

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The writer divides this chapter into some points which discuss some aspects related to review of related literature. They are politeness, politeness maxims, violation maxims, talk show, *Bukan Empat Mata*, and previous studies.

#### 1.1 Politeness

As a social creature, it is normal for human being in needing to have communication to the others. Everyone needs to communicate with others in order to cooperate and go along with them. Without communication and cooperation with others, it is difficult for someone having a life comfortably. In doing communication activity, human needs a device which is called language. As in the society, there are various social classes of people live in, so, it is a must for someone to use the language properly according to whom he talk to. Someone who can use the proper language can keep a good relationship to his or her friend, family, and his or her relation in the society. In pragmatics, this situation is described in a concept of politeness.

There are some definitions of the concept of politeness. For example, Yule (1996) notes that politeness in an interaction can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face. In this sense, politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distance or closeness. Showing the equivalent awareness when the other is socially close is often described in terms of friendliness, camaraderie, or solidarity.

## 1.2 Politeness maxims

Politeness maxims are proposed by Geoffrey Leech (1983). Politeness maxims contain six maxims which are Tact maxim, Generosity maxim, Approbation maxim, Modesty maxim, Agreement maxim and Sympathy maxim.

On this study, the researcher used Leech's theory because the explanation is very clear and easy to understand. The explanation and example of politeness maxim are shown below:

### 1. Tact Maxim

Tact maxim provides an instruction in order to the speaker can reduce his/her gain and give more profits to the hearer in having communication. Tact maxim is included in impositive and commisive illocutionary acts (Leech, 1983, p.132). In Indonesian context, the example of tact maxim as stated by Rahardi (2005, p.60) is as follows:

*Rudi: "Silakan Anda nikmati kopinya."*

*Tamu: "Terimakasih Pak."*

The example has fulfilled of tact maxim because Rudi does not emphasize a profit for himself but rather to maximize the benefits to partner. This is evidenced by Rudi when he invites the guest to enjoy the coffee which had been provided.

### 2. Generosity Maxim

With generosity maxim, the speakers are expected to respect others. Respect for others will occur if people could reduce profits for himself and maximize profits for others. In Indonesian context, the example of generosity maxim as stated by Rahardi (2005, p.61) is as follows:

*Rudi: "Silakan Bapak dan Ibu tidur di kamar depan. Biar kami menempati ruang tamu ini saja. Kami sudah terbiasa dengan cuaca dingin."*

*Tamu: "Wah, kami jadi merasa tidak enak Pak."*

The example has fulfilled of generosity maxim because Rudi does not emphasize the advantages for himself but rather adds to losses on him. This is evidenced by Rudi when he invites the guest to occupy a room in his house, whereas he succumbs to sleep in the living room.

### 3. Approbation Maxim

Approbation maxim states that the speaker will be considered politely if he always tries to give a good appreciation to hearer when he has a communication. With this maxim, it is expected that the participants of communication do not mock each other. In Indonesian context, the example of approbation maxim as stated by Rahardi (2005, p.63) is as follows:

*Bu Julia: "Wah, bagus sekali cincin baru Ibu. Pasti mahal harganya."*

*Bu Ana: "Ah. Biasa saja. Ini hadiah ulang tahun perkawinan dari suami saya."*

The example has fulfilled of approbation maxim. Mrs. Julia gives praise to Mrs. Ana so that she feels honored and proud with the ring which she is wearing.

### 4. Modesty Maxim

Modesty maxim states that the speaker is expected to be humble by reducing compliment to himself. People will be said arrogant if they always give praise to themselves. In Indonesian context, the example of tact maxim as stated by Rahardi (2005, p.64) is as follows

*Petani: "Silakan masuk. Maaf rumah orang kampung, seadanya, tidak*

*seperti rumah orang kota.”*

*Mahasiswa: “Ah, Bapak bisa saja.”*

The example has fulfilled of modesty maxim because the farmer states that the owned house is a makeshift home showed that he is a humble man.

#### 5. Agreement Maxim

Agreement maxim is emphasized that the participants are able to establish an agreement in communication. If there is a good compatibility between the speaker and the hearer, it can call as a politeness. In Indonesian context, the example of tact maxim as stated by Rahardi (2005, p.65) is as follows:

*Santi: “Besokkan libur, bagaimana kalau kita ke Taman Ria?”*

*Tati: “Aku setuju.”*

The example has fulfilled of agreement maxim because Tati has adjusted her desire with what Santi want. Tati does not do a resistance to suggestion proposed by Santi.

#### 6. Sympathy Maxim

Sympathy maxim states that all participants of communication can maximize their sympathetic between the speaker and the hearer. An antipathy toward one of the participants would be considered as impolite. In Indonesian context, the example of tact maxim as stated by Rahardi (2005, p.66) is as follows:

*Tari: “Maaf aku tidak bisa datang ke pesta ulang tahunmu. Ibuku sakit”*

*Suci: “Aku turut prihatin dengan keadaan ibumu. Semoga beliau lekas sembuh.”*

The example has fulfilled of sympathy maxim because Tari has shown a sympathetic to the Suci's mother who get sick. On the other hand, Suci does not show an antipathy to Tari because she cannot come to the birthday party.

### 1.3 Violation of Politeness Maxims

According to Grice (1975, p. 41-58), violation takes place when the speakers intentionally refrain to apply certain maxims in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participants' part or to achieve some other purposes.

