

VIOLATING POLITENESS PRINCIPLES IN CELLULAR PHONE PROVIDER

Tuty Handayani

*English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University 2013
only.tuty@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

In daily life, we need language to express our feeling. One of the language usages can be seen through the advertisement. The advertiser persuades the customers to use the product in many ways; one of them is through language. Language in television advertisement plays the important role to reach the goal of advertisement. Since we know that the viewers of television in Indonesia is about more than 128 million, we can imagine how strong the influence of television commercial is. To catch the viewer's attention, the advertiser sometimes used some strategies. It is good if they use the polite language, but if they use the impolite language, it gives the bad impact to the viewer.

In this thesis, the writer does not want to analyse the bad impact of language advertisement, but she prefers to analyse the kinds of politeness principles that are violated by the advertisements especially cellular phone provider.

The purposes of this thesis are to find out what kind of politeness principles that are violated by the advertisement and to find out what is the intention of violating such principles. The writer classifies the violation through the six maxims of politeness principles by Leech (1983).

In collecting the data, the writer used documentation method and non-participant observation. The population of this research are all the cellular phone provider advertisements in Indonesia, but the samples are chosen purposively, only the advertisements that violate the politeness principle that become the data of this research. In analysing the data, the writer uses the politeness principles theory proposed by Leech as the instrument of research, to classify the advertisement according to the maxim they violate. The writer also relates the violation with the ethic regulation of politeness principles proposed by Dewan Periklanan Indonesia. After analysing the kinds of maxim, the writer extends to the intention of violating through the explicature and implicature meaning.

In this research, the writer found 12 advertisements that violated the politeness principles. The violations occur in six maxims of politeness principles, such as tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim. Most of advertisements that violate the politeness principles also violate the ethic regulation of advertisement. Then, the general intentions of those violations were to attract the viewer's attention to use their product.

Keywords: Politeness Principles, Verbal Advertisement, Ethic Regulation of Advertisement, Explicature and Implicature Meaning

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of background of study, research puposes, and scope of study.

I.1. Backgroud of Study

In our daily life, we need language to communicate our feeling to one another. As social human being, we can communicate with other people to share our opinion, give contribution or cooperate with others. To reach the goal of our communication, we need participant who can corporate so that our communication can be understood.

One of the language usages in our daily life can be seen in advertisements. Companies persuade the consumers in many different ways to buy their products. They also try to make their product known by people, for example, through the advertisement in television. As we know, the viewer of television, especially in Indonesia, is about more that 128 millions (AGB Nielsen Institute, 2012) so, we can imagine how strong the influence of television commercial is.

To excite the viewer's attention, the advertisers use some strategies to construct the script of the advertisement. Many advertisers of television try to make a good advertisement. However, there are some advertisements that also use such less polite language to catch the viewer's attention. If the advertisements imply the language that violates the politeness principles, this can influence the viewer as well.

In this research, the writer does not want to analyse the impact of violating politeness principles but she wants to analyse the kinds of politeness principles that are violated. The writer is interested in analysing the language of television advertisements especially the language of cellular phone provider advertisements. Cellular phone provider advertisements are chosen because the advertisement of cellular phone provider is frequently shown in television and the quantity is numerous. Therefore, it is easier to collect the data. The data will be analysed according to politeness principles by Leech (1983). They are also related to the ethic

regulation of advertisement proposed by *Dewan Periklanan Indonesia* (2005) and the writer also wants to find out the intention of violating the politeness principles through its explicature and implicature meaning.

I.2. Research Purpose

The research purposes of this study are:

- a. To figure out the kinds of politeness principles that are violated in verbal advertisements of cellular phone provider.
- b. To explain the reason of violating the politeness principles.

I.3. Scope of Study

This thesis is actually a pragmatics study. Since there are so many sub divisions of pragmatics, the writer limits her thesis in politeness principles especially in its violation. Furthermore, the writer will find out the explicature and implicature meaning through the violation of politeness principles.

