

**THE VIOLATING OF POLITENESS MAXIMS FOUND IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION  
BETWEEN TEACHER AND ENGLISH STUDENTS**

**Devie Reztia Anjarani**

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Madura

Email: [devie@unira.ac.id](mailto:devie@unira.ac.id)

**Abstract:**

Politeness is a way to convey expressions smoothly, nicely and politely in verbal communication. Politeness is also required to be carried out in official forums such as the learning and teaching process in the classroom. In this case, the researcher is interested and raises the title of violation from the maxim of politeness in language teaching and learning interactions in the seventh semester students. The purpose of this study is to describe objectively the politeness maxims violated by teacher or students in the class interaction. This research is a qualitative research and the source of data in this study is in the form of conversations between students and teachers that have been copied or converted into written form. Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the deviation of politeness maxims in teaching and learning interactions occurs in all politeness maxims, namely the maxim of wisdom, maxim of generosity, maxim of praise, maxim of humility, maxim of agreement, and maxim of sympathy. The maxim that most violated appear in wisdom maxim, generosity maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim with three violation of each. While the violation that occurs the least is the maxim of humility which only appears once. Violations from these maxims occur due to various behaviors, such as giving harm to others, having bad thoughts, criticizing and putting others down, self-effacing, and showing antipathy towards others..

**Keywords:** Politeness Maxims, Classroom Interaction

**Introduction**

Language as the main media of communication cannot be separated from the cultural influences attached to the language users themselves. Language can be a characteristic of society itself. Wardhaugh (1986) states that grammar can describe a society's perspective on the world. In other words, language can shape a society and vice versa. Cultural diversity creates language diversity. Politeness is one of the branches of pragmatics that shows this diversity. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies signs or signs and their interpretations. Yule (1996) states that pragmatics is related to hidden meaning or how one can understand an utterance without having to say it clearly. Politeness, in this case, is one of the branches of knowledge in pragmatics.

Politeness is not only related to language, but also to the culture of a society. Politeness in one society will be different from politeness in other societies. Yule (2006) states that politeness is a way of communicating by showing awareness of other people's faces. Therefore, politeness can be defined

from the side of the speaker and the listener. According to Locher (2004), from a speaker's perspective, politeness can be interpreted as a positive speech from a speaker based on behavior according to norms with the aim of giving appreciation to the listener. Meanwhile, from the listener's perspective, Locher further explained that politeness is a positive perception received by the listener.

Politeness is not only related to our behavior as part of a community, but is also closely related to speech acts. Language procedures must be in accordance with the norms that apply in a culture. A negative view will be given by society to someone who is considered to have violated the norm of decency itself. Therefore, in language we must pay attention to the cultural norms of the community and not just convey what we think. Politeness in language is reflected in verbal signs and language procedures.

The theory of politeness has been put forward by several linguists. The theory emphasizes the statement that a language or speech can be understood as a whole if it is associated with the context or situation in which the speech occurs. Judging from the

speaker's intent, speech acts are classified into representative, commissive, directive, expressive, and declarative. Representative serves to inform others of something. For example, asking, saying, and stating. Commissive is a speech act where the speaker will do something like a promise and a threat. Directives are speech acts that will make the speaker do something, such as suggestions and commands. Next is expressive which is a speech act to express feelings and attitudes about the situation. The latter is a declarative which serves to describe a change in a state.

One of the well-known theories of politeness is the politeness maxim expressed by George Leech. Leech (1983) divides the maxim of politeness into six types, namely the maxim of wisdom, the maxim of generosity, the maxim of praise, the maxim of humility, the maxim of agreement, and the maxim of sympathy.

The illocutionary maxim of wisdom is minimizing harm to others and maximizing harm to oneself. The second maxim, which is the maxim of generosity, is to make big profits for others and make small profits for yourself. The maxim of praise deals with criticizing others as little as possible and praising others as much as possible. Next is the maxim of humility, which is praising yourself as little as possible and criticizing yourself as much as possible. The fifth is the maxim of agreement where the illocutionary statement reads: make agreement with other people as big as possible and make disagreement with other people as little as possible. The last maxim is the maxim of sympathy, which minimizes antipathy towards others and maximizes sympathy for others.

Conversations or utterances between speakers and listeners must meet the maxim of politeness above, to create good speech acts and can be accepted by the community. However, if these maxims are violated with the intention of demeaning, harming, or hurting, the speech becomes bad and even fails because the interlocutor feels that he is being treated impolitely. This causes violations from the maxim of politeness. The close personal and emotional relationship between speakers and listeners sometimes causes violations from these politeness maxims. One example is the violation of the maxim of praise, the illocutionary maxim of the maxim is to give praise to others as much as possible. However, speakers often do the opposite by maximizing self-praise.

