



Violation Of The Maxim Of Politeness In The Use Of The Sasak Language By Speakers In The Village Of Buin Baru

Hendra Gunawan¹, *Jumianti Diana², and Wiwik Surya Utami³

^{1,2,3}. Sumbawa University Of Teknologi (UTS), Sumbawa West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

hendra.gunawan@uts.ac.id

Abstract. In the Sasak-speaking community in Buin Baru Village, we often find the use of Sasak language that seems rude and does not comply with the principles of politeness in language, both in formal and informal settings. This condition can reflect the linguistic characteristics used. This study was conducted to find violations in the use of language in Buin Baru Village.

This study uses qualitative descriptive research. The data in this study specifically discusses violations of language politeness maxims used by Sasak speakers in Buin Baru Village. Data collection for this study was carried out using three techniques, namely: (1) Observation technique, (2) Eaves dropping technique, (3) Observation and conversation technique. As for the data analysis technique in this study, the researcher used the matching method, which is an analysis method that explains the object of study in relation to the situational context or socio-cultural context. The results of this study found six violations of the maxims of politeness. Among them were 2 violations of the maxim of agreement, 2 violations of the maxim of sympathy, 1 violation of the maxim of respect, and 1 violation of the maxim of generosity.

Keywords: Maxim, Polite Language, Immigrant Speakers.

1. Introduction

Variations in language use have become a characteristic and inherent feature of some communities [1]. The language used in communication is very diverse. This diversity or variation in language is not only caused by the heterogeneity of the speakers, but also by the diversity of their social interactions. Sarcasm is a type of figure of speech that contains mockery or harsh insults that hurt feelings [2]. When compared to irony and cynicism. Sarcasm is the harshest form of sarcasm. It involves cursing people with harsh and rude words. It is usually uttered by people who are angry [3].

Language use also involves communication ethics, and communication ethics itself involves morals. Morals have the same meaning as decency, which contains teachings about good and bad deeds. Thus, deeds are judged as good or bad [4]. This linguistic condition can be found in the community of Buin Baru Village. In the community of Buin Baru Village, it is common to hear conversations spoken by the community, whether they are employees, Sarifah, or unemployed people who speak Sasak and often use harsh words.[5].

The author himself has seen how people interact with each other using a tone of voice and Sasak language that is not appropriate to use. Perhaps for some people living in Buin Baru Village, this is considered normal, so they do not always take issue with every instance of impolite Sasak language that comes out in their communication. Then what will happen if the Sasak language used sometimes sounds harsh? What happens next is that people shout profanities or harsh words (sarcasm). The sarcasm that comes out of people's mouths is usually coercion, complaints, and so on, so that "verbal fights" often occur between them. In this section, the author will examine linguistic phenomena occurring in two hamlets, namely Karang Malang's hamlet and Belekong hamlet. Many things cause users to utter harsh words. Sarcasm itself can sometimes provoke anger in the target, but sometimes it has no effect because it has become commonplace for both parties. From the speaker's point of view, language functions *personally* or privately [6].

This means that the speaker expresses their attitude towards what they are saying. The speaker not only expresses emotions through language, but also shows those emotions when delivering their speech. In this case, the listener can also guess whether the speaker is sad, angry, or happy. From the perspective of the listener or interlocutor, language functions *as a directive*, that is, it regulates the behavior of the listener [7, 8, 9]. Here, language not only makes the listener do something, but also do activities that are in accordance with what the speaker wants. This can be done by the speaker using sentences that express commands, appeals, requests, or persuasion.

When viewed from the perspective of contact between the speaker and the listener, language here has a *phatic function* which is the function of establishing relationships, maintaining them, showing friendliness, or national solidarity.