CHAPTER II

LITERARY REVIEW

This chapter consists of politeness principles, the ethic regulation of advertisement, and the explicature and implicature meaning.

II.1. Politeness Principle

Leech (1983: 132) proposes six maxims of politeness principles. He asserts that, in conversation, the politeness does not only concern with the relationship between two participants, self and other, turn-taking but it also considers the existence of the third parties, who may or may not be present in the conversation. The six maxims of politeness principles are briefly presented in pairs as follows:

1. Tact Maxim

The tact maxim is defined as follows: "minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other; and maximize the expression of beliefs which give benefit to other" (Leech, 1983: 109). This tact maxim is applied in directive and commissive categories of illocutions (Leech, 1983: 107).

2. Generosity Maxim

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

3. Approbation Maxim

The approbation maxim states that the speaker should minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express appraisal of other (Leech, 1983: 135). This maxim is used in an utterance that expresses the speaker's feeling, such as expressions of like, dislike, joy, sorrow or pleasure and is used in representative speech. for instance, stating whether the speaker's

4. Modesty Maxim

This maxim states: 'minimize praise of self as well as minimize dispraise of self. This maxim is also used in expressive and representatives speech (Leech, 1983: 136).

5. Agreement Maxim

The agreement maxim proposes as follow: "minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other" It is used in representative speech (Leech, 1983: 138).

6. Sympathy Maxim

In sympathy maxim, the participant is expected to maximize the expression of sympathy to their hearer and minimize the antipathy. This maxim is usually used in representative utterances (Leech, 1983: 138).

II.2. The Ethic Regulation of Advertisement

Dewan Periklanan Indonesia (DPI) is an independent organization established by the delegation of the whole component of national advertisement industry such as AMLI, APPINA, ASPINDO, ATVLI, ATVSI, GPBSI, PPPI, PRSSNI, SPS, Yayasan TVRI and also KPI, BPOM and

further International Advertising Association. This organization is responsible for controlling the applying of ethic regulation in advertisement. DPI with the whole component of national advertisement industry above has made and agreed the ethic regulations in advertisement.

Dewan Periklanan Indonesia regulates the language usage in advertisement. The regulations are briefly explained in the following below:

- a. The language in advertisement should be understood by the target market and should not use encryption which can cause misinterpretation
- b. The advertiser is not allowed to use the superlative words, such as "the most", "number one", "top" and another similar meaning, without clearly describing the advantages of that product or service that can be evidenced by the written statement from the regulatory authorities or an authentic source.
- c. The use of the phrase "the only one" An advertisement should not use the word "the only one" or another expression having a similar meaning without clearly describing in what side the product can be the only one, and this should be evidenced or be accounted.
- d. The use of the word "free" The word "free" or another word having a similar meaning should not be in an advertisement if in reality still have to pay some cost.
- e. Fear and superstition An advertisement should not provoke and cause fear or exploit believe in superstition, except for a positive purpose.
- f. Violence An advertisement should not directly or indirectly show a violence scene that can stimulate or give the impression if the violence is justified.
- g. Safety An advertisement should not show the scene that neglects the safety aspects; especially it is not about that product.
- h. Hyperbola

Hyperbola can be done as long as for humorous purpose and to catch the audience attention, which clearly seems it is excessive and irrational, so it can not cause the misinterpretation (DPI, 2005: 17-19).

II.3. Meaning in Communication

a. Explicature

Sperber and Wilson stated that an assumption communicated by an utterance *U* is explicit if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by *U* (Sperber and Wilson, 1986: 182). An explicature is a combination of conceptual aspects which linguistically encoded and contextually inferred. The main task of the speaker is to convey the clearest information or assumption, and the first task of the hearer in recovering the assumption is to identify its right propositional form. The right propositional means the real intention of the speaker. The smaller the relative contribution of contextual aspects, the more explicit the explicature will be.

b. Implicature

Implicature is an additional level of meaning, beyond the semantic meaning or the words uttered. There is another meaning behind our utterance. An implicature is generated intentionally by the speaker and may (not) be understood by the hearer.