The world of education is always associated with formal situations and environments. All behavior including behavior is also carried out formally where it is required to always fulfill the maxims of politeness. However, in reality, even in the educational environment, violations from this maxim of politeness are still often found, both carried out by teachers as teachers and students. Observing and examining the violation of the maxim of politeness in the higher education environment at the university level will be very interesting, considering that students as students at the highest level of the education system in Indonesia are considered to have been well established both personally and emotionally.

Students are already at the level of adult age, so society will judge them as individuals who are considered capable of fulfilling behaviors and speech acts that are acceptable to the norms in society. However, it will be interesting if the maxim of politeness has not been fully fulfilled in the higher education environment.

Students as the object of research in this study are students from the English department, Madura University. Madura University was founded by the Madura University Foundation (YUM) which is one of the private universities in Pamekasan which was established on May 2, 1978. Currently, Madura University has 6 faculties with 10 study programs occupying a campus on Jalan Raya Panglegur KM. 3.5 Pamekasan (<http://www.unira.ac.id/?cat=5>). English language education is one of three study programs at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. This politeness maxim violation research was conducted on 7th semester students as final year students. The purpose of this study was to identify violations from the maxims of politeness that were carried out in the 7th semester students of Madura University in interactions between students or between teachers and students in the teaching and learning process in the classroom.

## **Method**

The most appropriate research method used in this study is descriptive qualitative method. Qualitative descriptive methods can describe the data obtained in real terms, and can clearly describe individuals, language conditions, symptoms or certain groups. The data collected is descriptive data in the form of student and teacher speech in English lessons, more precisely in the Translation course. The data

sources of this research are all conversations in the teaching and learning process for Translation courses in class, class discussions, presentations in front of the class, giving opinions, and so on.

The techniques used in this study include data collection techniques and data analysis techniques. The data collection itself was carried out by the observation method, where the researcher obtained data by listening to the data source. The listening technique used by the researcher in obtaining the data is, first, the free-to-see-capable (SLBC) technique, where the researcher is only an observer of the conversations carried out by the speaker and listener. The second is the conversational engagement (LC) technique, in which the researcher not only observes but is also involved in the conversation.

Conversations between communication participants during teaching and learning interactions took place, recorded with an audio recording device. The recording technique is intended to facilitate checking and correction during and after data analysis. This technique can also be used as a source to find out the context surrounding these conversations. The note-taking technique is done by recording the results of listening activities. Sentences that are indicated to violate the principle of politeness are then used as a corpus of data and then re-examined to become research data. The research data is then entered into the data card.

The analytical method in this study uses qualitative methods, such as those developed by Miller and Huberman (in Moeleong, 2008: 249), which uses interactive model analysis with three procedures, including:

1. Data reduction, namely the process of selecting, focusing attention, and simplifying, abstracting and transforming the rough data that emerges from the observations.
2. Presentation of data, namely the presentation of a set of information that is structured and provides the possibility to draw conclusions and take action. By looking at the presentation of the data, the researcher was able to transcribe the recorded data into written form, identified, classified into groups, analyzed, and then described qualitatively.
3. Drawing conclusions or verification, namely drawing conclusions from what has been done.

## Result and Discussion

### Deviation of Wisdom Maxims

The maxim of wisdom is related to minimizing harm to others, as well as in terms of speech. Deviations from the maxim of wisdom can be characterized by several actions, using harsh diction, direct rebuke, ordering, or refusing in a high or harsh tone. The deviations of the maxim of wisdom found are as follows:

*Hamid : Sul, translate dhin be'en*

*Samsul: Ghita 'mareh!*

A student named Hamid, intends to see the results of Samsul's practice questions by saying Sul, ngenjemmah dhin be'en (Sul, I see the results of your answers), which Samsul then replies with the words Ghita 'mareh! (Not finished yet). Samsul's statement indirectly is a rejection where he has given harm to others. Rejection that causes harm to others is categorized as a deviation from the maxim of wisdom.

*Teacher: You are all university students but how come the crowd is still like elementary school kids?*

The second data also violated from the maxim of wisdom, because the teacher reprimanded the students directly with harsh satire. It is said to be a harsh satire because the teacher compares students with elementary school children.

