negative face because the speaker gives a suggestion to the listener. Next, the acts that appear as disapproving of their wants called as positive FTA.

Positive face threatening act could be seen when a person shows disapproval, criticism, contempt, complaint, accusation, insult, disagreement, violence, taboo topics, and interruption to the interlocutor. For example when the speaker says "*I don't think you're right*", it means that the

speaker threatens the positive face of the listener's because the speaker expresses disagreement.

Face is an image of self-delineated in terms of approved social attributes - albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing of himself Goffman(1967: 5).It is, therefore, the self-assumption of a person's own appearance in public, which is determined by defined social features, such as profession, religion, gender, and ethnicity. In a conversation, the hearer directly reacts to the speaker's face, thereby hallmarking it. The individual concept of face changes during a lifetime, which could either lead to an improvement or a decline of the face, depending on whether the person's expectations are fulfilled. Face thus is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction Brown and Levinson (1987: 61).

III RESEARCH FINDING

Politeness Theory and the concept of face were further developed by Brown and Levinson in 1978 building on Goffman's theory of identity and facework. The linguists' major goal was to find out why people do not tend to use simple and direct language in a conversation, but rather complex and sometimes indirect phrases, especially if a hearer has to be motivated to do a particular act. As Brown and Levinson state a distinction has to be made between negative and positive face which are both treated as perpetual wants: Negative face: the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others Positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others Brown and Levinson (1987: 62).Positive face wants are defined in two ways: On the one hand, they refer to a person's desire to be accepted and approved of in a certain group and on the other hand to the appreciation of the self-image by others.

This also means that a speaker's goals in a conversation have to be accepted by or even desirable to other speakers in order to fulfill the positive face wants Thomas (1995:169). These

goals have to be accepted by specific conversation partners in order to align with the speaker's face wants: Persons want their goals, possessions, and achievements to be thought desirable not just by anyone, but by some particular other especially relevant to the particular goals. These others constitute a collection of sets (extensionally or intentionally defined) each linked to a set of goals Brown and Levinson (1987: 63) People usually use certain ways which are called strategy to deal with politeness. The strategy is applied differently in one culture to others, since it is influenced by any internal and external factors of communication. According to Brown and Levinson (Watts, 2003:85), in communication, the speaker should have a way to assess the dangers of threatening other participants face and to choose the appropriate strategies in order to minimize any face threats that might be involved in carrying out the goal direct activity called as politeness strategy. There are four kinds of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson: *Bald On Record*, *Positive Politeness*, *Negative Politeness*, and *Off Record*. According

doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2405087

to Brown and Levinson(1978: 74), bald on record strategy is a direct way of saying things, without any minimization to the imposition, in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way, for example "Do X!". Brown and Levinson (1987) claim that the primary reason for bald on record usage may be generally stated as whenever the speaker wants to do FTA with maximum efficiency more than s/he wants to satisfy hearer's face, even to any degree, s/he will choose the bald on record strategy.

The speaker does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer's face. The prime reason for its usage is that whenever a speaker wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy the hearer's face, even to any degree, he will choose bald on record strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1978: 95). This type of strategy is commonly found in people who know each other very well, and who are very comfortable in their environments, such as a close friend and family. The positive politeness is usually seen in groups of friends, or where people of given social situation know each other fairly well. It usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be expected (minimize FTA). Unlike negative politeness, positive politeness is not necessarily re-dressive of the particular face infringed by the FTA.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978: 106), positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his/her perennial desire to the his/her wants or actions acquisitions, values resulting from them -should be thought of as desirable. Furthermore, they describe that the redress consists in partially satisfying that desire that one's own wants or some of them are in some respects similar to the addressee's wants. BL also note that unlike negative politeness, positive politeness is not necessarily re-dressive of the particular face want infringe by the FTA. In other words, in positive politeness, the sphere of redress is widened to the appreciation of alter's wants in general or to the expression of similarity between ego's and alter'swants .

