CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURES, CONCEPTS, AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is divided into three subchapters; they are review of literatures, concepts and theoretical framework.

The first subchapter is review of literatures. It explains five studies related to this study. There are two kinds of study that are reviewed in this study, three studies of the previous students of English Department, Udayana University and two studies from online international journals. These studies explain politeness maxims that were related to this study.

The second subchapter is concepts. It explains about some concepts relevant to this study. Those concepts are the concept of politeness and the concept of politeness maxims.

The last subchapter is theoretical framework. It describes the main theory of politeness principles maxims proposed by Leech (1983).

2.1 Review of Literatures

There are three studies reviewed in this study that was taken from previous students of English Department, Udayana University. Those students also took politeness principle maxims as the topic and two studies from international journal; as following.
The undergraduate paper related into this study was written by Arnita (2010) she wrote a study entitled “The Politeness Maxims Found in the Drama “Pigmalion” by Bernard Shaw”. This study had of two aims; they are to describe the maxims of politeness used by the characters in drama “Pygmalion” and to explain the reason why the politeness maxims were applied by the characters. Qualitative method was used in order to collect the data. For analyzing data, this study was done by using descriptive method. Her research used in the theory is proposed by Leech (1983) about the politeness principles maxim. The results of this study are all maxims found and applied in the drama “Pygmalion” and the most reason for the use of the politeness maxim is because of context of situation (the relationship between the characters). The strength of this study was that she discussed the analysis very clearly so that easy to be understood by readers, however in the background she explains will be analyzing the degree of politeness but in the analysis, she did not explain about it.

Tanjung (2013) wrote a study entitled “Politeness Maxim in Different Settings of the Eat Pray Love movie”. There are two aims used in this study; to find out what types and functions of politeness maxims which are mostly used by characters in Eat Pray Love movie and to analyze the factors that affected the different usage of politeness maxims toward the different setting in Eat Pray Love movie. This study was done by using the technique of note-taking by watching and listening well. For analyzing data this study was done by qualitative descriptively method. Her research mainly applied the theory proposed by Geoffrey Leech (1983) which analyzed six politeness maxims. The sympathy
maxim is the maxim mostly applied in this movie. Where the setting was takes place in Bali, culture is the most factors of the use of politeness maxims. The strength of this study is she discussed about the most popular movie in recent time and also unique because the movie took place in three different places around the world. They are Italy, India and Bali-Indonesia. The weakness of this study is in method and technique of analyzing data were too long described and not clearly explained it might also make the readers feel confused.

Dewi (2013) wrote a study entitled “The Politeness Maxims Used by the Characters in “The Twilight” Movie”. Her research discussed the used of Leech’s politeness maxim in the real conversation in the Twilight Saga Movie. There were two aims of the study; to describe the maxim of politeness used by the characters and to explain the factors influence the politeness maxims used by the characters. This study was done by using observation and documentation method in order to collect the data. For analyzing the data, this study was done by qualitative and descriptive methods. The type of politeness maxims that mostly used in this movie is Approbation maxim, and the reason mostly influence the politeness maxim is because of the context of situation (the relation between the characters). The strength of this study are in the theoretical framework she explained the theory very clearly and in the analysis she found all of the six politeness maxims and had been explained well by her although the mostly used in this movie is approbation maxim. However, about the problem she used two problems and all of those asking by what questions.
The journal that was reviewed is Theory and Practice in Language Studies. It was published in 2013, Vol.3, No.11, pp.1969-1974 and the article entitled “A Corpus Study of Politeness Principle in Desperate Housewife”. This article discussed about the American TV series Desperate Housewife and focused on Cooperation Principle and the theory of conversational implication, in the conclusion is reached that Tact Maxim is the most frequently used. The strengths of this study is the writers used new theory which named theory of corpus study to analyze the data and also used two common researching method, one is qualitative method and the another one is quantitative method. However, about the weakness of this study appeared in conclusion. The conclusion is supposed to consist of the short findings research as whole but this conclusion also consist of limitation which is not important to be mentioned in conclusion.