*Mahfud : pass me my phone, Dol!*

Data 3) is a speech by a student named Mahfud which means Take my cellphone, Dol!. The utterance is a direct command and rough diction. In addition, the student uses the nickname Dol instead of mentioning the name of the friend in question. For this reason, Mahfud's speech cannot be said to fulfill the maxim of wisdom and deviate from the maxim.

### The Deviation of the Generosity Maxim

The maxim of generosity is concerned with increasing the benefits for others. The advantage in this case can be in the form of respect and respect for the other person. Deviations from this maxim can be in the form of giving the impression of not respecting others, not giving the opportunity to have an opinion, having bad thoughts, and not respecting and humiliating others. The data related to the deviation of the maxim of generosity are as follows:

*Teacher: If it's not clear, please ask your friend next to you, if it's not clear too.....*

*Wardah: Ask the teacher...haha*

A student named Wardah blatantly interrupted the teacher's conversation even before the teacher finished his sentence. This is a form of deviation from the maxim of generosity because the student does not respect and respect the teacher.

*Teacher: How come it hasn't been photocopied?*

*Tanti : Photocopy funds from friends have not been collected, mam.*

*Teacher: You have money for your phone balance, but not for photocopying.*

The context of the conversation above relates to students who do not fulfill the teacher's request to photocopy the handbook. The last speech of the teacher, money for phone balance, yes, but not for photocopy, does not fulfill the maxim of generosity because the speech contains the teacher's prejudice against his students. The utterance is categorized as deviation from the maxim of generosity.

*Hamid : Ratna is not finished yet, mam*

*Ratna : Mareh ko' la, Mid*

The context in the conversation above occurs when the teacher asks whether the student has finished doing the assignment. Then a student named Hamid said if Ratna had not finished the task, which Ratna replied with the words *Mareh ko' la, Mid* (I'm done, Mid). In this case, Hamid violated the maxim of generosity by accusing or having bad thoughts about Ratna. Likewise with Ratna who replied to Hamid's speech with a diction with a rough intonation.

## Deviation of Praise Maxim

The maxim of praise means, criticize others as little as possible, and praise others as much as possible. Deviation in this maxim means that the illocutionary illocution is not fulfilled in an utterance. Deviations from this maxim can be in the form of giving criticism that puts others down, speaking that hurts others, and not respecting others and being more selfish. The deviation of the maxim of praise can be seen in the following data:

*Hamid : I'm browsing from Hapi (means laptop, pronounced incorrectly), mam*

*Aan : Hapi??...hahahahaha*

The data above is one of student interactions in class. Hamid stated that he was looking for a reference from a cellphone (HP) whose pronunciation deviated slightly from Hapi. Hamid's mistakes spontaneously make Aan react and laugh at Hamid's mistakes. It is very clear, Aan has deviated from the maxim of praise, because he gave a negative criticism of Hamid.

*Mahfud : What's this, Sul? I don't know, the handwriting is bad.*

The context of the speech occurred when Mahfud borrowed Samsul's answer sheet. Then because he didn't understand Samsul's handwriting, Mahfud said, "What's this, Sul? I don't understand

tolessanna bhek-jhubhek (What does this mean, Sul? I don't understand, the writing is bad). Mahfud in his speech minimizes praise of others by criticizing or demeaning Mahfud's handwriting. Mahfud's speech can be categorized as a deviation from the maxim of praise.

## Deviation of the Modesty Maxim

In the modesty maxim is, a person is required to maximize disrespect for oneself and minimize disrespect for others. Speech participants are also expected to be humble to their listeners. Deviation from the maxim of humility is characterized by several behaviors such as imposing one's will, highlighting one's own strengths, arrogance, and superiority. The data that shows the deviation of the maxim of humility in the interaction in the classroom are as follows:

*Anang : Beh, mik la mareh ben kek? (how can you have done it already?)*

*Alvi : Abbeh jhek engkok ben. (it's me)*

In the speech, Anang said *Beh, mik la mareh ben kek?* (Why are you finished?) to Alvi to which *Abbeh jhek engkok ben* replied (this is me). Alvi in her speech emphasizes praise and respect for himself. This of course deviates from the illocutionary maxim of humility.

## Deviation of the Maxim of Agreement

In the maxim of agreement, a person is expected to reduce his disagreement and increase agreement with others. Deviations from the maxim of agreement can be marked by not giving a choice to the interlocutor, speaking not according to the situation / subject matter being discussed, and there is no agreement between the speaker and the interlocutor. The following is the data on the deviation of the agreement maxim.