There are four kinds of violation maxims based on Grice, which are shown below:

#### 1. Violation of Quantity

In the maxim of quantity, the speaker is expected to give a sufficient information and relatively adequate. Information should not exceed the actual information needed by the hearer. Here is an example of a conversation that violates the maxim of quantity:

*JOHN: Where's Meredith?*  
*ELIZABETH: The control room or the science lab.*

**Maxim Violated:** Quantity; Elizabeth didn't give as much information as John wanted (Meredith's exact location), but instead gave a weaker statement (giving two possible options).

**Implication:** Elizabeth doesn't know which of the two places Meredith is.

## 2. Violation of Quality

In the maxim of quality, the speaker is expected to convey something real and based on actual facts in having conversation. That fact must be supported by clear facts. Here is an example of a conversation that violates the maxim of quality:

*ELIZABETH: A lot of people are depending on you.*

*MEREDITH: Thanks, that really takes the pressure off.*

**Maxim Violated:** Quality; knowing that “a lot of people are depending on you” does not, in fact, take the pressure off. Meredith is saying something obviously untrue.

**Implication:** By saying something clearly untrue, Meredith is implying that the *opposite* is true (sarcasm). The true meaning being expressed here is probably more like “That really puts a lot of pressure on me” and perhaps, by extension, “Stop pressuring me.”

## 3. Violation of Relation

In the maxim of relevance, it is stated that in order to get a good relation between the speaker and the hearer, they should be able to give a relevant contribution in having conversation. Here is an example of a conversation that violates the maxim of relation:

*MEREDITH: You really love me?*

*JOHN: I like Ferris wheels, and college football, and things that go real fast.*

**Maxim Violated:** Relation; John is changing the topic.

**Implication:** Either John doesn't want to respond to Meredith (perhaps he has problems discussing his feelings) or the answer is “no.”

#### 4. Violation of Manner

Maxim of manner requires the participants of communication to speak directly and clearly. Here is an example of a conversation that violates the maxim of manner:

*SIMON: When are you coming home?*

*ELIZABETH: I will codify that question to my superiors and respond at such a time as an adequate answer is preparable.*

**Maxim Violated:** Manner; Elizabeth is using unnecessarily complicated and confusing words and construction.

**Implication:** Elizabeth does not know or does not wish to give an answer to the question.

#### 2.4 Talk Show and *Bukan Empat Mata* Talkshow

According to Lusia (2006), talk show is a program combining talk and show, and the material is called structured conversation because it has been designed in advance in such a way, for instance about the topic which is going to be discussed, when and how to present. She also explains that talk show is a program that features a well-known host interviewing celebrities.

Lusia also categorizes types of talk show based on the style, which are light entertainment and serious discussion. Light entertainment begins by interviewing celebrities, and the host sits in a coach and interviews the guest. This talk show has comfortable situation and stories. Another talk show, serious discussion, focuses on professional topics, such as politic or social, or on figures that have been related to the phenominal issues.

Nowadays, one of humorous talk show in Indonesia which have gained both controversy and popularity is *Bukan Empat Mata* hosted by Tukul Arwana and broadcasted on Monday – Friday at 10pm in Trans7. This talk show was guided by Tukul since September 2005. Every single episode conveys a certain theme punctuated with jokes. ([www.mytrans.co.id](http://www.mytrans.co.id))

## 2.5 Previous Studies

Many studies in analyzing politeness strategies are found, but only a few study conducted based on Leech's politeness maxim. This case should be considered that politeness maxim is actually stronger in applying politeness in concern of culture than politeness strategies. Politeness strategies are arranged in form of some strategies of politeness and applied in all society. Whereas politeness maxim is formulated socially and psychologically in accordance to people and their culture (Leech, 1983, p.80). So, the use of politeness maxim can be different from culture to culture and it is more applicable in connecting to culture. It becomes a challenge for the researcher in conducting study about politeness maxim.

Related to this study, the researcher chose two previous studies of politeness as guidelines of work for this study. The first study is conducted by Anggraini Puspita Sandra (2011) entitled *A Politeness Maxim Analysis on the Dialogue of "Date Night" Movie*. In her thesis, she analyzed violation of politeness maxim using Leech theory. She found out 21 violation of politeness maxims that consisted of violation of fact maxim (2), violation of approbation maxim (7), violation of modesty maxim (6), violation of sympathy maxim (2),



violation of agreement maxim (4), while the violation of generosity maxim was not found in the dialogue.

The second study is conducted by Devie (2010) entitled *The Study of Politeness Maxim in "The Queen" Movie Script*. In her thesis, she discussed politeness maxim was proposed by Leech. She analyzed all politeness maxims and also found some differences in using politeness maxim based on the social level of characters in *The Queen* movie. So, her thesis did not only about politeness textually, but it also covered politeness related to social level.

That previous studies are relevant with the present research. The researcher used the same theory about politeness maxim, but there were some other points that were differentiated between the previous studies and the present research. The previous researchers used movie as a data source, but the present researcher used the transcribed data of a dialogue in a talk show. Here Anggraini (2011) analyzed only violation of politeness maxim for her research. Meanwhile, the present researcher did not only analyze violation of politeness maxim but also analyzed politeness maxim. Secondly, there was no classification in Anggraini's research considered there were so many data found in approbation maxim. Here, the present researcher used a classification based on act. There were three acts used by the researcher, act of thanking, act of praising, and act of respecting.