The language behavior of speakers in Buin Baru Village, Buer District, is a distinctive linguistic feature that has become ingrained in the community. In linguistic studies, when someone discusses language behavior or politeness, they are also discussing pragmatics. This section examines several theoretical references used in the study, including (a) the principle of politeness in language, (b) context, and (c) discussion. Politeness is a rule of behavior that is established and agreed upon by a particular community, so that politeness also becomes a prerequisite agreed upon by social behavior. Therefore, politeness is commonly referred to as “manners.” Politeness is relative within a community. Certain utterances can be considered polite in a particular community, but in another community they may be considered impolite. Politeness is behavior that is expressed in a good or ethical manner. Politeness is a cultural phenomenon, so what is considered polite in one culture may not be so in another [10].

The purpose of politeness, including linguistic politeness, is to create a pleasant, non-threatening, and effective atmosphere for interaction. Politeness research examines language use in a particular language community. The speech community in question is a community with a variety of social and cultural backgrounds that accommodate it.

The aspects of politeness examined in this study are the meaning and function of speech. (1) The social-norm view of politeness. In this view, politeness in speech is determined based on the social and cultural norms that exist and apply in the language community. Politeness in speech is equated with language etiquette. (2) The view that sees politeness as a conversational maxim and as an effort to save face. The view of politeness as a conversational maxim considers the politeness principle to be merely a complement to the cooperative principle. (3) This view sees politeness as an action to fulfill the requirements of a conversational contract. Thus, acting politely is equivalent to speaking with consideration for linguistic etiquette, and (4) The fourth view of politeness is related to sociolinguistic research. In this view, politeness is seen as a social indexing. Such social indexing is found in the forms of social reference, honorific, and style of speaking [11].

According to Chaer, in short and in general, there are three rules that must be obeyed so that our speech sounds polite to our listeners or interlocutors. The three rules are (1) formality, (2) hesitancy, and (3) equality or camaraderie. So, it can be said that speech is polite if it does not sound forceful or arrogant, if it gives the listener a choice of

action, and if it makes the listener happy. It is very important to learn and understand the rules of language, because by following the applicable norms, we can achieve politeness in language. A person's politeness in language is acquired through learning to speak. There is no guarantee that someone with a high social position can speak politely because the ability to speak politely is determined by a person's culture, not by their position and rank [12].

It should be emphasized that politeness is related to social norms and is a form of saving face for the interlocutor. When speaking, taboo expressions, uncontrolled emotional expressions, and expressions that do not respect the values of speech should be avoided. This is because such expressions certainly do not apply politeness and may offend the conversation partner [14].

Several linguists have put forward theories of politeness, including Lakoff, Fraser, Brown and Levinson, and Leech. The following is an explanation of the four theories of politeness. Theory of politeness concerns three rules that must be obeyed in order for speech to be polite, namely formality, indefiniteness, and equality or familiarity. The principle of formality means "do not be forceful or arrogant." The consequence of this principle is that forceful and arrogant speech is impolite speech [15]. The theory of politeness is based on strategies, namely what strategies should be applied by speakers to make their speech polite. Bases his principle of politeness on rules. These rules are nothing more than advice that must be obeyed so that the speaker's speech fulfills the principle of politeness. In speaking, one should pay attention to the principle of politeness so that the speech uttered is well received and considered polite [15, 16, 17].

2. Method

This study uses qualitative descriptive research. It is descriptive because it describes qualitative data in the form of verbal linguistic data or oral data in the form of conversations and descriptions of information obtained in the field. It is qualitative because it is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of spoken words from people who can be observed [18]. It is also explained that qualitative research is research that uses a scientific background, with the aim of interpreting the phenomena that occur and is carried out by involving various existing methods [19].

The data in this study specifically discusses violations of language politeness maxims used by Sasak speakers in Buin Baru Village. The source of data for this study is the community of Buin Baru Village itself. Since the researcher is also a native speaker of the language used by the source of data for this study, the researcher is also indirectly *a key* instrument in the search for and collection of data.

