

# **POSSITIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED BY GRACE AND MEG IN MONTE CARLO MOVIE**

**By  
Eva Indriani**

## **Abstract**

The thesis is entitled “*Positive Politeness Strategies used by Grace and Meg in Monte Carlo Movie*”. It aims at finding out the types of politeness strategies produced by Grace and Meg in “Monte Carlo” movie.

The researcher used a qualitative research since the data engaged are displayed in the form of strings of words. The data were collected from a movie “Monte Carlo” which was realeased in 2011. The unit of analysis of this research is focused on the utterances produced by the main character Grace and her step sister Meg in Monte Carlo movie.

The result shows that Grace as the main character produced the highest number of positive politeness in her utterances compared to Meg. Beside that, she is younger than Meg; so she has to give her respect to Meg. Meanwhile, it is found that strategy 4: Use in group identity markers and strategy 12: Include both S and H become the highest number of strategy made by both characters in their utterances with 4 in total. Then it is followed by strategy 1: Notice, Attend to hearer’s wants and strategy 5: seek agreement with 3 numbers. After that, strategy 2: Exaggerate Interest and Strategy 3: Intensity interest to Hearer is in the third place with 2. The least number of positive politeness strategies is Strategy 8: Joke with only 1 found in the utterances produced by Grace and Meg. And this strategy is produced by Meg.

*Keywords: Movie, Politeness, Positive Politeness, Utterances*

Language as means of communication holds an important role in every human interaction. It is used to socialize and to interact with each other. Without language people will be difficult to cooperate and understand each other. In communication there are also different styles either in written or spoken language. However, in human daily interaction, spoken language is used more because it can express directly easily to the interlocutors. Through language, people can understand what other people want and think.

Communication is a process that allows organism to exchange several methods. Communication can be done in oral or written form. Basically, all people need to have communication to each other to convey what they want to achieve, whether in informal or formal situations. Communication among people is possible because such knowledge is shared with others, although how it is shared (or even how it is acquired) is not well understood. When one speak, he must constantly make choices of many different kinds : what he wants to say, how he wants to say it, and the specific sentence types, words, and sounds that best unite the *what* and the *how*. Fiske (1990:1) said that communication is one of those human activities that everyone recognizes but few can define satisfactorily.

It is known that communication does not only happen in individuals but also in organization. It can be seen that most organizations communicate to one another in order to achieve the goals. These goals can be achieved successfully from how good the communication has been done, because by doing good communication the organization will develop well in its interaction.

In interaction, people have to be aware of people's face in order to consider other's feelings or maintaining relationship with others. According to Yule (1996:60), "as a technical term, face means the public self-image of a person". Therefore, it refers to that emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize.

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 precondition 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 appropriately toward their addressee (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 treat politeness as a fixed concept, as in the idea of "polite social behavior" or etiquette, within a culture". It is also possible to specify 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 sympathetic toward others. Within an interaction, however, there is a more narrowly specified type of politeness at work. Politeness, in an interaction, can then be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face. Politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distance or closeness. Showing awareness for another person's face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference.

In every interaction people have different way of dealing with each other. Their way of speaking may sound different toward people who have different status from them. According to Holmes (1992:260-261), the way people talk is influenced by the social context in which they talk. It matters who can hear them and where they talk, as well as how they feel. People use different styles in different social contexts and indicate aspects of their social identity through the way they talk. The same message could be delivered differently to the different people.

Holmes (1992:296) said that one of the factors influencing an interaction is relationship to someone, especially solidarity. It means being linguistically polite involves speaking to people appropriately in the light of their relationship to others. Inappropriate linguistic choices may be considered rude. Positive politeness is solidarity oriented. It emphasized shared attitudes and values. On the other hand, negative politeness pays people respect and avoids intruding on them. Negative politeness involves expressing oneself appropriately in terms of social distance and respecting status difference. To reveal politeness, people need certain strategies and usually each people have their own different strategies. Thus, the researcher wants to observe more about these strategies.

The reason for choosing the topic "Politeness Strategies" is based on the researcher's curiosity in analyzing on four types of politeness strategies of one of the characters in a movie entitled "Monte Carlo". The topic of politeness strategy on socio-cultural competence is interesting for the researcher because she thought that by making an interaction, people can describe or show that they want to make a request, apology, refusal, and thank. So, other people understand what is meant and the interaction can occur naturally. The researcher also knows that politeness strategies are very needed for people to speak politely with other people. In line with the reason above, the research question is as follows: "What positive politeness strategies are used by Grace and Meg in "Monte Carlo" movie?"