The second journal that was reviewed is Open Journal of Modern Linguistics. It is an international article journal from Arezou Sobhani and Ali Saghebi was published in 2014, No.4, pp 91-99 and the article entitled “The Violation of Cooperative Principles and Four Maxims in Iranian Psychological Consultation”, this article presents about the understanding non-cooperative attitudes of the speakers and the violation of cooperative principle maxims in real Iranian psychological consulting sessions. The strength of this study is that the topic is interesting because it explains the violation maxims during the process of psychological consulting. This topic is rare in linguistics academic study, however, about the background of this study, it is supposed to be made from general concept to specific concept although with academic writing so that it will
be easy to be understand by the readers who comes from non linguistics background.

Those three undergraduate theses and also two online linguistics international journals then have close relation to this writing, since they also analyzed about politeness principle maxims. However, those papers do not include the discussion about the violation maxims which was proposed by Leech. Although in the second international journal discussed about the violation of maxim, however it was used the theory of Grice (1975). Therefore, based on the explanation mentioned above, this writing is different because this writing would be analyzed and discussed more about the violation maxims that would be found in the utterances among the plays in White House Down movie.

2.2 Concepts

In this study, there are two concepts from linguists that are relevant to this study. They would be used to help the process of understanding this topic and also as the description for the further theory, those are as follows.

2.2.1 Concept of Politeness

The concept is based on the ideas of some expert politeness studies. There are many arguments and definition about politeness. Research on linguistic politeness has seen enormous in its development in line with the need to achieve an effective, cross cultural communication. According to Oxford dictionary, ‘politeness’ refers to show good manners and respect for the feelings of others. It
is generally agreed that politeness is an essential feature of social life. Nowadays, politeness studies have grown into an important line of inquiry. There are some arguments and definitions about politeness as a part of linguistics research.

Spolsky (1998) defines politeness is the choice of an appropriate message form then can be modified to express a wide range of attitudes of the speaker to the listener. Watts (2003) said politeness is not something we are born with, but something we have to learn and be socialized into, and no generation has been short of teachers and handbooks on etiquette and correct behavior to help us acquire polite skills. Wardhaugh (1986:267) explains politeness itself is socially prescribed. This does not mean, of course, that we must always be polite, for we may be quite impolite in other occasions.

2.2.1.1 Positive Politeness

Positive politeness consists in maximizing the politeness of polite illocutions (Leech, 1983:84). Positive politeness utterances are used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy, to imply common ground of sharing of wants to a limited extent even between strangers who perceive themselves, for the purpose of the interaction as somehow similar. Holmes (2008:281) states that positive politeness is solidarity-oriented. It emphasizes shared attitudes and values. Positive Politeness strategies addressed to the H’s positive face range over sets of structures that can only be interpreted as ‘polite’ in the presence of the face-threat itself.
Example:

1. **Notice, attend to Hearer (her/his interests, wants, needs, goods)**

   (Strategy 1): Jim, you’re really good at solving computer problems.
   (FTA): I wonder you if you could just help me with a little formatting problem I’ve got.

   (Watts, 2003:89)

2.2.1.2 **Negative Politeness**

   Negative politeness consists in minimizing the impoliteness of impolite illocutions (Leech, 1983: 84). Negative politeness is oriented mainly toward partially satisfying the hearers negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer. Holmes (2008:281) states that negative politeness involves expressing oneself appropriately in terms of social distance and respecting status differences. Negative politeness being addressed to her or his negative face, this is not to say anything about whether one participant evaluates this politeness positively while another might give a negative assessment.

   Example:

   1. **Be pessimistic about ability or willingness to comply. Use the subjunctive.**

      *If you had a little* time to *spare* for me this afternoon, I’d like to talk about my paper.