The positive politeness strategy is usually seen in groups of friends, or where people in the given social situation know each other fairly well (Watts, 2003:87). This strategy is used to minimize the distance between them by

expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected (minimize the FTA). Negative politeness is the most elaborate and the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress; it fills the etiquette books although positive politeness also gets some attention. Furthermore, according to BL (1987: 135), the linguistic realization of negative politeness, conventional indirectness, hedges on illocutionary force, polite pessimism, and the emphasis on hearer's relative power are very familiar and need no introduction. In addition, BL say that the negative politeness outputs in all forms are used in general for social "distancing". Therefore, they are likely to be used whenever a speaker or a sender wants to put a social brake on the course of interaction. There are five main categories as the linguistic realization of negative politeness by BL, namely communicating sender's want not to impinge the receiver, not coercing receiver, not presuming/assuming, being (conventionally in) direct and redressing receiver's wants. Negative politeness strategies are oriented towards the hearer's negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer (Watts, 2003:88). Negative politeness focuses on minimizing the imposition by attempting to soften it. In this strategy. Brown and Levinson's (1978:216) define off record strategy as a communicative act which is done in such a way that is not possible to attribute one clear communicative intention to the act. In this case, the actor leaves her/himself an "out" by providing her/himself with a number of defensible interpretations. S/he cannot be held to have committed her/himself to just one particular interpretation of her/his act. In other words, BL claim, the actor leaves it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret the act.

Off record utterances are essential in indirect use of language. One says something that is rather general. In this case, the hearer must make some inference to recover what was intended. For example, if somebody says "*It is hot in here*", the hidden meaning of the utterance can be a request to open the window or to switch on the air conditioner.

1. The FTA is performed 'Off Record', typically through the deployment of an indirect illocutionary act which has more than one interpretation and, thus, allows for plausible deniability on the part of the utterer if the

doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2405087

intended recipient takes offence at the face threat inherent in the utterance (Bousfield, 2008:58). If the speaker wants to do an FTA, it means that he wants to avoid the responsibility in doing it. He

can do off record and leave it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it. In this strategy, the threat to face is very high. Off record strategy also has some sub-divisions working under it.

IV CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, the results of the research can be concluded as follows.

1. There are four types of politeness strategies employed by the characters in *The chronicles of Narnia* movie when having conversations. They are Bald-on record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness, and Off-record strategy. Among the four strategies, Bald-on Record strategy is the most frequent strategy that occurs 42 times out of 95 total data. It is followed by Positive politeness strategy (31 out of 95), Negative politeness strategy (19 out of 95), and Off record strategy (3 out of 95). The characters prefer to apply Bald-on record strategy in conveying their utterances since this strategy usually occurs in the groups of people in which they, in social situation, know each other very well. As it is seen in *The chronicles of Narnia* movie which happens in the context of family discourse, the characters know each other very well since they often interact in their daily life. Bald-on record strategy is also commonly found in the group of people who know each other very well and are very comfortable in their environment.

2. In the way of applying politeness strategies in *the chronicles of Narnia* movie utilize their own sub-strategies. Bald-on record has Seven sub-strategies: Warning (9 out of 95), Using Imperative form (13 out of 95), Showing disagreement (7 out of 95), offering (4 out of 95), giving suggestion (3 out of 95), Task Oriented (4 out of 95), and Requesting (2 out of 95). Positive politeness has seven sub-strategies: Noticing, attending to hearer (3 out of 95), Intensifying interest to hearer (7 out of 95), Avoiding disagreement (5 out of 95), Including both S and H (1 out of 95), Offering, Promising (6 out of 95), Giving or asking (2 out of 95), and Being optimistic (7 out of 95). Negative politeness has Four sub-strategies: Being pessimistic (7 out of 95), Giving deference (3 out of 95), Apologizing (8 out of 95), and Being indirect (1 out of 95). And the last Off record

strategies has one sub-strategies: Overstating (3 out of 95)

3. In the function of the politeness strategies in *the chronicles of Narnia* movie The study of courtesy strategies is essentially a study of knowing how people use language when they experience interaction or communication. It teaches how to use the language and have the conversation go well and run smoothly. But in terms of communication, everyone wants to be understood and not bothered by others; In addition, she does not want to lose her face while communicating. Losing face means understanding feeling embarrassed, humiliated or disappointed. That is why the face is something that is emotionally implanted, nurtured, enhanced, and constantly attended in an interaction.