## **Pragmatics**

The modern usage of term pragmatics is attributable to the philosopher Charles Morris (1938:6), who was concerned to outline (after Locke and Peirce) the general shape of a

science of signs or semiotics. Within semiotics, Morris distinguished three distinct branches of inquiry: syntactics (or syntax), being the study of “the formal relation of signs to one another”, semantics, the study of “the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable” (their designate) and pragmatics, the study of “the relation of signs to interpreters” Morris (1938:6). Within each branch of semiotics, one could make the distinction between pure studies, concerned with the elaboration of the relevant metalanguage and descriptive studies which applied the metalanguage to the description of specific signs and their usages Morris (1938:24).

As instances of usage governed by pragmatical rule, Morris noted that “interjections such as Oh!, commands such as Come here!, expressions such as Good Morning! And various rhetorical and poetical devices, occur only under certain definite conditions in the users of the language” Morris (1938:48). Such matters would still today be given a treatment within linguistic pragmatics but Morris went on to expand the scope of pragmatics in accord with his particular behaviouristic theory of semiotics Black (1947:28). “It is a sufficiently accurate characterization of pragmatics to say that it deals with the biotic aspects of semiosis, that is, with all the psychological, biological and sociological phenomena which occur in the functioning of signs” Morris (1938:54). Such a scope is very much wider than the work that currently goes on under the rubric of linguistic pragmatics, for it would include what is now known as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, neurolinguistics and much besides.

On the other hand and especially within analytical philosophy, the term pragmatics was subject to a successive narrowing of scope. Here the philosopher and logician Carnap was particularly influential. After an initial Morrisian usage (Carnap, 1938:2), he adopted the following version of the trichotomy:

If in an investigation explicit reference is made to the speaker, or to put it in more general terms, to the user of the language, then we assign it [the investigation] to the field of pragmatics... If we abstract from the user of the language and analyze only the expressions and their designate, we are in the field of semantics. And, finally, if we abstract from the designata also and analyze only the relations between expressions, we are in (logical) syntax.

Unfortunately Carnap’s usage of the term pragmatics was confused by his adoption of Morris’s further distinction between pure and descriptive studies and he came to equate pragmatics with descriptive semiotics in general and thus with the study of natural (as opposed to logical) language (Carnap, 1959:13). But Carnap was not even consistent here: he also held (Carnap, 1956:7) that there was room for a pure pragmatics which would be concerned with concepts like belief, utterance and intension and their logical inter-relation. This latter usage, now more or less defunct, explains the use of the term in, for example the title of a book by Martin (1959:84). Thus at least four quite different senses of the term can be found in Carnap’s works, but it was the definition quoted above that was finally influential.

The idea that pragmatics was the study of aspects of language that required reference to the users of the language then led to a very natural, further restriction of the term in analytical philosophy. For there is one aspect of natural languages that indubitably requires such reference, namely the study of deictic or indexical words like the pronouns I and you. The philosophical and especially logical, interest in these terms is simply that they account for the potential failure of generally valid schemes of reasoning. For example, “I am Greta Grabo, Greta Grabo is a woman, therefore I am a woman”, is only necessarily true if in addition to the first two premises being true, the speaker of the conclusion is the same speaker as the speaker of the first premise. Bar Hillel (1954:359) therefore took the view that pragmatics is the study of languages both natural and artificial that contain indexical or deictic terms and this

usage was explicitly adopted by Kallish (1967:355), and most influentially by Montague (1968:102). Such a usage has little to offer linguistics, since all natural languages have deictic terms and it would follow as pragmatics. If Gazdar (1979:1) points out, that natural languages would have no semantics but only a syntax and a the trichotomy is to do some work within linguistics, some less restricted scope for pragmatics must be found.

In fact, in the late 1960s, an implicit version of Carnap's definition investigations requiring reference to the users of language was adopted within linguistics and specifically within the movement known as generative semantics. The history of that movement awaits a historian of ideas but its association with pragmatics can be explained by the resurgence of the interest in meaning which the movement represented. Such an interest inevitably involves pragmatics as it shall see. Moreover this interest in meaning in a wide sense proved to be one of the best directions from which generative semantics could assail Chomsky's (1965:42) standard theory. At the same time, there was a keen interest shown by linguistics in philosophers' attempts to grapple with problems of meaning, sometimes from the point of view of the 'users of the language'. For a period, at least, linguistics and philosophers seemed to be on a common path and this commonality of interest crystallized many of the issues with which this writing is concerned. During the period, the scope of pragmatics was implicitly restricted. Carnap's investigations making reference to users of the language is at once too narrow and too broad for linguistics interest. It is too broad because it admits studies as nonlinguistic as Freud's investigations of 'slips of the tongue' or Jung's studies of word association.

