Flouting Maxims of Politeness in Utterances

Aulia Nisa Khusnia, M.A
University of Muhammadiyah Purwokerto

Abstract

This paper dealt with the politeness principle by focusing framework of politeness. It addressed the interrelationship politeness as a strategic device in political practices. The paper discussed about politeness as forms of behavior that establish and maintain comity. That was the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony.

Politeness as a theoretical construct were clearly addressed and acknowledged in the research. The flouting maxims of politeness could be shown in the data. The indirect strategies as stated by Beebe Takashi and Ulis Weltz (1990) were used as the guide of analyzing the data. The strategies were described as strategies in utterances that were used of both candidates, Mc Cain and Obama.

The data were utterances of both presidential candidates in some campaigns. Those showed some strategies such as statement of negative consequences strategy, critic strategy, disagreement strategy, and sarcasm strategy. Those strategies were used for some purposes, such as: attacking opponents' program, underestimating the interlocutor, and comparing the programs. In another hand, flouting maxims were found such as generosity maxim, approbation maxim, and agreement maxim which have some purposes. The purposes are to give benefit to speaker, to praise the speaker, and to dispraise others (interlocutor).

Keywords: *politeness, utterances, maxim of politeness* and *strategies*.

Pelanggaran Maksim Kesopanan dalam Tuturan

Ringkasan

Penelitian ini menitik beratkan prinsip kesopanan dengan berfokus pada kesopanan Bahasa. Hal ini mengacu pada hubungan kesopanan sebagai alat strategis dalam politik praktis. Penelitian ini mendiskusikan tentang kesopanan bahasa sebagai bentuk perilaku yang membangun dan menjaga hubungan. Seperti, kemampuan seseorang dalam hubungan interaksi social untuk membentuk sebuah interaksi harmonis.

Kesopanan sebagai teori yang diacu dan dibahas dalam penelitian ini. Pelanggaran maksim kesopanan terlihat dalam data penelitian ini. Strategi tidak langsung yang dinyatakan oleh Beebe Takashi dan Ulis Weltz (1990) digunakan sebagai panduan dalam menganalisis data. Strategi- strategi tersebut dideskripsikan sebagai tuturan yang digunakan kedua calon presiden, Mc.Cain dan Obama. Data tersebut berupa btuturan-tuturan yang digunakan calon presiden dibeberapa kampanye. Data- data tersebut menunjukkan beberapa strategi seperti *statement of negative consequences strategy, critic strategy, disagreement strategy, and sarcasm strategy*. Strategi- strategi tersebut digunakan untuk beberapa tujuan seperti menyerang program lawa, merendahkan lawan tutur dan membandingkan program. Sebaliknya, pelanggaran maksim maksim kemurahan, maksim penerimaan, and maksim persetujuan mempunyai beberapa tujuan. Tujuannya adalah memberikan keuntungan kepada pembicara, memuji pembicara dan mencemooh lawan bicara.

About the author:

Aulia Nisa Khusnia, S.S, M.A is a lecturer at the Department of English Education, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training UMP (Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto), Jl. Dukuh waluh PO BOX 202, Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia.

Introduction

Language is stated as a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used for human communication (Wardaugh and also Chaer, (2007). It is also used by humans to express idea, thoughts and feelings. Language is so dynamic and the activities of humans depend on it. People use language to show the attitudes such as agreeing, refusing and others. Language has an important role in achieving an image of a speaker. In political purposes, the way how the candidates promote themselves to public is very important. Promoting is done by giving the programs, building self image, and doing some campaigns. In doing the activities, the candidates can't be separated to language usage. By giving beneficial programs to society and delivering a polite utterances, mean that the candidates will have a good point. Furthermore, it can be followed by a good response and votes.

Some cultural problems rose during the campaign, such as the case of white and black candidates. The phenomenon is called Bradley Effect. It was about the tendency of voters. It struck black politician. (New York Times, 2008)

For some of the reasons, candidates attempt to oppose the opponent through several ways such as comparing the programs to the opponent, showing the opponent weaknesses, and building a good image to the society. In sober fact, the utterances in achieving the goals flout politeness principle.