*Teacher : Please browse from your respective smartphone, yes.*

*Atik : There is no data package, mam*

The conversation occurred when a student named Atik had difficulty finding an explanation about a material. The teacher then asked Atik to browse from his smartphone. However, Atik replied with the words *There is no data package, mam*. Indirectly Atik refused and did not agree with the orders from the teacher. In the speech, Atik has deviated from the maxim of agreement.

*Teacher : The assignments are collected today right.*

*Ienas : Mam, this is a lot of questions.*

The context of the data above is the teacher instructs students to collect assignments on the same day. However, Ienas and several other students replied to the teacher's words with Mam's words, this was a lot of problems. The meaning of the utterance is that there are too many problems to be solved that very day. The deviation of agreement maxim occurs because Ienas maximizes his disagreement with other people.

*Tanti : Literal Meaning that is the true meaning, mam.*

*Dina : not Tan, the meaning according to the dictionary.*

A student named Tanti tries to explain what is meant by literal meaning, but Dina doesn't agree with the term used by Tanti. Dina's speech is a deviation from the maxim of agreement, because even though she has the same meaning, Dina does not agree with the literal meaning according to Tanti.

### Deviation from the Maxim of Sympathy

The sympathetic maxim demands that people maximize sympathy and minimize antipathy towards others. The non-fulfillment of the illocutionary will lead to deviations from the maxim of sympathy. The deviation of the maxim of sympathy can be indicated by not giving sincere sympathy to the interlocutor and being antipathetic towards the interlocutor. The deviation of the maxim of sympathy can be seen in the following data.

*Samsul : Adduh Tang HP error kanak. (God, my phone got error guys)*

*Luqy : Dullat!*

The context of the speech is when a student named Samsul has a problem with his cellphone by saying Adduh tang, your cellphone has an error (ouch, my cellphone has an error, friend). Luqy then responded to Samsul's speech by saying Dullat (Syukurin). Luqy maximizes his sympathy for Samsul and increases his antipathy. Luqy's utterance is one form of sympathy maxim deviation.

*Teacher : Sorry I'm going outside for a while, I have diarrhea since last night.*

*Hamid : yes, mam. Take your time. Ha ha ha*

The conversation occurred when the teacher was unwell and asked the students for a moment. Then a student named Hamid said yes, mam. Long is okay too. Ha ha ha. Hamid's utterance shows a deviation from the maxim of sympathy because the feeling of antipathy is magnified by responding with a satire tone of answer. In addition, Hamid should also show sympathy by praying for the teachers to be

healthy again.

*Teacher : The answer is not quite right, Rat. That which depends on the context is called Contextual Meaning. While the Textual Meaning depends on the text of an article*

*Samsul : Becah pa teppak rah, Rat (read it carefully, Rat) Ha ha ha ha*

The context of the conversation occurred when Ratna misunderstood the textual meaning. Then Samsul replied to Ratna's mistake by saying Becah pa teppak rah, Rat. Hahahaha (Read it right, Rat). Samsul's speech contained a great sense of antipathy to the mistakes made by Ratna. Therefore, Samsul's speech is a deviation from the maxim of sympathy.

### Conclusion

Based on the research conducted regarding the deviation of politeness maxims in the interaction of students and teachers in class, it can be concluded several things as follows:

1. The maxim of politeness deviation in interaction in the classroom occurs in all politeness maxims, namely the maxim of wisdom, the maxim of generosity, the maxim of praise, the maxim of humility, the maxim of agreement, and the maxim of sympathy.
2. The maxim deviations that most often appear are the maxim of wisdom, generosity, agreement, and sympathy maxim with three deviations each. While the deviation that occurs the least is the maxim of humility which only appears once.
3. Deviations from these maxims occur due to various behaviors, such as giving harm to others, having bad thoughts, criticizing and putting others down, self-effacing, and showing antipathy towards others.

### References

- Moleong, Lexy J. (2000). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York. Longman Group.
- Locher, A.M. (2004). *Power and Politeness in Action Disagreements in Oral Communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.
- Universitas Madura. 2016. Profil Universitas Madura, diakses dari <http://www.unira.ac.id/?cat=5> (22 Oktober, 2016)
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. (1986). *An introduction to*

- Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Yule, George. (1996). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, George. 2006. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Suhartono, Suparlan. 2009. *Wawasan Pendidikan*. Jogjakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Thobroni, M. 2015. *Belajar & Pembelajaran Teori dan Praktik*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Wibowo, Sabto. 2012. *Menyelesaikan SPLDV*. Klaten: PT Intan Sejati.
- Yamin, Martinis. 2013. *Strategi dan Metode dalam Model Pembelajaran*. Jambi:GP Press Group