As the pragmatics study has been added to the review of related literature, politeness will also be added for this is the most theory that the researcher will use in analyzing the data.

### **Politeness**

This broader definition derives from the work of the Goffman (1967:215) and Brown and Levinson (1987:61) which describe politeness as showing concern for people's face. Politeness is the expression of the speaker's intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening act's toward another (Mills, 2003:6). Though language serves many functions, there are two - the referential and affective functions - which are particularly pervasive and basic Holmes (1955:5).

In everyday usage the term 'politeness' describes behaviour which is somewhat formal and distancing where the intention is not to intrude or impose. Being polite means expressing respect towards the person you are talking to and avoiding offending them. I will be using a broader definition of politeness. In this writing 'politeness' will be used to refer to behaviour which actively expresses positive concern for others, as well as non-imposing distancing behaviour. In other words, politeness may take the form of an expression of good-will or camaraderie, as well as the more familiar nonintrusive behaviour which is labeled 'polite' in everyday usage.

This broader definition derives from the work of Goffman (1967:215) and Brown and Levinson (1987:61) which describe politeness as showing concern for people's 'face'. The term 'face' is a technical term in this approach. While it is based on the everyday usages 'losing faces' and 'saving face', it goes further in treating almost every action (including utterances) as a potential threat to someone's face.

Everybody has face needs or basic wants and people generally cooperate in maintaining each others' face and partially satisfying each other's face needs. Politeness involves showing concern for two different kinds of face needs: first, negative face needs or the need not to be imposed upon; and secondly, positive face needs or the need to be liked and admired. Behaviour which avoids imposing on others (or avoids 'threatening their face') is described as evidence of negative politeness, sociable behaviour expressing warmth towards an addressee

is positive politeness behaviour (Brown and Levinson 1987:102). According to this approach, any utterance which could be interpreted as making a demand or intruding on another person's autonomy can be regarded as a potential face-threatening act. Even suggestions, advice and requests can be regarded as face-threatening acts, since they potentially impede the other person's freedom of action. Polite people avoid obvious face-threatening acts, such as insults and orders; they generally attempt to reduce the threat of unavoidable face-threatening acts such as requests or warnings by softening them or expressing them indirectly; and they use positively polite utterances such as greetings and compliments where possible.

Using this definition, behaviour such as avoiding telephoning a colleague early on a Sunday morning or apologizing for interrupting a speaker are expressions of negative politeness while sending a birthday card to a friend or calling a child sweetie are expressions of positive politeness. As the examples suggest, politeness may be expressed both verbally and non-verbally, but in this writing I will be focusing on linguistic politeness or ways in which people express politeness through their usage of language. I suggested above that women tend to be more polite than men. More specifically, it will become clear in the following chapters that, in general, women are much more likely than men to express positive politeness or friendliness in the way they use language. Women's utterances show evidence of concern for the feelings of the people they are talking to more often and more explicitly than men's do.

A variety of explanations has been proposed for gender differences in language use (see, for example, Henley and Kramanae 1991:18; Uchida 1992:547; Noller 1993:223). Some argue that innate biological differences account for differentiated rates of language acquisition, for instance, as well as for differences in psychological orientation or temperament. Psychological differences account for gender differences in orientation to others. Women are more concerned with making connections; they seek involvement and focus on the interdependencies between people (e.g. Chodorow 1974:17). Men are more concerned with autonomy and detachment; they seek independence and focus on hierarchical relationships. If one accepts this view, it is possible to see how such psychological differences might account for differences in the ways women and men use language. A preference for autonomy links more obviously with linguistic strategies that assert control, for example, while a focus on connection relates more obviously to linguistic devices that involve others and emphasize the interpersonal nature of talk.

Other researchers put a great deal of stress on socialization as an explanatory factor (e.g. Maltz and Broker 1982:196; Tannen 1987:167). In many societies, girls and boys experience different patterns of socialization and this, it is suggested, leads to different ways of using and interpreting language. In modern western societies, most girls and boys operate in single sex peer groups through an influential period of their childhood, during which they acquire and develop different styles of interaction. The boys' interaction tends to be more competitive and control-orientated, while the girls interact more cooperatively and focus on relative closeness. Gender differences in patterns of language use can be explained by the fact that girls and boys socialized into different cultures. Each group learns appropriate ways of interacting from their same sex peers - including ways of interacting verbally.

