

Language Politeness

Masda Surti Simatupang¹, Lamhot Naibaho²

¹Departement of Chemistry Education, Indonesian Christian University, Jl. Mayjen Sutoyo No 2 Cawang, East Jakarta

²Departement of English Education, Indonesian Christian University, Jl. Mayjen Sutoyo No 2 Cawang, East Jakarta

Corresponding Author: lamhot.naibaho@uki.ac.id³

ABSTRACT

In communication, language politeness is a crucial aspect because it can shape one's language and character. This research was conducted to describe violations and obedience with the principle of language politeness of employees in carrying out daily routines at Indonesian Christian University. The research approach used is qualitative with a descriptive analysis design. Obtaining the research data, an audio recorder was used as an instrument, the data obtained through audio recorders were Analysed using the pragmatic method. The research results obtained are that the number of obedience with the language politeness principle among employees at Indonesian Christian University is greater than the violations or impoliteness. It can be seen from 248 utterances, 192 utterances that obey the principle of language politeness and 56 utterances that do not obey the language politeness. Violations in the utterances are violations, one maxim, two maxims and three maxims in one utterance. The maxim that was violated the most was the maxim of appreciation and the maxim of wisdom. It was also found that none of the employees obeys the maxim of simplicity from the utterances spoken. Thus, it can be concluded that the Indonesian Christian University requires a conduct training program to improve employee language politeness.

Keywords: *Employees, language politeness, analysis*

1 INTRODUCTION

In interacting, rules are needed that govern the speaker and interlocutor to establish later good communication between the two (Leech, 2014). In language, humans need to pay attention to the politeness of language when communicating with other humans. Besides, language can be used politely not to hurt or offend the speaker (Diani, 2014; Kasper, 1990a; Myers, 1989).

Mistakes in language often occur in communication and interaction between humans with each other. It can be seen as well as activities within the tertiary institution. The problem that often arises is that education personnel often violate politeness in the language (Kasper, 1990a, 1990b).

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Politeness is one of the pragmatics studies (Diani, 2014; Leech, 2014; Ryabova, 2015). Politeness is a behaviour that is expressed in the right way or ethical (Diani, 2014). Politeness is a cultural

phenomenon, so what is considered polite by one culture may not be the case with other cultures (Leech, 2007). The purpose of politeness, including politeness in language, is to make the atmosphere of interaction pleasant, non-threatening to face and effective (Culpeper, 2009). Politeness research studies language (language use) in a particular language community (Fitri et al., 2019; Syahri, 2013).

Brief and general terms, three rules must be obeyed so that our speech sounds polite to our listeners or opponents (Blum-Kulka, 1987; Diani, 2014). The three rules are (1) formality, (2) uncertainty, and (3) equality or equality. So, it can be said briefly that a speech is called polite if it does not sound pushy or arrogant, the speech gives a choice of action to the interlocutor, and the interlocutor becomes happy (Diani, 2014).

That as interpersonal rhetoric, pragmatics requires the principle of politeness (Jansen and Janssen, 2010; Pilegaard, 1997). In line with the above, in polite speech, so that messages can be conveyed well to the speech participants, the communication that occurs needs to consider the principles of politeness in the language (Syahri, 2013). The principle of politeness in language put forward by (Leech, 2014) is as: a) People who hold and carry out the wisdom maxim will be said