Based on the phenomena, this research focused on the utterances of the candidates in US presidential 2008 period. The utterances would be analyzed on the frame of pragmatic, especially on the principle of politeness. The formulas of the problems are as follows:

1. How do the utterances of the candidates flout politeness maxim?

2. What are the strategies that used in the utterances?

Furthermore, this paper purposed to address above problems. It attempted to give an overview and show floating in utterances' of presidential candidates.

Politeness

Some of the sociolinguistic literature espouses politeness as well: for Lakoff "to be polite is saying the socially correct thing", politeness is associated with situations in which one "speaks or behaves in a way that is socially and culturally acceptable and pleasant to the hearer". Similarly, Ide views politeness as a cover term for behavior "without friction" (p. 7), while Brown sees it as "saying and doing things in such a way as to take into account the other person's feeling". Fraser and Nolen take a more general approach: "to be polite is to abide by the rules of the relationship. It can be concluded that politeness is the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony.

The maxims of politeness principle tend to go in pairs as follows:

1. Tact Maxim (in impositives and commissives)
    a) Minimize cost to other; b) maximize benefit cost to other

2. Generosity Maxim (in impositives and commissives)
    a) Minimize benefit to self; b) Maximize cost to self

3. Approbation Maxim (in expressive and assertive)

a) Minimize dispraise of other ; b) Maximize praise of other

4. Modesty Maxim (in expressive and assertive)

   a) Minimize praise of self ; b) Maximize dispraise of self

5. Agreement Maxim (in assertive)

   a) Minimize disagreement between self and other ; b) Maximize agreement between self and other

6. Sympathy Maxim (in assertive)

   a) Minimize antipathy between self and other ; b) Maximize sympathy between self and other

Nguyen (2006:30-31) and Yang (2008:104-1046), Beebe Takashi and Ulis- Weltz stated some implicit strategies such as a statement of regret, statement of wish, excuse/ reason/explanation, statement of alternative, set condition for future or past acceptance, promise of future acceptance, statement of principle, statement of philosophy, rhetorical question, treat/statement of negative consequences, restatement, unwillingness/ insistence, acceptance that functions as a refusal, postponement, and avoidance. All of them are indirect strategies.

Methods

To achieve the goal, the researcher collected some utterances in presidential debate in the campaign. There were three times of presidential debates: first debate in Mississippi University, oxford Mississippi, second debate in Belmont University, Nashville, and third in Hosfra University, New York.

Descriptive research was chosen to conduct this research. It gave qualitative research. The result of this research was descriptive data. In qualitative approach, it involved oral data in society (Sugiyono, 2012: 285). The data of this research was 130 utterances which analyzed in the pragmatic perspective.

Procedures of the research were: first, the researcher took debate presidential video; second, the researcher selected the transcription, third the researcher read all the transcription; fourth the researcher analyzed the data; and the last, the researcher drew a conclusion.

Technique of the research was formal and informal techniques. As stated by Sudaryanto, the data described with some symbols and signs. It is used to visualize the result. In this research, *D* represented for the presidential debate, and T represented for number of text.

Flouting of Politeness Maxim and Implicit Strategies

Flouting of politeness maxims occur in the utterances of both candidates.

The most important in campaign is how to make pollsters vote the candidates. In some cases one candidate tries to oppose opponent's program and show the opponent's weaknesses. In it, the candidates use implicit strategies to dissuade interlocutor (opponent). The implicit strategies are as follows:

a. Threat/ Statement of Negative Consequences

b. Critic

c. Disagreement

d. Sarcasm

Threat / statement of negative consequences is appeared when the speaker delivers the negative effect of opponent's statement or programs.

Data (DII, T72)

Statement of Mc Cain:

"If you're small business person and you don't insure your company, Sen. Obama will fine you.