To choose what politeness strategies that should be used on conversation, the politeness must be considered on the situation whether it is formal or informal.

Politeness is the expression of the speaker's intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face-threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003:6). Politeness consists of attempting to save face another. Politeness theory states that some speech acts threaten others' face needs. Politeness theory was created in 1987 by "Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson" and their

research has since expanded academia's perception of Politeness. This text has influenced almost all of the theoretical and analytical work in this field (Mills, 2005:57).

Politeness consists of attempting to save face of another. Brown and Levinson (1987:55) begin with the idea of "model person" which means that these rational agents think strategically and are conscious of their language choices. This influenced Brown and Levinson when examining Goffman's version of face where they agreed that rational agents have both positive politeness and negative politeness.

After each chart summarizing the four highest level strategies (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record) order strategies and the final choice of linguistic means to realize highest goals as output strategies.

### Positive Politeness

The positive politeness strategy shows that the hearer has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity.

Brown and Levinson (1987:101) list 15 positive politeness strategies: (1) Notice. Attend to hearer's wants, (2) Exaggerate interest / approval, (3) Intensify interest, (4) Use ingroup identity marks, (5) Seek agreement, (6) Avoid disagreement, (7) Presuppose / assert common ground, (8) Joke, (9) Assert knowledge of hearer's want, (10) Offer, promise, (11) Be optimistic, (12) Give (or ask for) reasons, (13) Assume / assert reciprocity, (14) Include speaker and hearer in the activity, (15) Give hints to the hearer (goods, sympathy, etc).

### Research Method

In this thesis, the researcher used a qualitative research since the data engaged are displayed in the form utterances. The research was conducted by formulating the statement of the problem, collecting the data, classifying the data, analyzing the data and drawing the conclusion. As it is impossible for the researcher to analyze them all, in his thesis the researcher would like to choose the utterance stated by the character that belongs to positive politeness strategies. The data were taken from the movie Monte Carlo which was released in 2011.

### Findings and Discussion

In this part, the researcher describes the findings and its analysis by presenting them in each of the excerpts. The following table below is the illustration of the finding of the positive politeness used by Grace and Meg in their conversation.

No.	Positive Politeness Strategies	G	%	M	%	Σ	%
1	Strategy 1: Notice, Attend to hearer's wants	2	10	1	12.5	3	10.71
2	Strategy 2: Exaggerate Interest	1	5	1	12.5	2	7.14
3	Strategy 3: Intensify interest to Hearer	2	10	-	-	2	7.14
4	Strategy 4: Use in group identity markers	3	15	1	12.5	4	14.28
5	Strategy 5: Seek Agreement	-	-	3	37.5	3	10.71
6	Strategy 6: Avoid Disagreement	2	10	-	-	2	7.14
7	Strategy 7: Presuppose / Raise / Assert Common Ground	1	5	1	12.5	2	7.14
8	Strategy 8: Joke	-	-	1	12.5	1	3.57
9	Strategy 10: Offer, promise	2	10	-	-	2	7.14

10	Strategy 11: Be optimistic	3	15	-	-	3	10.71
11	Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity	4	20	-	-	4	14.28
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100</b>

It can be seen in the table above that Grace as the main character produced the highest number of positive politeness in her utterances compared to Meg. Meanwhile, it is found that strategy 4: Use in group identity markers becomes the highest number of strategy made by both characters in their utterances with 4 in total. In this case, both speakers Meg and Grace are the dominant character in the movie Monte Carlo. Meanwhile, in this movie grace is the main chracter, that is why she produces more group identity markers. The following is the example of this strategy.

Excerpt 1

Father : And you bring some friends.

Grace : Yes, this is Emma and this is **Meg**. American friends in some way. Just follow me.

Emma : Hi

Meg : We are pleased to be able to come to the place you are. She does not speak French.

Emma : Gosh Meg

It can be seen in the excerpt 1 above that Grace produces a strategy 4 the use in group identity marker of **Meg**. Here, Grace said ‘Meg’ to indicate to her friend Meggy. The context of this conversation took place at Grace’s house when Grace brings her friends Emma and Meg to visit her home and introduce them to her father.

The following is another example of strategy 4 produced by Grace and her friends in their conversation.

Excerpt 2

Grace’s Mother : Honey, its not magic. Its not gonna turn you into a whole Different person.

Grace : Thank goodness. I kinda parish the one I got **Mom**, you found a whole new life with Robert. And I am happy for you.

It can be seen in the excerpt 2 above that Grace produces a strategy 4 the use in group identity marker of **mom**. Here, Grace said ‘mom’ to indicate her mother. Meanwhile, the context of this conversation is occurred in Grace’s house in America.