Data collection for this study was conducted using two techniques, namely: (1) Observation technique. The observation method is called the "observation method" because it involves observation: it is carried out by observing, namely observing using language [20]. (2) Eavesdropping technique. The tapping technique is called the basic technique in the listening method because, in essence, listening is realized through tapping in the sense that research in an effort to obtain data is carried out by tapping the language users of one or several people who become informants [21]. (3) Listening and talking technique. It is called the conversation technique because the method used in data collection is conducting direct conversations with informants. This method has a basic technique in the form of a probing technique followed by an advanced technique, namely the conversation technique. As for the data analysis technique, in this study, the researcher used the matching method, which is an analysis method that explains the object of study in relation to the situational context or socio-cultural context.

3. Results And Discussion

In comparing violations of the maxims of politeness, the researcher also used the six principles of politeness based on Lecch's theory, such as the maxim of generosity, the maxim of sympathy, the maxim of agreement, the maxim of humility, and others. The same applies to deviations, but in this case, the discussion focuses on the deviations that occur.

The description of deviations from the principles of polite language will be explained based on the maxims that have been violated. There are various reasons why speakers and their conversation partners deviate from the principles of polite language. The most common cause of deviation is the urge to boast about oneself and other emotions. Below, the researcher presents data from research on deviations from the maxims of politeness in the Sasak language of the Buin Baru village community.

3.1 Violating the Maxim of Agreement

In principle, the maxim of agreement requires compatibility between the speaker and the listener. However, if agreement cannot be found, it is certain that there is a lack of compatibility in the communication that has been established.

Sarifah : *Side boyaq empaq ke?* (Are you looking for fish?)

Munah : *Aoq'empaq siq maiq tapi muraq.* (Yes, I'm looking for fish, but cheap ones)

Sarifah : : *Te laiq nganggang adeq saq jual empaq- te-bok tie muraq-muraq* (Come here, let me sell your fish at a cheap price).

Sarifah : *Mbe taoq mauq muraq ne waye angen bleq sakit boyaq nane. Masa mele siq muraq – muraq doang.* (Where can you get cheap fish in strong winds like this? It's hard to get fish now. How can you want cheap fish)

Munah : *Aoq aneh inaq. Ndek gemes jak beli empaq tie. Manen murak endah.* (Yes, I agree. I wouldn't buy that fish either, even if it was cheap)

In this conversation, it is clear that the maxim of agreement has been violated. The violation of the maxim of agreement occurred because Munah and the seller could not agree on the price of the fish being offered. If we look more closely at the conversation, we can see that it not only failed to reduce the loss suffered by the interlocutor, but also reduced the loss of others. However, sarcasm and harsh language were also used by the fish seller.

This can be found in the following excerpt: *te laiq nganggang adeq saq jual empaq tebok tie muraqmuraq.* (Come here so I can sell your fish at a cheap price). Then Munah responded by ending the conversation with her disagreement to Sarifah's offer, with the words, "*Aoq aneh inaq. Ndek gemes jak beli empaq tie. Manen murak enadah.* (Yes, okay. I am also not willing to buy that fish even though the price is cheap).

A violation of the maxim of concordance also occurs in the following conversation.

- Andi : *Sai girang ngecas lek dalam mimbar masjid no, batur?* (Who often charges their cell phone inside the mosque pulpit?)
- Piyan : *Sai jage. Uik silin marbot no. soal ye ye doag jari siknte peringet. Laun ye endektebeng marek lek masjid laun malik.* (Don't know who. Yesterday, the mosque caretaker got angry. Even though he was reminded, he never listened. Later, he was no longer allowed to stay overnight at the mosque.)
- Sukri : *Angkak muni entan bilang malem sak Marek no. molah ite tetepte enget.* (That's why you should remind them every night so they remember).
- Andi : *Angkak batur-batur ne. bedoe kentok marak kentok binatang ore. Ndarak tao bedengah matik.* (That's why these friends are like animals' ears. No one wants to listen.).

During the conversation, there was a violation of the maximum agreement, marked by the disobedience of the young people who had previously been prohibited from charging their cell phones inside the mosque pulpit. The violation of the maximum agreement is found in the sentence, *Sai jage. Uik silin marbot no. soal ye ye doag jari siknte peringet. Laun ye endekte beng marek lek masjid laun malik.* (I don't know who. Yesterday, the mosque caretaker was angry. Even though he was reminded, he never listened. Later, he will no longer be allowed to stay overnight at the mosque).