Implicatures have been related with the context of conversation takes place, with the inference, which is made by the people who hear and attempt to maintain the assumption of cooperative interaction. Because this implicature are part of communicated and it is not said, speaker can always deny that they intend to communicate such meaning. Implicature can be calculated, suspended, cancelled and reinforced by the listener via inference (Yule, 1996: 44).

in utterance form. The writer used the secondary data only because the writer just collected the data by audiovisual media and not directly conducted. The data were taken from the television. The writer collected the data by listening the conversations of cellular phone provider advertisement on television and then writing them out. To make sure the accuracy of the data collected, the writer also downloaded the video of the cellular phone provider advertisement from www.youtube.com to recheck the script from the television and to minimize error in collecting data.

The method of collecting data used were documentation method and non-participant observation because the writer did not include in the conversation. The writer recorded and took note the advertisement in the television and observed what did happen both linguistically and non-linguistically.

After recording and taking some notes, the next technique to complete the analysis method, were identifying and classifying the data. Since not all cellular phone provider advertisements violate the politeness principle, the writer needed to choose the data which contained the violation of politeness principles. In classifying the data, the writer used politeness scale as the instrument of the research.

The population of this research was all the advertisement of cellular phone provider such as *Kartu AS*, *Simpati*, *XL*, *Three*, *IM3*, *Mentari* and in period 2012 – 2013. The writer only analyzed the advertisement through television and did not include the advertisement on radio, magazine, newspaper, internet and others media.

Since those advertisements contain so many conversations and the time available is limited, the writer just analyzed some of them as the sample. The sample was chosen purposively, called *purposive sampling*, because not all cellular advertisements contain the violation of politeness principles. Only the advertisements that contain the violation of politeness principles those were analysed and became the data of this research. The samples of this research were 18

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this research, the writer used descriptive qualitative approach, which was intended to give description on data obtained

advertisements, and each maxim has 2 advertisements as the sample to be analysed.

In analyzing the data, the writer used the distributional method. The writer wanted to find out the violation of politeness principles related to the ethics regulation in advertisement and to find out the intention both conveyed explicitly and implicitly of the phone cellular provider advertisement on television.

CHAPTER IV DISCUSSION

This chapter presents of the data analysis. The chapter is divided into six sub-chapters in accordance to Leech's maxims of politeness, (1) Violation of The Tact Maxim, (2) Violation of The Generosity Maxim, (3) Violation of The Approbation Maxim, (4) Violation of The Modesty Maxim, (5) Violation of The Agreement Maxim, and (6) Violation of The Sympathy Maxim. In every sub-chapter, the conversation will be related with the ethic regulation of advertisement and will be analyzed from the explicature and the implicature point of view. In this research, there are 12 advertisements as the the data that will be analysed.

IV.1. Violation of The Tact Maxim

The Tact maxim advises the speaker to minimize the cost to the hearer and maximize the benefit to the hearer (Leech, 1983: 109).

A. : *Ada donat nih setengah!*

(Here is a piece of donut!)

B. : *Mau dong?*

(Can I have it?)

A. : *Tapi cuciin piringnya ya? Gelasnya juga ya? Sendoknya juga!*

Sama itu tuh (pointing the wastafel), *mobil, baju, celana!*

A. : but wash the plates, OK? the glasses also! include the spoon! and that... (pointing the wastafel), car, clothes and pants!

B. : (giving back the donut which is given by A)

Narator : modal dikit mau dapat banyak. Cuma XL yang bisa ngasih 1000 SMS ke semua operator!

(Less capital but you want more. Only XL that can give 1000 free to all operator!)