      (Watts, 2003:89)
2.2.2 Concept of Politeness Maxims

According to Leech (1983:131), Maxims is a usually pithy and familiar statement expressing a principle generally accepted as wise or true. He also explained it means part of the best explanation of polite behavior. On the other hand, he said that maxims vary from culture, meaning, what may considered as a polite in one culture, may be strange or down light rude in another country. Leech sees cultural rules are at work in expression of politeness and he attempts to categorize some of the underlying intent behind these forms in more detail by articulating a set of rules or “politeness maxims” in polite dialogues. Leech divided politeness principle maxims into six maxims, namely tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim.

People violate certain maxims in the cooperative principle to follow some maxims in the politeness principle. This helps maintain good conversational atmosphere and a good relationship with the speech participant to finally realize the communicative goal. Therefore, we say the cooperative principle is the origin of conversational theory and the politeness principle is the continuity of the great thought and the supplement to it. Yule (1996:39) states that a speaker may ‘opt out’ of the maxim expectations like ‘no comment’ or ‘my lips are sealed’ in response to a question. An interesting aspect of such expressions is that, although they are typically not ‘as informative as is required’ in the context, they are naturally interpreted as communicating more than is said (i.e. the speaker knows the answer). This typical reaction (i.e. there must be something ‘special’ here) of
listeners to any apparent violation of the maxims is actually the key to the notion of conversational implicature.

*Example:*

In modesty maxim states that minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self.

[a] Please accept *this small gift* as a token of your esteem.

[a*] Please accept *this large gift* as a token of your esteem.

(Leech, 1983: 136)

In the example above [a*] is violated from modesty maxim because those utterances maximizing praise as well as minimizing dispraise.

### 2.3 Theoretical Framework

The theory used in this writing is Pragmatics theory. The main theory that would be applied is proposed by Geoffrey Leech and written in his book *Principle of Pragmatics* (1983). He proposes six maxims that determine politeness, it is well known as Leech’s Politeness Maxims. The theory proposed by Holmes (2008) would be applied to analyzing the reasons why politeness maxims are applied.

#### 2.3.1 Politeness Principles Maxim

According to Leech (1983), there is a politeness principle which can be divided into six maxims. The maxims of the politeness principles tend to go in pairs as follows:
1. Tact Maxim

The tact maxim is defined as follows according to Leech (1983:132): “minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other; and maximize the expression of beliefs which give benefit to other”. The first part of this maxim fits in with Brown and Levinson’s negative politeness strategy because of minimizing the imposition which implies cost to other, and the second part reflects the positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer’s interest, wants, and needs. This tact maxim is applied in directive and commissive category of illocutions.

The degree of politeness of an illocution can be measured by different scales:

1. Cost-benefit scale: indicates coat and/or benefit proposition to hearer. (benefit to hearer = greater politeness; cost to hearer = less politeness)

2. Indirectness scale: indicates degree of politeness on the basic of evaluating the same propositional content under increasingly indirect kinds of illocution (higher politeness = greater politeness)

Taken from Principle of Pragmatics by Leech (1983:107) these are some examples of cost-benefit scale and indirectness scale.

**COST-BENEFIT SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost to H</th>
<th>Less polite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Peel these potatoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hand me the newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sit down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Look at that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Enjoy your holiday

6. Have another sandwich

At some rather intermediate point on this scale (depending on the context) the relevant values become ‘benefit to H’ rather than ‘cost to H’; but clearly, if the imperative mood is kept constant there is a general increase in politeness (other factors being equal between [1] and [6]. Another way of obtaining a scale of politeness is to keep the same propositional content X. (eg: X=’You will peel these potatoes’) and to increase the degree of politeness by using a more and more indirect kind of illocution.

INDIRECTNESS SCALE:

1. Answer the phone

2. I want you to answer the phone

3. Will you answer the phone?

4. Can you answer the phone?

5. Would you mind answering the phone?

6. Could you possibly answer the phone?

Indirect illocutions tend to be more polite because they increase the degree of optionality and because the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its force tends to be.
Thomas (1995:161) states that: we can use ‘minimizes’ to reduce the implied cost to the hearer. Whether or not the strategy of minimizing the ‘expression of cost to other’ is perceived as polite or not may be highly culture-specific.