Context:

Health program of Obama stated to give health insurance for US society. For employee, it will be guaranteed from their companies.

Interpretation:

Mc Cain tried to give the negative impact of Obama's program by giving assumption to small business person. It meant that mc Cain used threat/ statement of negative

consequences. By saying it, Mc Cain flouts generosity maxim which it supposed to be minimize benefit to self and maximize cost to self. Mc Cain maximized benefit to himself. He stated that Obama gave fine to the owners of small business.

Critic was an implicit strategy that was used to oppose opponent's program. It was shown in some data containing disagreement. The nature of the disagreement was critic.

Data (DIII, T112)

Statement of Mc Cain:

" Because of previous agreement, their goods and products come into our country for free. Sen. Obama, who has never traveled south of our border, opposes the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. The same country that's helping us to stop flow of drugs into our country that's killing young Americans"

Context:

The discussion is about NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement). Mc Cain agrees for the existence of some free trade organization which is assumed to give benefit to US.

Interpretation:

Mc Cain tried to judge that Obama knows nothing about free trade and the relationship to south states. It meant that Mc Cain dispraises to Obama's knowledge. Flouting occurred because Mc Cain gives negative judgment to Obama. So it is concluded that Mc Cain's statement flouts Approbation maxim which minimize dispraise to other and maximize praise to other.

Disagreement was a strategy containing disagreement of interlocutor's statement but it was still shown indirectly.

Data(DII,T70)
Statement of Obama:

"And that's why we've got to make some investment and I've called for investment in solar, wind, geothermal. Contrary to what

Sen. Mc Cain keeps on saying, I favor nuclear power as one component of our overall energy.

Context:

Mc Cain believes that Nuclear power plants is safe, clean and it also creates hundreds of thousands of jobs. So he thinks that he will get economy going by creating millions of jobs. On the contrary, Obama opposes it , he says for energy, he will have solar, wind and geothermal for investment.

Interpretation:

Obama said his disagreement by saying that his investment in solar, wind and geothermal energy. The disagreement was used by comparing their programs. The statement was implicit strategy in point disagreement. Since it showed disagreement about safety program between Mc Cain and Obama, it could be concluded as flouting on agreement maxim. Obama did not minimize disagreement between Mc Cain and him.

Sarcasm was a strategy to oppose the interlocutor. It was shown in some data.
Data (D1, T38)

Statement of Mc Cain:

"And yes, Senator Obama calls for more troops, but what he doesn't understand. It's got to be a new strategy, the same strategy that he condemned in Iraq. It's going to have to be employed in Afghanistan.

Context:

The program is how to solve the problems of Iraq and Afghanistan. Obama thinks that calling more troops is a strategy to overcome it. In other hand, Mc Cain laughs at him, since it is ordinary strategy that is used in Afghanistan.

Interpretation:

The case of Iraq and Afghanistan need a new strategy as Mc Cain said. The statement showed that Mc Cain used Sarcasm to dissuade Obama's statement. Mc Cain dispraised Obama's solvency by saying that he does not understand. It meant that Mc Cain judges Obama that Obama knows

nothing, including the problem to foreign affairs. Mc Cain flouted approbation maxim.

Data (D1, T29)

Statement of Mc Cain:

"The next president of the United States is not going to have to address the issue as the whether we went into Iraq or not. The next president of the United States is going to have to decide how we leave, when we leave, and what we leave behind. That's the decision of the next president of the United States".

Context: The program is how to solve the problems of Iraq and Afghanistan

Interpretation:

The statement was shown that Mc Cain uses Sarcasm to oppose his opponent. He judged that Obama was still confuse to solve Iraq and Afghanistan. So, he assumed that Obama would ask more on what the president should do to overcome the problem. Mc Cain dispraised Obama ability. It flouted approbation maxim.

