

## POLITENESS UTTERANCE AND ITS VIOLATION OF COOPERATIVE MAXIMSOFTWO ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKERS, A PRAGMATIC APPROACH

Sri Kuncoro Dibyo Sarjono Maskuri<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ABA Prawira Martha Kartasura

E-mail: [dibyomaskuri@gmail.com](mailto:dibyomaskuri@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

*This pragmatic study is aimed to recognize the types of politeness utterance and the violation of cooperative maxims of English native speakers. The data in this study is utterances performed by two native speakers of English and be taken from a book of communication skills in American English. This study is qualitative with using descriptive technique, and the approach is pragmatics. The objects scrutinized are English utterances of native speakers in the form of written language. The data of politeness utterance is analyzed by using the politeness model from Brown and Levinson, and the violation of cooperative maxims is analyzed by using Grice's cooperative principle. The type of politeness utterance which is found in this study is only positive politeness, negative politeness is not found. In addition, the types of strategy to perform the positive politeness is found as well. Then, the violation of cooperative maxims found in this study is only maxim of quantity. The research output and analysis in the study are presented in informal model or narration model not in the model of mathematic formula.*

**Key words:** *utterance, politeness, maxim violation, speech act, pragmatics*

### Abstrak

Kajian pragmatic ini dimaksudkan untuk mengenali jenis tuturan kesantunan dan pelanggaran maksim kerjasama dari penutur asli Bahasa Inggris. Data dalam kajian ini berupa tuturan-tuturan yang dilakukan oleh dua orang penutur asli Bahasa Inggris yang diambil dari sebuah peristiwa percakapan yang terdapat di dalam sebuah buku tentang ketrampilan berkomunikasi dalam bahasa Inggris bergaya Amerika. Kajian kualitatif ini bersifat deskriptif dengan menggunakan pendekatan pragmatik. Objek kajian yang diamati berupa tuturan-tuturan bahasa Inggris dari penutur asli dalam bentuk bahasa tulis. Data yang berupa tuturan kesantunan tersebut dianalisis dengan menggunakan model kesantunan dari Brown dan Levinson. Dan pelanggaran maksimnya dianalisis dengan menggunakan prinsip kerjasama dari Grice. Dalam kajian ini hanya ditemukan jenis tuturan kesantunan positif, tidak ada tuturan kesantunan negatif. Sebagai tambahan, ditemukan juga strategi atau cara penutur asli melakukan kesantunan positif. Kemudian pelanggaran maksim kerjasama yang ditemukan hanya jenis maksim kuantitas. Hasil kajian dan pembahasan dari penelitian ini disajikan dalam model informal atau model narasi bukan dalam model formula matematis.

**Kata kunci:** *utterance, politeness, maxim violation, speech act, pragmatics*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Politeness study on language use is considered as a new horizon in linguistics. It constitutes a topic of study

in pragmatic linguistics, it scrutinizes a language use. Politeness in language usage, although be considered as new horizon, has attracted much attention

from many linguists especially pragmatic linguists. In fact, there are many studies on politeness in language usage. For example, Karafoti (2007) from Aristotle University of Thessaloniki investigated politeness from the perspective of gender and the speaker's face. The major aim of the study is to reveal that dominant theories of politeness are other-oriented (to the hearer) and underestimate the needs of the speaker in communication, and explore how gender is (or is not) involved in the protection of the speaker's face. Cutrone (2011) from University of Nagasaki studied 'Politeness and Face Theory: Implications for Backchannel Styles of Japanese L1/L2 Speakers'. Aziz (2000) from University of Indonesian Education investigated how the Indonesian people did a refusal utterance; he concluded that the refusal utterance of Indonesian people contained the certain politeness values. This case indicates that there is a new concern or field in linguistics, not only from the aspects of grammar, psychosocial, but also ethics.

As the new concern in linguistic study particularly in the study of language use, politeness in language use should be paid attention properly by the linguists, language teachers, and language learners. Furthermore, it is important for everyone to understand the politeness in language use because human naturally is 'language-use creature' who always performs a verbal communication in the daily life.

Even though pragmatics in language use is now getting attention, the matter of language use politeness itself has leaned on or existed for a long time in the verbal communication in any society\_ wherever it is. Politeness in language use is traditionally ruled by norms and social morality which is internalized in the contexts of culture and local wisdom. Politeness in English

language use is different from Indonesian language use, moreover if a communication/ interaction across culture is happened to the language users. In other words, politeness in language use from one ethnic/tribe to other ethnic has certain distinction and characteristics.

Communication strategy is a non-linguistic factor in the process of communication or interaction, the other important non-linguistic factor is politeness in language-use. This politeness factor is related to socio-cultural aspect of the language user rather than linguistic aspect. In a communication process, speaker and listener are not only demanded to obey *cooperative principle* (from Grice), but both of them have to understand each other and comprehend the meaning of communication i.e. utterances although it is spoken implicitly.