(XL Version Paket Serbu – donut)

If we look at the speaker A's next utterance "*Tapi cuciin piringnya ya? Gelasnya juga ya? Sendoknya juga! Sama itu tuh* (pointing the wastafel), *mobil, baju, celana!*" apparently speaker A was insincere in giving the hearer B that offer. Speaker A expected something else after giving the hearer B a piece of donut. After giving the donut, the speaker A wanted the hearer B to clean the plates, glasses, spoons, car, clothes, pants and so on. Therefore, we can assume that the speaker A violated tact maxim because the speaker A did not minimize the cost to the hearer B and the speaker A also did not maximize the benefit to the hearer B.

This advertiser frankly has the intentions and messages to be delivered by this advertisement. The writer divides it in to two categories, both explicature meaning and implicature meaning. Followings are the explicature meaning of this advertisement.

- a. With very low budget, people could get many benefits if using XL as their cellular phone provider.
- b. Only XL that could give 1000 free SMS to all operators.

While the implicature assumptions of this advertisement are:

- a. XL encouraged those who have minimum budget but want many things, to use XL because no cellular phone provider could provide such services as what XL provides.
- b. Another cellular phone provider could not give 1000 free SMS to all operators like what XL gave.
- c. Another cellular phone provider could not provide a lot of services with cheap cost, or, in other word, another was more expensive than XL.

As the writer has said in the very first time, the writer does not only analyse the data by using politeness principles but she also analyse it by using the ethic regulation of advertisement. If we look from the ethic regulation of advertisement proposed by *Dewan Periklanan Indonesia*, this advertisement actually did not violate any regulation linguistically, especially in part

where the character A violated the tact maxim.

IV.2. Violation of Generosity Maxim

Generosity maxim is used to minimize the expression of benefit to self and maximize the utterance of cost to self. If in the tact maxim the focus is on *other-centred*, in generosity maxim, it focuses on *self-centred* (Leech, 1983: 133).

A : *Uang kecil aja neng, nggak ada kembalian.*

(Smaller amount, please. I have no return cash).

B : [about to looking for the smaller amount in her bag]

C : *Saya aja. Rey [introduce himself]. Kita makan yuk? besok kita nonton ya? Nikah Yuk?*

(Let me pay. Rey [introduce himself]. Let's have lunch! let's go to the movie tomorrow! let's get married!)

B : [Slapping C]

Narrator : *Modal dikit mau dapat banyak! Hanya XL yang bisa ngasih 1000 SMS ke semua operator.*

(fewer capital but want more. Only XL that can give 1000 free to all operator!)

(XL)

In C's utterance "*Kita makan yuk? besok kita nonton ya? Nikah Yuk?*", C was insincere giving an offering to B by buying her that stuff. C expected something else by giving B an offering. Moreover, C was a stranger for B and conversely. C expected too much from B just because C paid what B bought. In other word, C spent less money, but he wanted many things. If we refer to the cost – benefit analysis, C did not minimize the benefit to himself and C also did not maximize the cost to himself because C asked too many favours to B which all of those favours were actually giving him much benefit. Therefore, C violated the generosity maxim of politeness principles.

The explicature meaning of this advertisement are :

a. Only XL that could provide 1000 free SMS to all operator.

b. With less money, people could get more services by using XL

While the implicature meaning of this advertisement are:

a. Another cellular phone provider could not provide 1000 free SMS to all operators.

b. Generally, people who have less money could not get more services. However, those kinds of people could get it easily right now, if they use XL as their cellular phone provider.

c. C's utterances above also represented how people commonly want more and better services with cheaper cost that should be paid.

If we refer to the ethic regulations of advertisement proposed by this advertisement did not violate any of them. This advertisement did not use the superlative word, except word "*hanya*" said by the narrator, but XL as the advertiser can prove that XL actually provided 1000 free SMS to all operators.

IV.3. Violation of Approbation Maxim

Approbation maxim suggests that we should minimize the expression of beliefs which express disfigures of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express appraisal of other (Leech, 1983: 135).

A : *Kerja yang cepet dong kayak internet saya! Nggak tau internet kan? Ndeso! Masang yang bener, liat internet. Nggak tau kan? Ndeso!*

Mau kerja aman? Nggak tau ya? Ndeso!