3.2 Violating the Maxim of Sympathy

The maxim of sympathy is violated when the speaker lacks sympathy and empathy for the problems faced by the listener.

Merun: *Belabur ne ndaraq sekali-kali kaitan kance ite. Jari pade daq wah dateng jaoq-jaoq boyaq taoq ngunsi.* (This flood has nothing to do with us. So you don't need to come all the way here looking for shelter).

Mustahi: *Arak semendak sih. Amun wah tais aik ne molahte tulak malik alo persik balente.* (We are only staying here for a few days while we wait for the water to recede and our house to be cleaned).

Merun: *Wahke muni urusan pade wah tie.* .
(I've already said this is your business and your problem).

The context of the conversation took place in Buin Baru Village between residents of Karang Malang Hamlet and residents of Belekong Hamlet. At the heart of the conversation between the two residents was the unsympathetic remarks made by the residents of Belekong Hamlet. This can be seen in the following excerpt from the conversation *Belabur ne ndaraq sekali-kali kaitan kance ite. Jari pade ndaq uah dateng jaoqjaoq boyaq pade ngunsi.* (This flood has nothing to do with us. So you don't need to go far to find a place to take refuge here).

In the following data, researchers found one linguistic phenomenon that was identified in the communication of the Buin Baru village community, which was categorized as violating the maxim of politeness, also present in the following conversation: following conversation:

Safar : *Beli duren.. beli duren. sei mele mbeli?* (Buy durian... buy durian. Who wants to buy durian?)

Hasbi : *Wey..! ndaq bedagang tene be ente doang ngre-misin gubuk!* (Wey..! Don't sell here. You're the only one littering the village!)

Safar : *Yoh ante je epe urusanmek? Beruqmeq jeri peg-awe kantor dese. epelegi kmeq*

jeri DPR ! (You just became a village official, let alone a member of DPR.)

Hasbi : *laguq lelah dengan mersi q ken te gelis lombe dese! (But it's tiring to clean this place. Because soon we will have a village competition.)*

Safar : *Be kan jeuq ku ye tulak mun ne arak ngaken tene ye ampoq ku njeuq karong. Makat ente repot!" (It's not like I brought all my trash home. Why are you getting upset?)*

Hasbi : *Ado mule ente ndeq meq tao tebalaq. (You really can't be told.)*

The linguistic phenomenon above is an excerpt from several sentences that violate the maxim of sympathy that occurred between Safar (durian seller) and Hasbi (village office employee). If we consider the basic principle that must be present in the maxim of sympathy, then what the speaker should do is to empathize and feel that he is part of every misfortune or problem faced by the listener. However, in this conversation, this did not happen at all; in fact, it deviated from the maxim.

3.3 Violating the Maxim of Respect

In principle, the maxim of respect reflects a person's behavior towards others. In practice, the maxim of respect seeks to honor others and reduce insults or abuse toward others. This is in contrast to violating the maxim of respect. In the community of Buin Baru Village, violations of the maxim of respect are often found in open and informal speech. For example, speech that occurs between pedestrians and road workers who are repairing agricultural roads in Belekong Hamlet, Buin Baru Village.

Sabandi : *Silaq pade periri solah-solah langan siq uah pesolah ne Bapak/ Ibu. Mudahan bau bantu side. (Please take care of the road that we have repaired. Hopefully it will help.).*

Ruslan : *Mbe ntan pade pesolah langan ne rue. Ndaq tges-teges. Mate kepeng ore pade ne. (How can you guys work*

like this? It makes no sense at all. You guys are only looking for profit).

The context of the conversation took place between road workers/public works officers who were working on a farm road in Karang Malang Hamlet, Buin Baru Village. The maximum violation of respect can be found in the following excerpt from the conversation: *Mbe ntan pade pesolah langan siq ne rue. Ndaraq teges-teges. Mate kepeng ore pade ne.* (How can you work like this? It's completely meaningless. You guys are just raking in the money).