This recent study provides a practical and theoretical view about politeness in using English which is able to be used as a reference to reveal or reflect the issues in using English. The reflection to see the politeness value in using English is important because English is one of international languages having the biggest influence in the world of international relation/communication. For example, the followings are utterance illustrations of a native speaker of English (NSE) asking time to non native speaker of English (NNSE), he asks the time because his wrist-watch does not work.

1) X (NSE) : Excuse me. Do you have a watch?

Y (NNSE): It's 9.30

2) X (NSE) : Excuse me. What time is it?

Y (NNSE): It's 8.30.

Both utterances, (1) and (2), include the speech act of directive, and indicate that the speaker(x) performs a speech act of asking listener (Y) to do something \_to tell the time to the

listener. The difference of directive utterance (1) from utterance (2) is on the way how the speaker uses indirect utterance, they are performed in the form of interrogative sentence. Indirect speech acts (utterance) are usually considered to be more polite than direct ones (Huang, 2007:115). The more indirect utterance, the more polite.

The examples of utterance (1) and (2) above indicate the politeness utterances, the interrogative form of the directive speech act (utterance) and the expressive speech act ‘Excuse me’ preceding the speech act of directive are the politeness markers of a speech act or utterance. However, the directive speech act ‘Do you have a watch?’ is more polite than the directive speech act ‘What time is it?’, the utterance of ‘Do you have a watch’ contains a non-literal meaning, but ‘What time is it?’ does not.

Based on the explanation and examples above, the writer is interested to analyze the using of politeness in English performed by native speakers of English. The problems scrutinized in this study are (1) how do two native speakers of English perform language politeness in English in a communication event? and (2) what do the violation of cooperative maxims performed by the native speaker of English look like?

Accordingly, this study is aimed to recognize the politeness model of native speakers of English when they are communicating, and also identify the violation of cooperative maxims done by the native speakers of English.

The benefits of this study are, firstly for linguistic study, able to enrich the references of the politeness in language use; secondly, able to document the values of the politeness in English use; and thirdly for learners of English as foreign language, it can widen their practical knowledge of communication in English.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a quickly developing field in linguistics. In present years, it has not only become a center of intense interest in linguistics and the philosophy of language, it has also caught a great deal of attention from anthropologist, cognitive scientist, psychologist, and semioticians.

Pragmatics is related to the study of meaning as communicated by the speaker/writer and interpreted by listener/reader. Yule (1996:3) thinks that pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning and contextual meaning. Thus, this study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said or communicated. Mey (2001:6) defines pragmatics as the study of using language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society. Denoting to the two definitions, pragmatics can be interpreted as the study of language meaning that is used in a communication or interaction and the meaning is determined by the socio-cultural conditions surrounding the communication.

Context itself refers to relevant features of the dynamic setting or environment in which a linguistic unit is systematically used (Huang, 2007:13). And Verschueren (1999:112) defines context as the product of a generation process involving both what is ‘out there’ (social world) and its mobilization (and sometimes manipulation) by language users. Looking over two notions of context, it can be interpreted that context goes beyond the linguistic context (or contexts) and includes the speaker, the hearer, and other situational variables which are relevant for the interpretation of utterance (Archer, 2012:7). Then, typically there are three sorts of context namely situational context, background

knowledge context, and co-textual context(Cutting,2008:5). Ultimately understanding an utterance meaning in a communication/interaction depends on the context encircling during the communication process.

## 2.2 What is Politeness?

The linguistic politeness phenomena have attracted many attention from various point of view since more than thirty years ago. Among many researchers, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) is considered to have weightiness in linguistics (pragmatics) and has a great deal of influence on politeness research. Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed a politeness model which was built on social interaction and viewed strategically choices of people in interactions to mirror the cross cultural variability presenting in communication (Pishghadam,2012:162).

In the view of Lakoff, politeness consists of three rules, they are formality, hesitancy, and equality/camaraderie(inGunarwan,2007: 187). So, politeness utterance should fulfill the three rules; formality means 'not imposing or humble', hesitancy means 'give options to listener', and equality means 'make the listener happy'.Fraser (in Gunarwan2007:188) explained the politeness into three items; they are, firstly, politeness is a property or part of utterance, so it is not the utterance itself. Secondly, it is the listener's view which determine whether politeness exists in an utterance. It may happen that an utterance is polite in the view of speaker but it is not in the view of listener, and vice versa.Thirdly, politeness is related to the right and obligation of the participants in interaction\_ speaker and listener. It means that politeness of utterance is able to be measured on the basis of:

a) Does the speaker un-exceed his/her authority to the listener and

b) Does the speaker perform his/her obligation to the listener?

Brown and Levinson (in Bonvillain,2003:127) said that politeness is concerned with *face*, defined as an "individual's self-esteem" or the public self-image' that every member wants to claim for him-/herself. The notion of 'face' demands different kinds of desires (face wants) that all people have and that all people know others to have. These face wants consists of two types: positive face wants and negative wants. And Brown and Levinson proposed strategies for performing politeness in language use. The strategies includes (1) on record, (2) positive politeness,(3) negative politeness,(4)off record, and (5) Don't do the FTA (Face Threatening Act)/Silent. The choice of the strategy is determined by the social distance between speaker and hearer/listener, their relative power, and the size of the imposition in the cultural context (Archer,2012:85).