(Work faster as my internet! You don't know internet, do you? *Ndeso!*)

(Make it properly! See internet! Don't you know? *Ndeso!*)

(Wanna work safely? Don't you know? *Ndeso!*)

Narator : *Makanya pake XL super ampuh, bayar sekali, gratis internetan 24 jam, puas, puas!*

(That is why, just use XL Super Ampuh, once paid, get internet free 24 hours. Satisfied, satisfied!)

A : *Kembali ke....*

(Back to...)

B : *Kembali kerja semua! kamu juga!*

(Back to work! You too!)

A : *Lho yang punya rumah saya!*

(This house belongs to me!)

B : *Yang punya rumah ini artis! **Mukamu ndeso!** sana kerja!*

(This house belongs to an artist! Your face is *ndeso!* Back to work!)

(XL Super Ampuh – Tukul version)

Instead of giving his worker an appreciation, A barked the workers and claimed them as *ndeso*, which has the negative connotation. A used word *ndeso* to criticize the worker who worked too slow, putted the iron improperly, and installed the electricity improperly just because they did not know how to access the internet. A did not only disfigure the performance of the workers, but A also insulted all the countryman since this advertisement was showed in the national television, so all people may watch it. Furthermore, A spoke in the high tone and used directive utterance. We therefore can say that, A and B violated the approbation maxim, because A and B did not minimize the disfigure to their addressee and did not maximize the praise to their addressee.

The explicature meanings of this advertisement are:

- a. XL provided the 24 hours free internet acces just by once paid
- b. All information that people need could be found in the internet.

While the implicature meanings of this advertisements are:

- a. People could work faster if they could access internet freely, and XL as the cellular phone provider could provide the free internet acces.
- b. People could work more properly if they could access the internet freely, and XL could provide the free internet acces to its customers.
- c. People could work safer if they could access internet freely, for example to look how to work safely. As we know, on the internet, there is all information we need.

Then, XL can help people to get free internet acces.

If we look at the ethic regulation of advertisement, this advertisement did not violate any regulation. It did not use superlative word, hyperbola or word “free”.

IV.3. Violation of Modesty Maxim

This maxim states that “we should minimize praise of self as well as maximize disfigure of self” (Leech, 1983: 136).

A : *Makanya saya sudah tobat, ternyata **Kartu AS yang paling murah, langsung dari menit pertama. Pagi, siang, malam nggak ribet, nggak dibates-batesin. Ok!***

(That’s why, I’ve learned my lesson, **apparently Kartu AS is the cheapest cellular phone provider since the first minute, in the morning, afternoon, evening, uncomplicated, unlimited. Ok?**)

Narator : *Paling murah ya Kartu AS!*

(The cheapest one is *Kartu AS*)

A : ***Saya kapok dibohongin sama anak kecil***
(I don’t want to be led by a child)

(Kartu AS)

In this case, although A did not praise himself as a person, he praised his product he offered to the audience by explicitly saying “*ternyata kartu AS yang paling murah*”. Indeed, A was the brand ambassador of *Kartu AS* and his main task was to promote his product. However, if we look at Leech’s advice about modesty maxim, A violated it because this maxim told us to keep humble. Besides that the narrator also violated the maxim by saying “*Paling murah ya Kartu AS!*”. The narrator also said the superlative word “*paling*”. Therefore, this advertisement strongly showed the violation of modesty maxim.

If we look at the intention of this advertisement through the violation, we can assume the explicature meaning like below:

- a. *Kartu AS* was the cheapest cellular phone provider
- b. *Kartu AS* was always cheap every time, morning, afternoon and evening and it was unlimited.

While the implicature assumptions of this advertisement are:

- a. Another cellular phone provider was expensive
- b. Another cellular phone provider that also said they were the cheapest one, especially *Kartu AS*'s big rival was lying and fooled the consumers.
- c. Another cellular phone provider was complicated and limited; the cost was different and changing at morning, afternoon and evening.