2. Generosity Maxim

This maxim is used to minimize the expression of benefit to self and maximize the utterance of cost to self. It is used in directive and commissive illocutionary act. If in the tact maxim the focus is on other-centered, in generosity maxim, it focuses on self-centered. Leech (1983:133).

Example:

*You relax and let me do the dishes*

*You must come and have dinner with us*

The hypothesis that the Generosity Maxim is less powerful than the Tact Maxim supported by the observation that an impositive can be softened and thereby made more polite by omission of reference to the cost to H.

Thomas (1995:162) states that Leech also points out that some cultures attach much more importance to the Generosity maxim than do others (he suggests that it is particularly important in Mediterranean cultures), but remember that we are only dealing with the importance attached to the linguistic expression of generosity there is no suggestion that members of one culture really are more generous than members of another.
3. Approbation Maxim

The approbation maxim states that the speaker should minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express appraisal of other Leech (1983:135). This maxim is used in an utterance that expresses the speaker’s feeling, such as expression of like, dislike, joy, sorrow or pleasure and is used in representative speech. The operation of this maxim is fairly obvious: all things being equal, we prefer to praise others and if cannot do that, to sidestep of issue, to give some sort of minimal response (possible through to remain silent). The first part of maxim avoids disagreement; the second part intends to make other people feel good by showing solidarity.

Example:

_I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. It was, um...different._

Thomas (1995:163) states that as Leech points out, the ‘other’ may not be the person directly addressed, but someone or something dear to him or her. Thus in most societies it is as unacceptable to say: _Did you do these ghastly daubing?_ As it would be to ask: _Are these talentless children yours?_ (Thomas, 1995:163)

Often in pragmatics (and in linguistics in general) we only become aware of the fact that a norm or regularity exists when someone (often an immature member of, or an outsider to, a particular group) fails to observe the norm.

4. Modesty Maxim

This maxim states: ‘minimize praise of self as well as maximize dispraise of self”. This maxim is also used in expressive and representative speech
Example:

Oh, I’m stupid; I didn’t make a note of our lecture! Did you?

Thomas (1995:165) further states that we become aware of the fact that a norm or regularity exists only when someone so spectacularly fails to observe it! It is important in pragmatics (perhaps in linguistics in general) to take careful note of incidents such as this one which jar or cause embarrassment or (mock) outrage—they will often point up the existence of a particular norm in a given society.

5. Agreement Maxim

The agreement maxim proposes as follows: “Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other” It is used in representative speech (Leech, 1983:138). In this case Agreement maxim is in line with Brown and Levinson’s positive politeness strategies of ‘seek agreement’ and avoid disagreement’ to which they attach great importance. However, it is not being claimed that people totally avoid disagreement. It is simply observed that they are much more direct in expressing agreement, rather than disagreement.

A: ... I don’t want my daughter to do this, I want her to do that.

B: Yes, but ma’am, I thought we resolved this already on your last visit.

(Thomas, 1995:165)

This example is not clearly shows the agreement expression by the Hearer, but it seems that the Hearer tries to avoid disagreement with the Speaker in polite
utterance. Although the Hearer less agree with the intent of the speaker but he tries to minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other.

There is a tendency to exaggerate agreement with other people, and to mitigate disagreement by expressing regret, partial agreement, etc. Therefore a Maxim Agreement is a must to be talked. Compare the rudeness of the reply in [1] with the replies [2] – [4]:

[1] A: It was an interesting exhibition, wasn’t it?
   B: *No, it was very interesting.

   B: Yes, definitely.

[3] A: English is a difficult language to learn.
   B: True, but the grammar is quite easy.

   B: Yes, well written as a whole, but there are some rather boring patches, don’t you think?

As [3] and [4] show, partial disagreement is often preferable to complete disagreement.