Referring to threenotions ofpolitenessabove, the writer tends to use Brown and Levinson's concept for the utterance analysis in this study because, in the writer's view, it is more comprehensive.

## 2.3 Politeness in Language Usage and Speech Act

Lakoff was one of the first linguists to study politeness and elicited the concept that politeness is an important aspect of interaction or communicationthat needs to be studied. Lakoff's theory of politeness suggests that people follow a certain set of rules when they interact with each other, which prevent interaction from breaking down(Johnstone, 2008). Lakoff proposes that there are two rules of politeness, which aim at minimizing conflict in an interaction. As outlined in

“Politeness Theory” (2011), Lakoff’s rules are as follows.

1. Be clear (based on Grice’s Cooperative Principle Maxims)
  1. *Maxim of Quantity*  
Sub maxim: state as much information as is needed in the conversation but not more.
  2. *Maxim of Quality*  
Only say what you believe to be true based on your own knowledge and evidence.
  3. *Maxim of Relations* (be relevant)
  4. *Maxims of Manner*  
Be concise, avoid confusing, ambiguous statements
2. Be polite
  1. Don’t impose
  2. Give options
  3. Make others feel good

These subsets of “Be Polite” have also been referred to as the *maxim of formality or distance*, the *maxim of hesitancy or deference* and the *maxim of equality or camaraderie* (Johnstone, 2008). Lakoff suggests that interlocutors must try to find a balance between these three maxims because they cannot all be maximized at the same time. When the balance of these three maxims is thrown off, people perceive behavior or speech to be inappropriate or impolite.

The Grice’s cooperative principles may be often violated and neglected. It occurs because there are certain circumstances which make the cooperative principles do not always exist. In other words, the maxims of cooperative principles are violated and neglected on purpose by interlocutors (speaker and listener) for the interaction

or communication keeps going on. For that reason, politeness in language usage is an important element in communication, and it is built on the principles which have established or existed in a society.

Politeness in language use is one of objects in pragmatics, the others are speech act, deixis, implicature, and presupposition. Pragmatics studies the usage of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society (Mey, 2001:6). Therefore, pragmatics is considered as an appropriate tool to comprehend a problem and analyze data, and describe the result of analysis about the politeness in language usage.

Theory of politeness is greatly influenced by the notion of ‘face’ from Brown and Levinson. They said that face is the public self-image that everyone wants to claim for oneself (Brown and Levinson, 1987:61). Someone’s face or public self-image can fall or lose. Therefore, the face is necessary to protect. When people (speaker and listener) are communicating, they are suggested to protect their face each other. By doing so, they will not lose their face or not feel embarrassed. One of elements in language usage which have potency to make someone’s face loses or falls is *speech act*. The speech act requires politeness in language usage in order to save the face of speaker or listener.

Theory of speech act is initiated by Austin (1962), he classified the speech act into three namely locution, illocution, and perlocution. First, locution is the act of saying something (Cutting, 2008:14) or producing a meaningful linguistic expression (Yule, 1996:48). The locutionary act is performed to deliver a message for listener from speaker, and the message contains a lexical meaning. In other words, locution is used to deliver the speaker’s message to listener literally.

Second, illocution is ‘what is done in uttering the words’ (Cutting,2008:14), or it refers to ‘what is performed in saying something’ (Archer,2012:37). Illocutionary act demonstrates the function of utterance or the specific purpose that speakers have in mind. Some examples of illocutionary act are ‘inviting’, ‘ordering’, ‘promising’, ‘requesting’, ‘refusing’, ‘apologizing’, ‘complimenting’, etc. To understand the message in the illocutions, listeners require to consider the relations between the utterance or words with its context\_ physical and social world (Cutting,2008:4). Third, perlocution is the result of the words/utterance (Cutting,2008:14), it shows the listener’s reaction of the speaker’s utterance. Huang (2007:103) explained that perlocution is the act by which the illocution produces a certain effect in or exerts a certain influence on the addressee or listener. Of these three speech acts, the most discussed is illocution act. Therefore, the term speech act in its narrow meaning is often received to refer particularly to illocution act.

Searle, then, classified Austin’s idea about illocution act into five: *assertive/representative*, *directive*, *commissive*, *expressive*, and *declaration*. *Assertive*, here the speaker asserts a proposition to be true, using such verbs as: *affirm*, *believe*, *conclude*, *deny*, *report*. *Directives*, the speaker tries to make the hearer do something, with such words as: *ask*, *beg*, *challenge*, *command*, *dare*, *invite*, *insist*, *request*. *Commissive*, here the speaker commits himself (or herself) to a (future) course of action, with verbs such as: *guarantee*, *pledge*, *promise*, *swear*, *vow*, *undertake*, *warrant*. *Expressives*, the speaker expresses an attitude to or about a state of affairs, using such verbs as: *apologize*, *appreciate*, *congratulate*, *deplore*, *detest*, *regret*, *thank*, *welcome*. *Declarations*, the speaker alters the

external status or condition of an object or situation, solely by making the utterance: *I now pronounce you man and wife*, *I sentence you to be hanged by the neck until you be dead*, *I name this ship ‘Thunder’*, etc.