to be polite (Culpeper et al., 2017; Kasper, 1990a). Likewise, speech that is spoken indirectly is usually more polite than speech that is spoken directly. In this maxim of wisdom, (Leech, 2014) uses the term wisdom maxim; b) Maxims of generosity, the purpose of this generosity maxim are to make the smallest possible profits; make as significant a loss as possible (Kamlasi, 2017). That with a maxim of generosity or maxim of generosity, participants in speech are expected to respect others (Rahardi, 2005). The term acceptance maxim for Leech maxim of generosity (Aitchison and Wardaugh, 1987; Clark and Yallop, 2006); c) Maxims of appreciation and appreciation are expressed by expressive sentences and assertive sentences (Eshghinejad and Moini, 2016). Rahardi (2005) added, in the maxim of appreciation, explained that people will be considered polite if in speech, always try to give appreciation to other parties; d) Maxims of simplicity - Rahardi (2005) says that in the maxim of simplicity or maxim of humility, the speech participant is expected to be humble by reducing praise to himself. This maxim of humility is expressed in expressive and assertive sentences; e) Maxims of agreement - According to Rahardi (2005), in this maxim, it is emphasised that the speech participants can foster mutual agreement or agreement in speaking activities; and f) Maxims of sympathy, in this maxim, hoped that the speech participants could maximise the sympathy between one party and the other (Yeomans et al., 2019). Antipathy toward one of the speech participants will be considered as an impolite act. People who are antipathy towards others, especially to be cynical towards other parties, will be considered people who do not know society's manners (Rahardi, 2005; If the opposite person gets success or happiness, the speaker is obliged to congratulate him (Maros and Rosli, 2017).

3. METHOD

This study uses descriptive-qualitative methods to find the broadest possible knowledge of language politeness violations during class discussion activities in Indonesian subjects and obedience with the principle of politeness in staff's utterances at the Indonesian Christian University. The location of this research is at the Christian University of Indonesia Jl. Mayjen Sutoyo No. 2 Cawang East Jakarta, 13360. This study's subjects were the Indonesian Christian University's academic staff, totalling 196 academic staff (BSDM UKI, 2019). In this study, the data collection method used is the

method of referring to sound recording techniques. Researchers do not involve themselves in conversation activities carried out by research subjects. Researchers only observed and listened to the use of language spoken by education staff when communicating. The research instrument used in this study is the researcher himself (human instrument), with all his knowledge of the theories that support research (Moleong, 2004).

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of this research on the analysis of the language politeness of the Indonesian Christian University staff that occurs in daily activities in the office. Based on the study's data, they found violations and obedience with the language politeness principle. There were total data collected based on the number of data cards, 252 speech data cards. Data cards in the form of violations in the language politeness amount to 74 data, while those in the form of obedience to the language politeness amount to 101 data.

Violating of the Principle of Language Politeness

Table 1 shows that the staff in conducting the daily routines consisting of eight discussion topics. It is found that 74 utterances violate the principle of politeness in language. Each group presents a different discussion topic following the research that has been done. Based on the number of maxims violated, there are 39 violations of one maxim, 34 violations of two maxims, and 1 Violation of three maxims. Of the 74 utterances that were violated, the most maxims that were violated were the maxims of appreciation. The rest are the maxim of wisdom, generosity and appreciation, each of which amounted to 10 utterances.

Table 1. The Violation of the Language Politeness Principle

| Conversation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | One Max | | | | | | Two Maxims | | | | | Three Max | |
| | M. Wis | M. Gen | M. App | M. Sim | M. Agr | M. Simp | M. App & M. Symp | M. Wis & M. Gen | M. Wis & M. App | M. App & M. Sim | M. Wis & M. Symp | M. Wis & M. Gen & W. App | |
| 1 | 5 | - | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | |
| 2 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | - | - | |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3 | 2 | - | - | |
| 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | - | 1 | |
| 6 | - | 1 | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | |
| 7 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | | | |
| 8 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Amount | 8 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | 39 | | | | | | 34 | 1 |
| | TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | 74 |

M. Wis = Maxims of wisdom; M. Gen = Maxims of Generosity; M. App = Maxim of Appreciation; M. Sim = Maxim of Simplicity; M. Agr = Maxim of Agreement; M. Simp = Maxim of Sympathy

Maximum Wisdom - In this maxim of wisdom, the speaker should always reduce his profit and maximise the profits of the other party is speaking. When speaking with others, speakers must be polite, wise, not burdensome to the speaker, and use subtle diction in speaking.