In principle, if the discourse between the speaker and the listener no longer respects politeness in language, for example, there is no effort to respect each other, they mock, insult, and belittle each other, then it is certain that the communication or speech that takes place violates the maxim of respect.

3.4 Violating the Maxim of Generosity

In principle, the maxim of generosity in generatio generosity. This can be proven from the following excerpt from the conversation. *Nendek awis pupaq tie kamu. Lamun ite siq ndaraq mauq ku* (Don't touch the grass on the rice field embankment. Then what's the point of me maintaining it if I don't get anything in return). Sententiae is a maxim that has the principle of reducing one's own gains and adding to one's own losses. However, if in communication there is a conversation or communication that only prioritizes personal interests, then it is certain that the person or speaker has violated the maxim of generosity. The following conversation is an example of a violation of the maxim of generosity.

Johar : Ndaq pade garu pupaq leq bangket tie.
 (No one is allowed to touch the grass on
 this rice field embankment.)

Jumiri : Aroo. Pupa-pupa tie rue sikn pere-
 kengan. (It's just bad grass. Too calcu-
 lating.)

Johar : Be ape teges rawat tie kamu. Lamun ite
 sindaraq mauq ku. (Then what's the

point of me taking care of you if I don't get anything).

The conversation took place in a rice field located in Karang Malang Hamlet, Buin Baru Village. The conversation was between the owner of the rice field and the grass cutter. From the conversation, it can be seen that there was communication that violated the maxim of generosity. This can be proven from the following excerpt from the conversation. *Nendek awis pupaq tie kamu. Lamun ite siq ndaraq mauq ku* (Don't touch the grass on the rice field embankment. Then what's the point of me maintaining it if I don't get anything in return).

4. Conclusion

From the results of research on violations of the maxims of politeness in language conducted by the researcher in Buin Baru Village, six violations of the maxims of politeness in language were found. (1). There were two instances of violating the maxim of agreement. The first instance of impoliteness was found in the use of the phrase "*Aoq aneh inaq. Ndek gemes jak beli empaq tie. Manen murak endah*" (I am also not willing to buy your fish even though the price is cheap). The second data point regarding the maxim of agreement is found in the sentence fragment, *Sai jage. Uik silin marbot no. soal ye ye doag jari siknte peringet* (I don't know who. Yesterday, the mosque caretaker was angry. Even though he was reminded, he never listened. Later, he was no longer allowed to stay at the mosque). (2). There are two instances of violating the maxim of sympathy. The first instance of unsympathetic language is found in the phrase unsympathetic. *Belabur ne ndaraq sekali-kali kaitan kance ite* (This flood has absolutely nothing to do with us),,

The second violation of the maxim of sympathy is found in the phrase, "*Wey...! ndaq bedagang tene be ente doang ngremisin gubuk!* (Don't sell here. You are the one who is making the village dirty). (3). Violation of the maxim of respect: 1 instance. The lack of sympathy is found in the phrase, *Pade ne pade melek "Mbe ntan pade pesolah langan ne rue. Ndaraq tges-teges. Mate kepeng ore pade ne.* (How can you guys work like this? It makes no sense at all. You guys are only looking for profit). (4). Violation of the maxim of generosity is found in the sentence fragment, *Ndaq pade garu pupaq leq*

bangket tie "(No one is allowed to touch the grass on this rice field embankment. Then what's the point of me taking care of you if I don't get anything). Thus, regarding the maxim of politeness violation in this study, it can be concluded that the Sasak language community in Buin Baru Village is predominantly impolite in their communication.