#### 2.4 Theory of ‘Face’ from Goffman and Brown and Levinson

Inspired by Goffman’s view of ‘face’, Brown and Levinson revealed that having polite act is to take care of the face of speaker and listener. In this case, the meaning of ‘face’ is related to the *public self-image*, not in the physical meaning.

Concept of ‘face’ derives from traditional view in China, which is developed by Confucius, and it has correlation with humanistic values worked in China (Azis,2008). In the China’s tradition, ‘face’ attaches to social attribute or public self-image, it is such an appreciation given by people/public. Thus, ‘face’ is like an academic title/degree rewarded by university or college, but it can be withdrawn by the university. Therefore, the owner of ‘face’ has to be careful in doing something included in using language.

While Goffman (1967) stated that face is social attribute, Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that face is a personal attribute owned by everyone and it is universal. Accordingly, Brown and Levinson divide the theory into two types of face namely *positive* and *negative*. *Positive* face relates to value of solidarity, non-formality, togetherness, and companionship/friendship, in other words it refers to a person’s desire to be accepted and liked by others (Huang,2007:116). *Negative* face demonstrates a person’s need to be independent, free from external disturbance, and person’s need to be respected on that independence by others (Aziz,2008:2). Considering that face has certain values, the values

require to maintain or save. One of ways to save the face is by using language politely, so the values of face is not cracked or broken.

*Politeness* itself has different meaning from *deference/courteousness*. The word ‘deferential or courteous’ illustrates a respect or honor to listener (well-mannered), while ‘polite’ illustrates the language usage based on the social distance between speaker and listener. The notion of ‘face’ stated above is really related to ‘politeness’, not ‘deference’. A respect which is demonstrated through language usage may result in ‘politeness’; this means that being deferential or courteous in using language will save ‘face’ if speaker and listener have far social distance, for example between lecturer and student or manager and staff. However, being polite in using language does not always mean courteous, moreover when the speaker and listener do not have far social distance such as work-mate/colleagues, close friends, girlfriend, etc. The language usage by speaker and listener having close social relation tend to be equalizing or egalitarian.

To understand the concept of ‘face’ more obviously, the writer provides examples of positive and negative face in using language politely.

### **2.5 Utterance Example of Positive Face**

As stated above positive face has relation to the values of friendship/relationship between speaker and listener. It can be noticed in the short dialog between two friends, boy and girl. The boy invites his girlfriend to go to a movie.

- (1) Boy : I’m going to movie.  
Come with me.  
(2) Girl : No, I can’t.  
(3) Boy : Come on. You’ll enjoy it!  
(4) Girl : No. No, thanks. I really can’t.

- (5) Boy : You’ll like it. Come on! Let’s go!  
(6) Girl : Look! I can’t go! Now leave me alone!.

Scrutinizing the utterances, it can be said that the communication is performed by individuals who have close relationship. The utterances in the short dialog illustrates how the boy and the girl communicate to maintain their own positive face. The utterance (1) ‘*Come with me*’ is speech act of directive; the boy has performed an act of asking the girl to go to a movie with him directly. The utterance may happen because the boy has social close relation with the girl, i.e. that girl is his girlfriend. It will be a peculiar utterance if the boy performs directive speech act indirectly, for example utterance ‘*Would be so kind to go to a movie with me?*’. It sounds peculiar a boy invites his girlfriend to go to a movie by using an indirect utterance (request). Although the indirect utterance constitutes a form of polite speech act, that is precisely the opposite of the facts, it is impolite speech act. The other utterances of directive speech act in the dialog, utterance (3) and (5), have the same function as utterance (1).

The response utterances of the girl, (2), (4), and (6), also illustrate a positive face. Those utterances of the girl are the speech act of refusal, the act of refusing an invitation from her boyfriend to go to movie. Those are performed by the girl for maintaining the social distance or friendship with her boyfriend to remain close. Therefore, the way to respond the directive speech act from her boyfriend is performed directly too, it is performed to maintain the relationship with her boyfriend. If the girl, for example, responds the directive speech act from her boyfriend indirectly such as ‘*Oh I’d like to, but why don’t we go to movie some other time?*’, it may bring about the

relationship between them be distantly spaced, and their face is threatened. Even though that utterance is a polite indirect form of refusal speech act, it is not commonly used by the interlocutors (speaker or listener) having close social relationship. Thus, the closeness of social distance which is reflected in the language usage such example above contains the value of positive face, *solidarity, togetherness, non-formality, and companionship/friendship*.