Then it is followed by strategy 5: seek agreement with 3 numbers. The following is the example of this strategy made by the characters in their conversation.

Excerpt 3

Theo : Book

Grace : Oh, that book.

Theo : Yes, that book.

Meg : **Perfect.**

Thank you.

Emma : Thank you.

Meg : We should go from here.

Based on the conversation among Theo, Grace and Meg above, it can be seen that they talked about a book. In this case, Meg agrees to what Theo and Grace said that they have already chosen a book. Here, Meg said “perfect” to indicate that she is totally agree.

After that, strategy 2: Exaggerate Interest is also produced by Grace and her friends in their conversation and it can be seen in the following example below.

Excerpt 4

Meg : No, there is a misunderstanding.

Reception : Yes, I understand. We apologize once. We will soon be ready in the morning. For a while we have prepared like you expect. A lobster special Paris.

Grace : **I'll pick up in my room. Can you imagine we are in the room, and eat it? Yes! that's what I think.**

Meg : **Ok, you watch!**

Based on the example of the excerpt 4 above, this conversation took place at the hotel where Grace, Emma and Meg stay. Here, Grace talked to the reception that she orders a lobster and she raise her intonation by saying “yes that what I think” because she does not think what will happen next after they eat the lobster.

Meanwhile, the following strategy 3: Intensity interest to Hearer is made by Grace and her friends in the communication and it can be found in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 5

Emma : Great, now you go to bed. Goodnight.

Grace : We will just go on a holiday.

Emma : Brown. It feels like money.

Grace : **Meg, come on. This is only for one day. Here, come on.**

Meg : Ok. Only for one night.

Grace : Huh? We...we... what time is it? We, us...

From the excerpt 5 above, the context of this conversation is that Meg, Emma and Grace are talking about their plan to go for vacation. In the conversation, Grace asks Meg to join them for the vacation.

The least number of positive politeness strategies is Strategy 8: Joke with only 1 found in the utterances produced by Grace and Meg. And this strategy is produced by Meg. The following excerpt below is the example.

Excerpt 6

Meg : How do you do? You sound terrible.

Grace : Who cares.

Meg : **Sound like poor Marry Poppins.**

Grace : Give more.

Meg : All right. I want to go Spain.

Grace : **I want friends, I want a golden goose ...**

It can be seen in the excerpt 6 above that this conversation took place at Grace's house before they leave for Paris. They talked about Grace condition and also Grace's wishes. In this case, Pam asked Grace if she was fine but Grace seems so annoyed with the questions. Then, Meg gives a joke by saying **Sound like poor Marry Poppins** to cheer Grace up. In the meantime, Grace also make a joke by saying that she needs more friends which is indicated by an utterance **I want friends, I want a golden goose.**

## Conclusions

By focusing on the conversation between Grace and Meg, the researcher found 28 utterances produced by both Meg and Grace in their conversation. By focusing on the conversation between Meg and Grace, the possitive strategies commonly used are strategy 4:



Use in group identity markers and strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity with 4 number. The reason why they commonly used that strategy is in general, positive politeness as a kind of social accelerator, where 'S', in using them, indicates that he wants to 'come closer' to 'H'. The strategies that the characters used, Meg and Grace, have been socially and culturally accepted because what they speak is appropriate to the situation of the culture when the utterances are produced. What links these strategies to their verbal expressions is exactly the same kind of means-ends reasoning (Brown and Levinson, 1987:91-92).

## References

- Bar, Hillel, Yehoshua. 1954. *The Semantics of Belief Sentences*. Newyork: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Carnap, 1956. *Meaning and Necessity: a study in Semantics and Modal Logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Duzsak, Anna. 2002. *Us and others: social identities across languages, discourses and cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.Co.
- Fiske, John. 1990. *Introduction to Communication Studies*. London: Routledge, Print.
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. *Pragmatics: Implicature, Presupposition and Logical Form*. London: Academic Press, London.
- Gerot, Linda and Wignel, Peter. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Australia: Gerd Stabler.
- Green, Georgia M. 1996. *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Holmes, Janet. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Publishing.
- Holmes, Janet. 2001. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Kalish, D.& Montague, R. 1964. *Logic Techniques of Formal Reasoning*. Newyork : Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Leech, Geofry. 1993. *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, M, Richard. 1959. *The Notion Of Analytic Truth*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Morris, Charles. 1938. *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chicago, IL.
- Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Method in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2000. *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*. Queensland: Antipodean Educational Enterprises, 49.
- Webster, Merriam. 2005. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (11<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.