1st speaker: "Yes, there are various kinds of odours, so there are insects who like certain smells, or for example, orange peel, mosquitoes also do not want to. Nevertheless, according to humans, it smells good. That is enough right? "

Co-speaker: Yes, yes."

Context:

When the 1st speaker answers the Co-speaker's question, the 1st speaker forces his opinion on the Co-speaker so that the Co-speaker agrees with the 1st speaker's answer.

Examples of violations from the maxim are as follows.

1st speaker: "I see. That is their own doing. They do not think about the future."

Co-speaker: "Oh well, then."

Context:

During the discussion, the Co-speaker disagreed with the opinions of the 1st Speakers, but the Co-speakers continued to respect the opinions of the 1st Speakers.

Data (2) violates politeness with the maxim of appreciation because the 1st speaker's speech minimises respect for others. The 1st speaker's utterances, "It is their own doing. They do not think about it in the future, "they feel condescending to others, which can

make a criticised person hurt. In this maxim of appreciation, people will be considered polite if in speaking, they always try to give appreciation to others.

Data included in the violations of maxims of generosity are described as follows.

1st speaker: "Yes, the year is immersed within 24 hours."

Another participant: "Ha, it has been a long time. Isn't it? "

Context:

During the discussion, participants rejected the answers given by the 1st speaker.

Data included in the maximal violations of simplicity are described below.

Co-speaker: "Are you sure the data is accurate?"

1st speaker: "That is also from some official websites. That is also a research report, and the results are

Almost from several studies or the web, the results are the same. "

Context:

During the discussion, some participants asked the 1st speaker whose questions cornered the 1st speaker.

Speech in data (4) is included in the violation in the maxim of simplicity because the speaker does not maximise respect for others. Speech "Are you sure that the data is accurate?" Minimise respect for others because the Co-speaker looks prejudiced against the 1st speaker. The speech became impolite because Co-speaker's statement seemed to discredit his opponent.

Here are the data of violations in the agreement maxims.

Co-speaker: "What I want to ask, usually, is that if you know that what has been boiled is durable, so it has not given lime, it is fine too."

1st speaker: "In our opinion, yes, we have boiled it not close like that, you know. What is orange juice for, avoid bacteria like that. Like just boiling it, there's still bacteria. "

Context:

The Co-speaker still disagrees with the answer given by the 1st speaker, while the 1st speaker explains to reinforce his opinion.

Data (5) violates the agreement's maxims because the 1st speaker is unable to establish compatibility with the Co-speaker. The presentation of the 1st speaker above shows that the 1st speaker does not want to support the correct opinion, even though his opinion is wrong. The 1st speaker continues to provide a defence to strengthen his opinion, even though the answer is not supported by substantial evidence. Therefore, the speech above is impolite because the 1st speaker is unable to maximise compatibility with the Co-speaker.

Here are the data of violations in the maximal conclusions.

1st Speaker: Good afternoon. Friends, our first group will present the results of our scientific

work on pesticides as papaya leaves, sorry I repeat.

Co-Speaker: HUUUUUUUU.

Context:

When the moderator opens the presentation, the moderator makes a mistake in delivering the title, then the participant cheers for the moderator.

The speech in data (15) violates the maxim of sympathy because the discussion participants do not sympathise with the moderator who made a mistake in delivering the title. The participants' utterances showed mocking and cynical attitudes towards the mistakes made by their interlocutors. People who cannot give sincere sympathy to others who do wrong are called people who do not know manners in society.

The Obedience of the Principle of Language Politeness

Obedience with the principle of politeness in language found in the staff's daily routines at *Universitas Kristen Indonesia* consisting of eight parts of conversation totalling 190 utterances. The data of obedience with the principle of politeness is the maxim of generosity, wisdom, sympathy, appreciation, and sympathy.