## 2.6 Utterance Example of Negative Face

It is different from positive face, in which speaker and listener expect to maintain the values of solidarity, non-formality, and friendship, negative face illustrates how speaker and listener expect a social distance. The following example shows an interaction between a student (Gretchen) and his lecturer (Dr. Hampton). The student knocks at the door before coming into his lecturer's room. He wants to invite his lecturer for a dinner party to celebrate completing his dissertation.

- (7) Gretchen : (Knocking at the door)  
Good morning, Dr. Hampton. May I come in?
- (8) Dr. Hampton: Good morning, Gretchen. Of course, How can I be of help?
- (9) Gretchen : Well, it's not about school, Dr. Hampton. It's just that Alan and I  
Wanted to have a few people over for a dinner party to celebrate  
finishing my dissertation, and we'd like to invite you especially, since you are chairman. Would you be able to come the weekend after next, on Saturday?
- (10) Dr. Hampton : I'd be delighted to, Gretchen. Saturday, did you say?

- (11) Gretchen : If that's all right for you and Mrs. Hampton.
- (12) Dr. Hampton: I'll have to check with Elizabeth, but I'm sure It'll be all right.
- (13) Gretchen : Good. If you could come around six thirty or seven o'clock, that would give us time to chat a while over a glass of wine before dinner.

Scrutinizing the utterances in that example, it shows obviously that both interlocutors, Gretchen and Dr. Hampton, shows a formality in the conversation. It can be found in utterance (7) when Gretchen uses utterance 'Dr. Hampton' for addressing his lecturer, this is a formal address, and he also uses a directive speech act of asking permission "May I come in?", this is a formal speech act. Both utterances are used by Gretchen to save negative face of Dr. Hampton, his lecturer. It means that Gretchen does not want to look close, act as he wants to, and disturb the space of Dr. Hampton.

The other utterances illustrate negative face are also found in utterance (9), (11) and (13). Utterance (7), 'Would you be able to come the weekend after next, on Saturday', is a directive speech act of inviting, Gretchen wants Dr. Hampton to come for dinner party to celebrate finishing his dissertation. This directive speech act is performed in a request sentence (polite utterance), which means it does not show a close relationship, it is formal utterance. Utterance (11) and (13) are also formal utterances, performed in conditional sentences, which illustrate Gretchen does want to impose Dr. Hampton to come for the dinner party. This means that Gretchen acts to save negative face of Dr. Hampton, he has used language politely. The negative face utterances illustrate the values of

*formality, courteousness or deference, and*

Referring to two examples of conversation explaining the concept of face, positive and negative faces, it is obvious that in using language we are suggested to think over social distance between speaker and listener. Politeness in language usage lies on the social distance including age, social status, academic stratification, and the like, rather than diction.

### 2.7 Face Threatening Act

As a technical term, ‘face’ means the public self-image of a person (Yule, 1996:60). Defined in another way, ‘face’ means roughly an individual self-esteem (Huang, 2007:116). Accordingly, face refers to the emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize (Yule, 1996:60). Someone’s face will be threatened when a speaker tell something which contains a threatening towards individual’s expectations having relation with his/her self-image or self-esteem.

The face threatening act (FTA) will occur through a speech act when speaker and listener use language without considering their social distance. This is the example, a conversation via telephone between two friends, the one (B) is asking for a help from the other one (A), however, because it has been late night, A refuses to help B.

- (14) A: Hello?  
(15) B: Hi, Bob. Can you help me out?  
(16) A: Do you know what time it is?!  
(17) B: I know it’s late. I’m sorry.  
(18) A: I can’t.

In that such conversation context, B has threatened A’s face by performing a directive speech act of asking for a help: *Can you help me out?* (utterance 15). This utterance is included into a face threatening act, A’s face is disturbed

with this directive speech act although they are close friends or the social distance between A and B is close. This can occur because it is affected by the situational context of time, this conversation occurs in the late night/midnight. Hence, A’s way to respond B’s directive utterance, although performing an indirect utterance (interrogative sentence), describes the utterance of refusal act\_ it is indicated with the exclamation mark which expresses a strong emotion/anger: *Do you know what time it is?!* (utterance 16). The indirectly refusal is used to show a mitigated utterance or polite refusal. The refusal act in utterance (16) is affirmed by performing an assertive act: *I can’t* (utterance 18).

Face threatening act (FTA) may be positive and negative as well. When the speaker and listener have close social distance, FTA will tend to be negative. And, when the speaker and listener have far social distance, FTA will tend to be positive. Thus, positive face refers to speaker’s wants to be accepted by listener as their social closeness between them; negative face describes a want to be free from intervention, imposition, or disturbance from others. If the wants of positive face is unreachable in the interaction/communication, the positive face is threatened. And if the wants of negative face is unreachable, the negative face is threatened. The logical consequence of face threatening is losing face\_ shame or embarrassed.