Acknowledgments. We express our pride and gratitude to all those who helped with the planning, process, and completion of this article. This article is the result of our research journey while serving as thesis advisors at our workplace, the University of Technology Sumbawa. We met and discussed with students who had a background in the Sasak language, and we discovered unique characteristics and differences in language use, particularly in terms of politeness, even though they came from the same area as speakers of other languages in Sumbawa. This is why we were interested in conducting a more in-depth study of this linguistic phenomenon. We would also like to thank the ICLC-6 committee at Hasanuddin University for providing a forum for these ideas. The positive feedback from seminar participants has enhanced the quality of this article.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors declare that this study was conducted without any commercial, financial, or personal relationships that could be interpreted as a potential conflict of interest. The design, implementation, data analysis, interpretation of the research results, and preparation of this manuscript were fully funded and carried out independently by the research team. There was no external funding, grants, or commitments from any third parties that could influence the objectivity or results of this study.

Translated with [DeepL.com](https://www.deepl.com/) (free version)

REFERENCES

1. Diyanti, H., & Awalya, A. (2022). Hubungan Antara Komunikasi Interpersonal dengan Interaksi Sosial Siswa Kelas VIII SMP. *Indonesian Journal of Guidance and Counseling: Theory and Application*, 11(3), 105. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijgc.v11i3.56699>
2. Purwadarminta, W. J. S. (1954). *Kedudukan Bahasa Daerah dan Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

3. Badudu, JS. 1975. *“Cakrawala Bahasa Indonesia II*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
4. Salam, Burhanudin. 2000. *“Etika Individual :Pola Dasar Moral”* Jakarta: Rineke Cipta.
5. Gunawan, H., Hermansyah, W., & Rea, S. (2021). Maksim Kesantunan Berbahasa Penutur Bahasa Samawa di Desa Buin Baru. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan (JISIP)*, 5(4), 2598–9944.
6. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. (Versi terbaru yang paling sering disitasi saat ini).
7. Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Jakobson, R.. 1960 *"Linguistics and Poetics"*, in T. Sebeok, ed., *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press,
9. Zamzani, dkk. 2010. *Pengembangan Alat Ukur Kesantunan Bahasa Indonesia dalam Interaksi Sosial Bersemuka dan Non Bersemuka. Laporan Penelitian Hibah Bersaing (Tahun Kedua)*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
10. Rahardi, K. 2005. *Pragmatik; Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
11. Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
12. Chaer, Abdul. 2010. *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta.
13. Rahardi, R. K. (2009). *Penyuntingan Bahasa Indonesia untuk Karang-Mengarang*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
14. Lakoff, G. (1972). *“The Invariance Hypothesis: Is Abstract Reason Based on Image Schemas”* . *Cognitive Linguistics* 1. 39-74.
15. Fraser B. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*. 1999;31(7):931-52.
16. Leech, G. 1993. *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik* (terjemahan, M.D.D. Oka). Jakarta: UI-Press.
17. Oğan, Y. (2025). An ethnographic insight into the Laz cuisine culture in Artvin (Turkey). *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2025.101132>
18. Fahdiran Irga, Aurelius Refinus Lolong Teluma, M. J. N. (2021). Komunikasi Antarbudaya Melalui Tradisi Perkawinan Suku Bajo dan Suku Samawa di Sumbawa Besar. *Jlmakom: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Komunikasi Universitas Mataram*, 2(1).
19. Oğan, Y. (2025). An ethnographic insight into the Laz cuisine culture in Artvin (Turkey). *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2025.101132>.
20. Sudaryanto. 1993. *“Metode Dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa, Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik”*. Duta Wacana University Press; Yogyakarta.
21. Muhammad. 2011. *Penelitian Bahasa: Paradigma Kualitatif*. Liebe Book Press; Yogyakarta.

References

1. Author, F.: Article title. *Journal* **2**(5), 99–110 (2016)
2. Author, F., Author, S.: Title of a proceedings paper. In: Editor, F., Editor, S. (eds.) *CONFERENCE 2016, LNCS*, vol. 9999, pp. 1–13. Springer, Heidelberg (2016)
3. Author, F., Author, S., Author, T.: Book title. 2nd edn. Publisher, Location (1999)
4. Author, F.: Contribution title. In: 9th International Proceedings on Proceedings, pp. 1–2. Publisher, Location (2010)
5. LNCS Homepage, <http://www.springer.com/lncs>, last accessed 2023/10/25

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

