

## RESEARCH METHOD

### A. *Research Design*

Since the study focused more on words, especially the data are in the form of utterances rather than number, a descriptive-qualitative method was adopted. A qualitative method allows for more comprehensive analysis and involves the researcher's interpretation. As stated by O'Leary (2017), a qualitative approach allows for subjectivity and prioritizes in-depth analysis over quantity in order to thoroughly examine and address the issue under study. Sutopo (2002, as cited in Rosari, M., 2021) also argued that the data collected are usually verbal and visual, rather than numerical.

Among many qualitative methods, discourse analysis is deemed to be the most suitable for this research. Discourse analysis, according to Brown and Yule (1983), is essentially the analysis of language in use. In addition, discourse analysis primarily focuses on examining texts or utterances within a particular socio-cultural context, offering a method of data analysis that reveals insights into the discursive construction of a phenomenon (Willig, 2008). This is in line with this research, which focuses on politeness strategies employed by Mr. Peanutbutter in the context of the TV series *Bojack Horseman*.

While linguistics and fictions, in this case animated tv series, are somehow two unrelated fields, analyzing linguistics aspects of a fictional work has become a common practice. Among many scholars in the field of linguistics, one who stands out for analyzing language aspects of fictions is Djenar (see for examples Djenar, 2008; Djenar, 2015; Djenar, 2017). Indeed, real-life conversation and fictional conversation differ. As Djenar (2017) pointed out, in real life conversation, the flow of conversation will be more natural as those involved can respond to the discussion freely; meanwhile, in fictional conversation, as it is crafted neatly by the author, there are multiple layers of speech production. However, that does not mean analyzing linguistic aspects of a fiction is undoable. That perception is also one of the reasons why, according to Djenar (2015), many think that fictions are just a product of one's imagination, that studying linguistics aspects of them might be invaluable work since it

does not reflect real life context. In fact, Agha (2007, p. 151, as cited in Djenar (2015)), argued that literary or fictional works are a form of 'metadiscursive genres' in which they not only present fictional characters and their dialogues but also reflect on language use itself. Thus, analyzing politeness strategies in fictional contexts can still be beneficial.

### ***B. Procedures of Data Collection***

The data were collected by carefully watching all episodes from season 1 to 6 on Netflix, focusing specifically on Mr. Peanutbutter, to later select all episodes containing his politeness strategies to be analyzed. The reason to analyze all episodes containing his politeness is to avoid or minimize any potential bias in selecting the data. Second, I took notes on parts or utterances where he employs politeness strategies. Lastly, the utterances or transcripts were collected just before the analysis began. The episodes analyzed are season 1 episode 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12; season 2 episode 1, 2, 4, 7; season 3 episode 1, 3, 5, 6, 9; season 4 episode 1; season 5 episode 2, 4, 8; season 6 episode 2, 4, 11, 13.

### ***C. Procedures of Data Analysis***

The analysis will draw upon Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory as it is one of the most prominent and widely recognized frameworks for analyzing politeness strategies in communication. Most importantly, Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness originates from Goffman's idea of 'face,' which is rooted in Western culture, making it suitable for analyzing the *Bojack Horseman* TV series, which also hails from Western culture. The theory argued there are four types of politeness strategies: Bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record.

To analyze the data, a draft of raw analysis was first created and each collected utterance began to be analyzed. After all utterances have been analyzed using Brown and Levinson (1987) framework, a findings table was made to categorize or code the types of politeness strategies employed by Mr. Peanutbutter, as well as the realizations. Following that, a brief summary or explanation of the table's content was provided, outlining the number and types of politeness strategies used by him. Lastly, a more detailed explanation and analysis of the politeness

strategies, their realizations, the context, and the effect of his use of politeness were presented. Below is a sample of the procedure of coding an utterance based on Brown and Levinson's framework.

Positive Politeness – Exaggerated (interest, approval, etc)

Todd: Hey, Mr. Peanutbutter!

Mr. Peanutbutter: *Hey, buddy! This place is amazing.* It's like some sort of Disney version of Knott's Berry Farm.

The realization of positive politeness above is marked when Mr. Peanutbutter addressed Todd back with the word 'buddy', which falls under positive politeness with sub strategy 'exaggerated'. The process is applied to all the utterances containing politeness strategies found.

Furthermore, this research also has incorporated triangulation. According to Denzin (2006), triangulation involves using multiple external methods to ensure the accuracy and validity of the analysis. For this research, triangulation was achieved through investigator triangulation, in which the analysis has been approved by an expert of this field. Investigator triangulation means that the phenomenon or the study has been explored by more than one researcher; it is usually done by an expert of the field (Denzin, 2009). In addition, to minimize bias, the study also analyzed all episodes containing Mr. Peanutbutter's politeness rather than just selecting several episodes to ensure a comprehensive and representative analysis.