### 3. METHOD OF RESEARCH

Research method which is used in providing data in this study is non-participation method. It means that the writer reads deeply a written texts or discourse containing a conversation happened in English. The written discourse of conversation is adopted from a book entitled ‘Speaking Naturally, Communication in American

English(Tillit,1985:46). The research method of this study is qualitative, and its technique is descriptive because the writer would like to describe the *types of politeness* and the *kinds of violation of cooperative principles* performed by the speaker. And the approach used in this study is pragmatics and the object of study is a written discourse containing utterances which focus on the speaker and utterance context.

After the data collected, the writer searches the type of politeness and its violation maxim to analyze. The analysis model refers to Grice's cooperative principle, politeness from Brown and Levinson and types of speech act from Searle. The product of analysis, then, is presented in informal model namely narration model not in the model of mathematic formula.

#### 4. RESEARCH OUTPUT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents a research data about a English conversation between two native speakers provided with its context of conversation.

##### **Data :**

##### **Context:**

*Jeffrey and Paul, roommates at college, are visiting their hometown during spring break. Jeffrey has just told a neighbor, Mrs. Wallace, about Paul's new job after graduation. He also tells her about how much Paul is going to get. be earning. And Paul knows what Jeffrey has done.*

##### **4.1 Utterances:**

- (1) *Paul: Aw, Jeffrey!(ESA)What did you have to go and do that for?(DSA)*
- (2) *Jeffrey : Do what?(DSA)*
- (3) *Paul : You know what I am talking about (ASA). Why did you go and tell Mrs.*

*Wallace how much money I'm going to make?(DSA). Now she'll go and tell the whole world!(DeSA).*

- (4) *Jeffrey : Well , I'm sorry(ESA).*
- (5) *Paul : Yeah, but you know how she talks to everybody and their brother!(ASA).*
- (6) *Jeffrey: Well, I apologize(ASA). I guess I wasn't thinking, I got all excited!(ASA)*
- (7) *Paul : Well, it's done now (ASA). I guess it doesn't matter that much, anyway (ASA) They were bound to find out eventually (ASA) Everybody in this town's got a big nose! (ASA)*
- (8) *Jeffrey: You know, it is a lot of money for a first job(ASA)*
- (9) *Paul : You think I'll able to buy a Porsche?(DSA)*
- (10)*Jeffrey: Well, I think you'd better wait and see how much is left after UncleSam gets his share!(ASA)*

Abbreviations: ASA (Assertive Speech Act), DSA (Directive Speech Act), CSA (Commissive Speech Act), ESA (Expressive Speech Act), DeSA (Declaration Speech Act).

##### **4.2 Analysis:**

The conversation happens between two friends, Paul and Jeffrey, having a close social distance; they are roommates at a college. One day they visit their hometown during the spring break. When they are in hometown, Jeffrey tells their neighbor ,Mrs. Wallace, about Paul who has graduated from college and begun to work. Jeffrey also tells Mrs. Wallace about the salary Paul will get. Paul does not like what Jeffrey has done, therefore an interaction describing Paul's annoyance to Jeffrey comes up in the conversation between them.

The utterance (1) comprises two kinds of speech act, *expressive* and *directive*. Utterance ‘*Aw, Jeffrey!*’ (*expressive*) is spoken by stronger degree of stress and accompanied by a rise in pitch and the exclamatory marker (!) in the utterance is an indicator how the speaker (Paul) generate the utterance. Pragmatically, this utterance does not only illustrates Paul’s emotion of annoyance but also means that Paul has performed an act to express his complaint to Jeffrey. Paul does not like what his friend Jeffrey has done because of informing their neighbor, Mrs. Wallace, that he has completed his study in a college and begun to work too. In addition, Jeffrey has told Mrs. Wallace about the salary which Paul will have. This case makes Paul feels more annoyed to Jeffrey. Paul’s annoyance/anger is represented in utterance (1) *Aw Jeffrey!*, this utterance describes a speech act of *expressive*, Paul expresses his attitude of dislikeness to what his friend Jeffrey has done to him. In addition, the speech act of *expressive* is an act that express a psychological attitude or state in the speaker such as joy, sorrow, and likes/dislikes (Huang, 2007).

Utterance (1) also contains the speech act of *directive*, *What did you have to go and do that for?*. Directive speech act is an act to ask a hearer to do something by using words which may drive the hearer to do something. In the utterance of ‘*What did you have to go and do that for?*’, the speaker (Paul) has done a speech act of *directive*, which means that the speaker asks the hearer (Jeffrey) to clarify why he has told Mrs. Wallace that the speaker has got a new job after graduation. Thus, this directive speech act happens be preceded with the *expressive* act, in other words the speaker asks the hearer to do something (giving a clarification to the speaker) based on a situation or happening which causes him disappointed. The

happening that has made the speaker disappointed is represented with the *expressive* utterance ‘*Aw Jeffrey!*’, then it drives the speaker asks the hearer to do something by generating the *directive* utterance ‘*What did you have to go and do that for?*’.