People use decency as a way of fraud to help protect the needs of each face (avoiding actions that threaten the face or soul). Knowing the type of language in a particular conversation is very important to maintain our face, therefore a courtesy strategy is used. Courtesy is not only used by the main character in a movie, but also can be used more than one character which has different characters. This study can be a reference to the politeness strategy in the interaction between the people around, family and the environment. However, it must have several factors that influence them in choosing the preferred strategy. These factors lead to a much more in-depth analysis relating to the preferred strategy implementation function. Thus, researchers advise linguistic students to find out these factors and functions to achieve a much better understanding of the realization of such politeness strategies.

This research still has many weaknesses. Still limited to the politeness strategies used by characters, when having. On the other hand, there are other types of interactions from different participants that can be analyzed as well, such as the interaction between families of

doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2405087

differing opinions. Furthermore, family discourse is the context of this study. Different sexes and positions within the family make a person adopt different politeness strategies. A mother and father can use certain courtesy strategies in their interactions and also in interactions with their children. They also have different strategies in applying modesty in their interactions among children, with their parents, and with their parents. In addition, gender differences also exist for children. Therefore, the researcher hopes that other researchers will conduct further studies focusing on the propriety strategy applied by different participants, sex and position in the family.

This study shows a preview of politeness strategies in the context of family discourse. Readers can understand more about how to show their politeness to others through their strategy.

This research can also be used as an additional reference in teaching and applying courtesy in their family, especially to get used to being polite because doing modesty does not just apply the matter of saying please, sorry, sorry, and thank you. For that reason, understanding strategies is so important that parents can teach and apply decency in the right way. For the reader in general, once they understand the strategy, the researcher hopes that they can apply the strategy in appropriate ways and the appropriate context when interacting with others. However, this study presents only a small part of the application of decency in everyday human life as reflected in the film. Thus, researchers also recommend readers to know some of the more important values of decency in other resources.

Bibliography

- Anonymous. 2003. *Uptown Girls*. <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0263757/> retrieved On December 12th, 2013.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasmi, M. 2013. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Reflected in Nanny McPhee Movie*. Unpublished Thesis. Yogyakarta: Study Program of English Language and Literature, English Education Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Yogyakarta State University.
- Hogan, P. 2003. *Uptown Girls Script*. http://www.script-orama.com/movie_scripts/u/uptown-girls-dakota-fanning.html On July 15 2013.
- Holmes, J. 1995. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Indriani, E. 2014. *Positive Politeness Strategies Used By Grace And Meg In Monte Carlo Movie*. Semarang: Faculty Of Humanities Dian Nuswantoro University
- Lakoff, R.T. 2005. *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Leech, G. 1991. *Principle of Pragmatics: Eight Impressions*. New York: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Levinson, S. C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Noviani, Q. 2014. *A Pragmatic Analysis Of Politeness Strategies And Politeness Principles In Uptown Girls*. Yogyakarta: English Language and Literature Study Program, Languages and Arts Faculty of Yogyakarta State University. <http://eprints.uny.ac.id/19418/1/Qolidina%20Noviani%2009211141005.pdf>.
- Saadiah, I. 2003. *Politeness Strategies Used by Indonesian Chatters in Internet Relay Chat*. <http://www.infoskripsi.com/Artikel-Penelitian/Artikel-Skripsi-Politeness-Strategies.html> retrieved on November 3rd, 2012.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Wardhaugh, R. 1987. *Language in Competition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Watts, R. J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yuniawati, T. 2012. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Features in Revolutionary Road*. Yogyakarta: English Language and Literature Study Program Languages and Arts Faculty of Yogyakarta State University.