Data (D1, T11)

Statement of Mc Cain :

"Now, that's a fundamental differences between myself and Senator Obama, I want to cut spending. I want to keep taxes low. The worst thing we could do in this economic climate is to raise people's taxes"

Context: Health care program between Mc Cain and Obama is different. Obama believes that a raise 5% of tax to accommodate health care system is wise. He guarantees that everyone will get health care that is taken from the tax. On the contrary, Mc Cain never believes that raising tax is fine in economic crisis.

Interpretation:

Mc Cain compared the difference between Obama and Mc cain.
He dissuaded his opponent by saying that actually he needed to keep taxes low. Mc Cain assumed Obama would burden the society. Sarcasm was there. Mc Cain flouted

generosity maxim. He tried to show his positive programs. Whereas, his opponent was lower than Mc Cain. He said about positive elements such as he wanted to cut spending, and kept US taxes low.

Data (D II, T76)

Statement of Mc Cain :

" Sen. Obama was wrong about Iraq and the surge. He was wrong about Russia when they committed aggression against Georgia. And in his short career, he does not understand our national security challenges".

Context:

Both of the candidates talks about Iraq and the surge. Mc Cain believes in deregulation in every circumstance. This opinion is opposed by Obama. Obama believes that the deregulation does not make any change for economic condition in US.

Interpretation:

"In his short career" was stated as sarcasm. One of the indirect or implicit strategies were used to oppose the interlocutor. Mc Cain said it to prove that he had more experience than Obama. It flouted generosity maxim since Mc Cain had benefit to himself.

Data (DII,T71)

Statement of Mc Cain:

"You know who voted it? You might never know. That one. You know who voted against it? Me".

Context:

Citizen of US are worried about the new energy bill. It is because the last energy bill is promoted by Bush is failed and gives bad impact to society.

Interpretation:

Mc Cain pointed out Obama and says "that one". *That one* described race. Mc Cain tried to say that Obama was black candidate which it meant he did not have the same

race to Us society. It used Sarcasm strategy and flouted generosity maxim.

To achieve the goals, both candidates used implicit strategy such as statement of negative consequences, critic, disagreement, and sarcasm. They also flouted some politeness maxim such as generosity maxim, approbation maxim, agreement maxim, and generosity maxim. All of them were used to dissuade interlocutor, to build an image of the candidate, to tell about their experiences, to compare their programs, and to show the weaknesses of the opponent. Furthermore, all could create image which all followed by giving their votes**.**

Conclusions

This research revealed the way of candidates to oppose the opponents. The candidates used implicit strategies. The use of implicit strategies because the candidates wanted to give disagreement opinion indirectly. Some of the strategies were statement of negative consequences, critic, disagreement, and sarcasm. Statement of negative consequences was used for showing the negative impact of opponent's program. Critic was shown disagreement but sometimes it was also used to underestimate the opponent. Disagreement was used to compare both candidates' program. Sarcasm showed disagreement and underestimating.

Flouting some maxims were found in this research. The maxims were generosity maxim, approbation maxim, and agreement maxim. All the maxims were used for some purposes. Generosity maxim was used for praising the speaker and attack the interlocutor. Approbation maxim was used for giving beneficial impact to the speaker and dispraising the opponent. Agreement maxim was used for showing disagreement to opponents' programs.

References

Chaer, Abdul.2007. *Linguistik Umum*: Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Djajasudarma, T. Fatimah. 1993. *Metode Linguistik: Ancangan Metode dan Kajian*. Bandung: Eressco.

Mc Cabe, Brian.2013. *Five Thirty Eight*. New York Times. Retrieved on 19th march 2013

Nguyen, Thi Minh Phuong. 2006. *Cross Cultural Pragmatics: Refusals of Requests by Australian Native Speakers of English and Vietnamese Learners of English*. Disertasi. Queensland. The school of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies.The University of Quensland.

Renkema, Jan. 2004. *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sugiyono. 2012. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Wardaugh, Ronald. 1977. *Introduction to Linguistics*.USA: MCGraw-Hill,Inc.