And in line with the type of politeness, utterance (1), in the eye of Brown and Levinson, is included as *positive politeness with using a strategy of asking for reasons* (in Goody, 1987:128). The politeness utterance is represented in the form of indirect question, not direct question, as it happens in utterance (1) ‘*What did you have to go and do that for?*’. By performing this politeness, Paul the speaker basically wants to mitigate his annoyance to Jeffrey the hearer.

Jeffrey’s response, utterance (2) *Do what?*, is a speech act of *directive*. This speech act illustrates that Jeffrey has performed an act to asks Paul to do something, Jeffrey wants Paul to explain what he means. The utterance *Do what?* describes that he does not know what he has done, so Jeffrey performs a *directive* speech act. Furthermore, this utterance, however, can also illustrate an act to camouflage a guilty on what Jeffrey has done. In other words, Jeffrey pretends that he does not tell anything about Paul to others.

Utterance (3) contains three different utterances of speech act that have different meaning, and this utterance entirely describes Paul’s unbelief on Jeffrey’s response (utterance 2); Paul thinks that Jeffrey’s response is just a pretending. The first utterance ‘*You know what I’m talking about*’ shows’ is a speech act of *assertive*. It is performed by Paul to affirm/insist that he really does not like Jeffrey’s act. Accordingly, he reaffirms by uttering indirectly a *directive* speech act: *Why did you go tell Mrs. Wallace how much money I’m going to make?*. This utterance means that Paul asks Jeffrey to

explain the reason why he has told Mrs. Wallace about the salary going to have. It is same as the utterance (1), this directive utterance describes *positive politeness with using a strategy of asking for reasons* (Brown and Levinson in Goody, 1987:128). Then, Paul adds an utterance of commissive speech act *‘Now she’ll go and tell the whole world’* after the directive speech act. This commissive speech act illustrates how annoyed Paul is, Paul assumes that Jeffrey has told something he dislikes to the other. This utterance is using a figurative language of hyperbola, therefore it is included positive politeness with using strategy of intensifying interest to listener (Brown and Levinson in Goody, 1987:106). And this utterance shows a violation of quantity maxim, basically it is enough for Paul just say *‘You know what I’m talking about. Why did you go and tell Mrs. Wallace how much money I’m going to make?’* without adding utterance *‘Now she’ll go and tell the whole world.’*

Utterance (4), *‘Well, I’m sorry’*, is a speech act of expressive which describes the feeling of Jeffrey’s regret for the wrongdoing he has done. The utterance of *‘sorry’* just shows ‘mild regret’, it is not purely apologizing. For that reason, Paul is not satisfied with the Jeffrey’s response (utterance 4); Paul wants Jeffrey to apologize. That’s why Paul performs a speech act of assertive (utterance 5) *‘Yeah, but you know how she talks to everybody and their brother!’*. This assertive utterance has a pragmatic force or implicature that means Paul does not want to accept the Jeffrey’s regret only.

What Paul means is understood by Jeffrey, so Jeffrey apologizes to Paul as it is illustrated in utterance (6) *‘Well, I apologize. I guess I wasn’t thinking. I got all excited’*. It looks in this utterance (6), there is a violation of quantity maxim. Actually it is enough

for Jeffrey by uttering only *‘Well, I apologize’*, it has already fulfilled cooperative principle namely maxims of manner and relation/relevant. The existence of utterance *‘I guess I wasn’t thinking. I got all excited’* illustrates the violation of quantity maxim. In other words, Jeffrey utters something that exceeds what Paul wishes.

Hearing Jeffrey’s utterance apology, Paul feels what he wishes is fulfilled because ‘apologizing’ shows purely regret’ rather than ‘sorry’. And this is realized in utterance (7) *‘Oh well, it’s done now. I guess it doesn’t matter that much, anyway. They were bound to find out eventually. Everybody in this town’s got a big nose!’*. Utterance (7) consists of utterances: first, expressive speech act *‘Oh well, it’s done now. I guess it doesn’t matter that much’*, second, assertive speech act *‘They were bound to find out eventually’*, and third, declaration speech act *‘Everybody in this town’s got a big nose!’*. This utterance entirely shows that Paul really accepts the request for forgiveness from Jeffrey. Nevertheless, this utterance violates maxim of quantity, Paul exaggerates his apology acceptance. It is shown in the utterances of assertive speech act (*They were bound to find out eventually*) and declaration speech act (*Everybody in this town’s got a big nose!*). Actually, the expressive speech act *‘Oh well, it’s done now. ...’* is sufficient to perform, Jeffrey will understand that Paul can accept apologizing. By uttering *‘They were bound to find out eventually. Everybody in this town’s got a big nose!’*, Paul has violated the maxim of quantity; but this utterance illustrates *positive politeness with using jargon/slang* (Brown and Levinson in Goody, 1987:111). As a result, this exaggerating utterance stimulates Jeffrey to comment again *‘You know, it is a lot of money for a first job’* \_utterance (8). This speech act of assertive is performed by Jeffrey

because he thinks that Paul has forgiven him.