Besides violating the politeness principles especially modesty maxim, this advertisement also violated the ethic regulation of advertisement proposed by *Dewan Periklanan Indonesia*. DPI (2005: 17). This advertisement used the superlative word, this explicitly said that *Kartu AS* was the cheapest cellular phone provider ever. Therefore, we can conclude that this advertisement violated both modesty maxim of politeness principles and ethic regulation of advertisement.

IV.5. Violation of Agreement Maxim

Agreement maxim suggests that the speaker should minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other and conversely the speaker should maximize the agreement between self and other (Leech, 1983: 138). Thus, this maxim tells us to agree what other's word.

A : *Nggak coba yang lain, Mas?*

(Don't you try another one, Mas?)

B : *Oh tidak bisa! Kartu AS paling murah*

(Oh, Nope! *Kartu AS* is the cheapest one)

C : *Yang lain ada gratis SMS lho!*

(Another one provides free SMS!)

B : *Oh tidak bisa! Kartu AS gratisnya lebih banyak, 5000 SMS.*

(Oh, nope! *Kartu AS* provides more free SMS, free 5000 SMS)

Narator : *Paling murah ya Kartu AS!*

(The cheapest one is *Kartu AS*)

B : *Ada yang lebih murah dari kartu AS?*

(Still there any else which is cheaper than *Kartu AS*?)

A dan C : *Oh tidak bisa!*

(Oh nope!)

(**Kartu AS**)

The setting of this advertisement was in the counter of a phone cellular shop. A, B and C

were the buyers. A asked B to use another cellular provider "*Nggak coba yang lain, Mas?*" but B disagreed and rejected A's suggestion by saying "*oh tidak bisa!*". As well as A, C also kept making sure B to use other provider by saying "*Yang lain ada gratis SMS lho!*" and B disagreed and refused C's suggestion. B kept choosing *Kartu AS* as his cellular phone provider. Therefore, we can see that B did not maximize the agreement to the A and C; and B also did not minimize the disagreement to the hearers. We can say that B violated agreement maxim as proposed by Leech (1983).

The explicature meanings of this advertisement are:

- a. *Kartu AS* was the cheapest phone cellular provider that was why the customer did not want to change it.
- b. *Kartu AS* provided more free SMS than another; it was 5000 free SMS.

While the implicature meanings of this advertisement, were:

- a. By saying "*oh tidak bisa*", B was concluded as a common consumer who kept using *Kartu AS* although there were so many providers that offer the cheaper services.
- b. No providers could provide the cheaper services like *Kartu AS* gave to its costumer.
- c. There was no the cheaper cellular phone provider, except *Kartu AS*.

Besides violated the agreement maxim, B apparently also violated the ethic regulation of advertisement. It is because B used the superlative phrase "*Kartu AS yang paling murah*", while another cellular phone provider also said the same thing at the same time. Certainly this will make the viewer got confused which one the cheapest, since there was only one that exactly being the cheapest. This advertisement also did not show us the evidence that it was the cheapest. Although it said that it provided 5000 free SMS but still there was another one which provided unlimited free. Therefore we cannot exactly accept 100% if this provider which was the cheapest one.

IV.6. Violation of Sympathy Maxim

In sympathy maxim, Leech proposes that the participant is expected to maximize the expression of sympathy to the hearer and minimize the antipathy to the hearer (Leech, 1983: 138). The speakers are suggested to give their sympathy to the hearer especially when the hearer is in the bad condition or situation.

A : *Harga diri! Biasanya gue yang mutusin*
[crying]

(My pride! I am the one who usually break off by boyfriend first!) [Crying]

B : *Elo sih gonta-ganti.*

(It is because you keep changing)

A : *Emang kalo setia nggak diputusin?*

(If I am faithful, would I not be abandoned?)