Table 2. The Obedience of the Principle of Language Politeness

| Conver sation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| | One Max | | | | | | Two Maxims | | | | | | Three Max |
| | M. Wis | M. Gen | M. App | M. Sim | M. Agr | M. Symp | M. Wis & M. Agr | M. Wis & M. Gen | M. Agr & M. Symp | M. App & M. Agg | M. Wis & M. App | M. App & M. Symp | M. Wis & M. Agg & M. Symp |
| 1 | 18 | 5 | 11 | - | 5 | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | 17 | 5 | 9 | - | 5 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | 7 | 5 | 9 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 4 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | - | 3 | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | 13 | 4 | 9 | - | - | 2 | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 6 | 12 | 4 | 10 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | - |
| 7 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| 8 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Amount | 71 | 27 | 53 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - |
| | | | | | | 171 | | | | | | 29 | 1 |
| | TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

M. Wis = Maxims of wisdom; M. Gen = Maxims of Generosity; M. App = Maxim of Appreciation; M. Sim = Maxim of Simplicity; M. Agr = Maxim of Agreement; M. Simp = Maxim of Sympathy

Table 2 shows that in doing the daily routines consisting of eight discussion topics, the staff of *Universitas Kristen Indonesia* found that 201 utterances obeyed language politeness. Each group presents a

different discussion topic following the research that has been done. Based on the number of maxims that were obeyed, 171 falls in one maxim, 29 drops in two maxims, and one fall in three maxims. Of the 201

utterances that obeyed the principle of politeness in language, the most followed maxim was the maxim of wisdom as much as 71 utterances.

The fall in wisdom maxim is shown in the following data.

1st speaker: "Yes, thank you from your questions, then we will answer in a moment.

Co-Speaker: "Yes, responding to a question from Brother Ervinda Wahyu, why should pesticide fertiliser not be used during breeding? The question will be answered by sister Chika. "

Context:

The moderator arranges the discussion in polite language.

Data (7) is included in the maxim of wisdom because the moderator's maxim maximises the profit to the interlocutor. The subtle choice of words such as using the words "thank you", "brother" makes the interlocutor feel valued. On the scale of loss and gain, the speech is detrimental to the speaker, the more polite the speech is.

Commanding with question sentences will feel more polite than using command sentences. The following is data on the maximisation of generosity.

Co-speaker: "Could you give an example, how to operate this program?"

1st speaker: "Sure, it's my pleasure."

Context:

Participants in the discussion gave questions to the 1st speaker in a polite manner, not impressed by directing the 1st speaker.

Obedience with the maxim of generosity is shown in data (8) because the Co-speaker's utterance maximises profits for others. Speech Can you give an example, garbage that can kill mangrove forests? is a form of the command, but the Co-speaker conveys with sentence questions, does not seem to command so that the speech becomes polite.

The agreement's maximal agreement is described in the following data.

1st speaker: "Have you done?"

Co-speaker: "Yes, I have."

Context:

The moderator allows participants whether the questions are enough or not. The Co-speaker feels it's enough.

The speech in the data (9) adheres to the agreement's maxims because the Co-speaker can build compatibility with the 1st speaker's answer. In the sentence Yes, I have indicated that the Co-speaker agreed and accepted the discussion results. So the speech above shows that the Co-speaker can maximise compatibility with the 1st speaker.

The appreciation maxim can be seen in the following data.

Co-speaker: "I just want to suggest to you, you should do a check and recheck before you submit something! 1st speaker: "Thank you for the advice."

Context:

When the 1st Speaker group gets criticism from the participants, the 1st speaker still thanks and is polite.

Speeches in data (10) are included in maximising appreciations because the moderator can maximise respect for the discussion participants. The moderator's speech causes the politeness of speech. "Thank you for the advice.", showing gratitude for the suggestion or criticism given by others. It makes others who have given criticism feel valued.

Following are the data of obedience maxim.

Co-Speaker: "I have another opinion, I think that the first things to do is calculating the expenses first."

1st speaker: "Yes, thank you for your opinion. I do agree to what you have suggested.

Context:

When other participants gave suggestions, the 1st Speakers thanked them and used polite language.