Hearing such response, Paul expresses a reciprocal *response* ‘*You think I’ll able to buy a Porsche?*’ (utterance 9). Porsche is a kind of car that is only able to buy by the one who is very rich. This expressive speech act shows that Paul does not like with Jeffrey’s comment in utterance (8). And, utterance (9) illustrates a *positive politeness with using a strategy of giving/asking for reasons* (Brown and Levinson in Goody,1987:128). Utterance (10) ‘*Well, I think you’d better wait and see how much is left after Uncle Sam gets his share!*’ is Jeffrey’s response of Paul’s expression (utterance 9). Utterance (10) is a speech act of directive that illustrates *positive politeness with using in-group identity markers of jargon/slang* (Brown and Levinson in Goody,1987:111). It is indicated in the use of jargon/slang ‘... after Uncle Sam gets his share!’ This utterance (10) means that Paul is asked to wait till gets a lot of money in for being able to buy what he wants such as a luxurious car.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This pragmatic study focuses on politeness in language usage and the violation of maxims. The data resource is a conversation between two close friends that is taken from an English book entitled ‘Speaking Naturally, Communication Skills in American English’ by Bruce Tillit and Marry Newton Bruder. Although the data of conversational utterances used in this study not natural, but in the writer’s view the conversational data describes a real and natural practice of communication happened in the society where English is the first/native language such as in the United States of America. In short, the data of utterance is close to natural.

Referring to the research output and discussion above, it can be concluded that the conversation between two close friends, Paul and Jeffrey, generally takes place cooperatively. It means that both speaker and listener perform utterances that can save their face each other.

The realization of politeness in this study is found in the utterance (1) *What did you have to go and do that for*, (3) *Why did you go tell Mrs. Wallace how much money I’m going to make?*, (7) *They were bound to find out eventually. Everybody in this town’s got a big nose!*, and (10) *Well, I think you’d better wait and see how much is left after Uncle Sam gets his share!*. Utterance (1) illustrates a positive politeness with using strategy of asking for reasons. Utterance (3) also illustrates a positive politeness with using strategy of asking for reasons and performing in-group identity markers. Then, utterance (7) illustrates a positive politeness using jargon/slang as its strategy. And utterance (10) illustrates a positive politeness using a strategy of in-group identity markers. The negative politeness is not found in this study, it can occur because the participants in the communication have close social distance.

The violation of maxims that is found in this study is only on maxim of quantity. This is indicated in utterances: (3) *Now she’ll go and tell the whole world*, (6) *I guess I wasn’t thinking. I got all excited’ I guess I wasn’t thinking. I got all excited*, and (7) *They were bound to find out eventually. Everybody in this town’s got a big nose!*.

Based on the research finding above it can be concluded that studying politeness in language usage is going to find the violation of maxim, and speech act is used as one of indicators of politeness in the language usage. The violation of maxim can not be avoided by speaker and hearer

(participants) in the communication/interaction, this is performed by them in order to be able to keep cooperative principle.

Eventually, this study will give practical knowledge for readers, especially English language teachers, to share the information to the learners of English as foreign language or those who are interested in learning English. A future study with a more various context of communication may elicit more information and understanding on politeness in English usage of native speakers.

## REFERENCES

- Archer, Dawn, Karin Ajmer and Anne Wichmann. 2012. *Pragmatics, An Advanced Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group
- Aziz, Aminuddin. 2008. *Horison Baru Teori Kesantunan Berbahasa, Membingkai yang Taserak, Menggugat yang Semu, Menuju Universalisme yang Hakiki*. Speech Paper of the Inauguration of Drs. E. Aminuddin Aziz, M.A., Ph.D., as Professor of Linguistics for University of Indonesian Education, Bandung.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, Joan. 2008 (2nd edition). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Cutrone, Pino. 2011. *Politeness and Face Theory: Implications for Backchannel Style of Japanese L1/L2 Speakers*. England: University of Reading, Language Studies Working Papers.
- Elleni, Karafoti. 2007. *Politeness, Gender and the Face of the Speaker*. Greece: Linguistic Department, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Goody, Esther N. 1987. *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunarwan, Asim. 2007. *Pragmatik, Teori dan Kajian Nusantara*. Jakarta: Penerbit Univeristas Atmajaya.
- Huang, Yan. 2007. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. Meldon, MA, USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics, An Introduction*. Massachusetts USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Nadar, F.X. 2009. *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik*. Jogjakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Pisghadam, Reza. 2012. *A Study into Politeness Strategies and Politeness Markers in Advertisements a Persuasive Tools*. Mediterranean Journal of Social Science. Vol.3 (2) May 2012:162.  
<http://linguistics.usask.ca/Ling347/webp/politeness2/index.ht>
- Tillit, Bruce. 1985. *Speaking Naturally, Communication Skills in American English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold, a member of the Hodder Headline Group.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford. Oxford University Press