B : *Sama indosat enggak. Makin setia makin banyak bonusnya. Jadian 5 bulan, dapat 50 SMS sehari, malah bisa lebih. Gue lewat 2 tahun, gratis 100 SMS + nelpon 100 menit. Cuma Indosat yang bisa begini!*

(If you are with Indosat, it would not be. The more you are faithful, the more you get bonus. Getting along 5 months, you get 50 free SMS per day, even more. I am over than 2 years; I get 100 free SMS + 100 minutes free talk. Only *Indosat* that can be like this.

(IM3 Indosat advertisement)

From the conversation above, we can see that B's utterance "*elo sih gonta-ganti*" did not show any sympathy toward A who seems sad because she was abandoned. B even blamed A for what she got. Although the conversation took place in the informal situation by means they use informal language; the setting was at home, both the speaker and the participant seem had the close relationship, but since B did not give any sympathy to A, we can conclude that B violated sympathy maxim. To obey this maxim, B had to give her sympathy to B, for example by saying "Be patient. Then you will get the better one."

The explicature meaning of this advertisement, are:

a. The longer people used IM3 the more bonus they got.

b. Only IM3 that provided more bonuses if the costumer use it longer.

While the implicature meaning of this advertisement were:

a. This advertisement encouraged people to do not change their cellular phone provider, which was IM3. It was because they will get more bonuses if they used it longer.

b. When B said "*Cuma Indosat yang bisa begini*" actually she implicitly quipped another phone provider that could not give the similar services like IM3 did. Since mention another product directly especially for negative purpose is not allowed by *Depan Periklanan Indonesia* (2005), this advertisement used the implicature meaning to delivered its message.

Although violated the sympathy maxim, this advertisement did not violate the regulation. Although it used superlative word "*cuma*", the advertiser could describe in what side it was being the only one (DPI, 2005: 18). Since this advertisement was published, there were no other providers that made the similar program.

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION

From the whole chapters of this thesis, the writer takes some conclusions to make this thesis brief and to review the main line of this thesis. The writer found six maxims of politeness principles were violated by 12 advertisements of cellular phone providers. However, because this is just an resume, the writer only explains the six ads and one for each maxim.

a. Violation of tact maxim was done by *XL*. The intention of *XL* violated this maxim was to inform the viewer that people could get more services (1000 free SMS) with the less budget. However, this advertisement did not violate any ethic regulation of advertisement.

b. Violation of generosity maxim was done by *XL*. The intention of the ad was to inform that with *XL* people can get more benefits with less budget. However, the ad did not violate ethic regulation.

- c. Violation of approbation maxim was done by *XL* ad again. The intentions of the ad was to inform that *XL* gave free for internet browsing. However this ad did not violated ethic regulation.
- d. Violation of modesty maxim was done by *Kartu AS*. The intention of the ad was to inform that *Kartu AS* was the cheapest provider anytime and unlimited. Related to ethic regulation of advertisement, this ad violated the maxim.
- e. Violation of agreement maxim was done by *Kartu AS*. The intention of the ad was to say that *Kartu AS* is the cheapest. Furthermore, this advertisement violated ethic regulation of advertisement as well.
- f. Violation of sympathy maxim was done by *IM3*. The intention of *IM3* was to inform that the longer people use *IM3* the more bonuses they will get. However, this ad did not violate ethic regulation of advertisement.

[-it/umum/1888-jenis-jenis-iklan.html.>](#)

Wardhough, Ronald. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

www.youtube.com/search.

Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford Press University.

REFERENCES

- Dewan Periklanan Indonesia. (2005). *Etika Pariwisata Indonesia (Tata Krama dan Tata Cara Periklanan Indonesia)*. Jakarta.
- Holmes, Janet. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. Edinburgh: Longman.
- Holmes, Janet. (2001). *An Introduction to Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Longman.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Mey, L. Jacob. (1993). *Pragmatics [An Introduction]*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sperber, Dan, and Wilson, Deirdre. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford/Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Suartawan, Nyoman. (2010). Jenis-Jenis Iklan. 02 Mar 2013 <<http://iramagrafis.com/index.php/info>