Data (11) is the obedience to the principle of politeness in the maxim of sympathy because the participants' speech can maximise the conclusions of the 1st speaker. The participant's speech above shows that the participant can provide sincere support to the 1st speaker by supporting the 1st speaker's answer. It shows that the participants were able to give their sympathy when they saw others getting into trouble.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis in the last part, it is concluded that: a) the violations of politeness principle in the conversation of the staff while doing the daily routines were in the form of one maxims violations such as violations of wisdom maxim; b) there are also violations of the two maxims namely the violations of the maxim of appreciation and the maxim of sympathy; c) there are violations of the three maxims, namely the maxim of wisdom, the maxim of generosity and the maxim of appreciation.; d) the obedience with the principle of politeness in the conversation of the staff while doing the daily routines were in the form of the fulfilment of one maxim.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aitchison, J., Wardaugh, R., 1987. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Br. J. Sociol. <https://doi.org/10.2307/590702>
- [2] Blum-Kulka, S., 1987. Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? J. Pragmat. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(87\)90192-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90192-5)
- [3] Clark, J., Yallop, C., 2006. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics, Religion. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2003.0268>
- [4] Culpeper, J., 2009. Politeness in Interaction, in: English Language. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-07789-9_31
- [5] Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., Kádár, D.Z., 2017. The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness, The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7>
- [6] Diani, G., 2014. Politeness, in: Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139057493.009>
- [7] Eshghinejad, S., Moini, M.R., 2016. Politeness Strategies Used in Text Messaging: Pragmatic Competence in an Asymmetrical Power Relation of Teacher–Student. SAGE Open. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016632288>
- [8] Fitri, N., Artawa, K., Satywati, M.S., Sawirman, ., 2019. Pragmatic Hedges in Court Trial: Indonesian Case. English Lang. Teach. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n8p106>
- [9] Jansen, F., Janssen, D., 2010. Effects of positive politeness strategies in business letters. J. Pragmat. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.02.013>
- [10] Kamlasi, I., 2017. The Positive Politeness in Conversation Performed by the Students of English Study Program of Timor University. Metathesis.
- [11] Kasper, G., 1990a. Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. J. Pragmat. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90080-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90080-W)
- [12] Kasper, G., 1990b. Linguistic politeness: J. Pragmat. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90080-w](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90080-w)
- [13] Leech, G., 2014. The Pragmatics of Politeness, The Pragmatics of Politeness. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341386.001.0001>
- [14] Leech, G., 2007. Politeness: Is there an East-West divide? J. Politeness Res. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.009>
- [15] Marsih, L., 2010. Linguistic Politeness in Different Culture. Parafrase, 10 (1).
- [16] Maros, M., Rosli, L., 2017. Politeness strategies in twitter updates of female english language studies Malaysian undergraduates. 3L Lang. Linguist. Lit. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2017-2301-10>
- [17] Moleong, L.J., 2004. Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif. Remaja Rosda Karya, Bandung.
- [18] Myers, G., 1989. The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. Appl. Linguist. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/10.1.1>
- [19] Nadar, F. X., 200). *Pragmatik & penelitian pragmatik*. Graha Ilmu.
- [20] Paek, T., 2003. Toward a taxonomy of communication errors. Res. Work. Error Handl. Spok.
- [21] Pilegaard, M., 1997. Politeness in written business discourse: A textlinguistic perspective on requests. J. Pragmat. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(96\)00084-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(96)00084-7)
- [22] Rahardi, R. K., 2005. Pragmatik: kesantunan imperatif bahasa Indonesia. Erlangga.
- [23] Rahardi, R. K., 2009. Sosiopragmatik: Yogyakarta.
- [24] Ryabova, M., 2015. Politeness Strategy in Everyday Communication. Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.033>
- [25] Syahri, I., 2013. Resemblance of indirectness in politeness of EFL learners' request realisations. Indones. J. Appl. Linguist. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v3i1.197>
- [26] Yeomans, M., Kantor, A., Tingley, D., 2019. The politeness package: Detecting politeness in natural language. R J. <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-079>.