(Leech, 1983:138)

Thomas (1995: 165) states that we simply observe that they are much more direct in expressing their agreement, than disagreement. Time and again you will hear someone who holds a diametrically opposed view to the one just expressed begin a counter-argument by saying: *Yes, but...*
6. Sympathy Maxim

In sympathy maxim, the participant is expected to maximize the expression of sympathy to their hearer and minimize the antipathy. This maxim is usually used in representative utterances (Leech, 1983:138). This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulations, commiseration, and expressing condolences—all of which is in accordance with Brown and Levinson’s positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer’s interest, wants, and needs.

_I am sorry to hear about your father._

This is the simplest example that is usually expressed by someone to show sympathy to other people. This expression is an example of a very polite utterance when we want to show our concern for others for showing the expression of condolences of someone to his friend’s father.

Maxim of sympathy explains why congratulations and condolences are courteous speech acts, even though condolences express beliefs which are negative with regard to the hearer.

_I am terrible sorry to hear that your cat died._

(Leech, 1983: 138)

This is polite, in contrast, for example, with *I am terribly pleased to hear that your cat died.* There is nevertheless some reticence about expression of condolences, since to refer to the propositional context X is a fact to express an impolite belief in the sense of belief unfavorable to H.
2.3.2 Factors Influencing the Use of Politeness Maxim

The context of situation and social factors (participant, setting, and topic) influence the characters to express the politeness because these are the basic components of why people not speak in the same way all the time. No living language is simply one set of words which can be used the same way in all situations. The nature of language is such that there are an infinite variety of different ways of arranging its elements. What this means is that there are many ways to say the same as this, depending on where you are, who you are, and how you feel (Holmes, 2008:3).

According to Miller and Smith, there are three factors that related to the use of politeness, they are: etiquette, culture and directive compliance. Politeness has a close relationship with cultural and social factors. Culture is believed to determine whether an utterance is polite or impolite in context based on whether their perception of the face threat present in the interaction is balanced by the amount of redress. Furthermore, all cultures are also presumed to reckon face threat as a function of power difference, social distance and degree of raw imposition. And finally, all cultures have been observed. However, differences in appreciation of politeness among various cultures may lead speakers to choose different expression according to their cultural values. (Miller & Smith, 2008: 1-5)

Based on Holmes (2008) someone expresses politeness based on:

1. Age

Age has an important extent in influencing the politeness expressions, adult people address the young people with first name (FN) and adult
people received title last name (TLN). It means that the younger speakers have to speak politely to the older speaker. Age can be considered very influential on people’s language. Age states that middle-aged people use different language to that of children and elderly people because the environment surrounding them. Since they are supposed to be in the center of society, they are more likely to use more standard forms.

2. Gender

Gender is crucial factor to be taken into consideration when dealing with politeness phenomena. Women and man have a different ways of talking and hence of realizing and interpreting speech acts. Where men use language as tool to give and obtain information and women see language as means of keeping.

3. Kinship

Kinship terms indicate blood relationship between the speaker and the hearer. According to Wardhaugh (1992:227) states that kinship system is a system of describing how people in various parts of the word refer to brother, sister, father, mother, uncle and son. Kinship relationship is the family relation which obligates them to respect the other.

4. Social Status

Social status as determined by occupation, education and wealth. Social status, social distance or solidarity, and the degree of formality of the
interaction are relevant dimensions in all societies in determining ways of speaking politely. Social status divided into three divisions, those are:

a. Low level is the all children learn first regardless of social class origin, and everyone uses it on some occasion, even close acquaintances.

b. Middle level is used by town-dwellers who are not close friends, or by peasants addressing superiors.

c. Highest level is used among the old aristocrats or by anyone at the highest levels of the society who wants to give the appearance of elegance.

Lower class people usually do not get enough education or just graduated from elementary and junior high school. Therefore, they might not know to use formal speech that is considered polite forms. On the other hand, there are some lower classes that can use polite forms in addressing other people.