

Politeness Strategy In Maxims
Used by Staff and Students Of language and Arts Faculty
HKBP Nommensen University in Their Academic Services

Tiara K Pasaribu, Sondang Manik

tiara_pasaribu@yahoo.com

Abstract

The staffs of FBS – UHN Medan used four of six types of politeness principles in directive and expressive speech act to communicate with the students at their services. They were tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim and agreement maxim. The dominant type of politeness principles used by the staffs of FBS – UHN was tact maxim. Staff needs the ability to communicate politely. The staffs were easier and felt more as older and appropriate in using this type in directive speech acts as mostly focused on by the researcher. The students didn't comply with all the staffs' utterances although they were already in polite way. Staffs gave their polite response to some students' utterances or commands but in other way they ignored the some else staffs' utterances to them, this was because of the influence of positive emotions and also strongly affected by their poor pragmatic competence.

Keywords : The Tact maxim, The Generosity maxim, The Approbation maxim, The Agreement maxim,

1. Background of the Study

Staffs at the office of Language and Arts Faculty is working in discipline. They do the administrative service as a higher education as the work place, staffs deal with lecturers, and students to give information to type letters etc. He/she has to be able to communicate well, and friendly. In this case, one of the ability needed is the use of politeness in their conversation. The staffs' performance will upgrade the quality of the faculty.

Staff needs the ability to communicate politely. For the administrative staffs politeness is described as the behavior or attitude which is formal and good. Politeness in staffs conversation means that to communicate respectfully towards the guest, lecturer or students. Therefore, politeness is very important, particularly in interactions in campus life.

Being polite is a complicated business in any language. Politeness has an important role in conversation, particularly in communication between the receptionist and the guests. It is interesting to study the positive ways to communicate that leads to the best conversation. The reason of choosing this topic is to find the way of the administrative staffs interact in daily conversations. Do they use politeness principles in maintaining the good communication in order to get the accurate messages from both sides.

The Objective of The Study

To find out maxims of politeness principles are found in the conversation between the Staff of UHN and Students of Language and arts faculty

and to find out Maxim of the politeness principles is mostly used in the conversation between the Staff of UHN and Students of Language and arts faculty ?

The Scope of Study :

The scope of the research is limited to the habitual of daily conversation between the administrative staff of Language and Arts faculty for their service to the students. There are only three of the administrative staffs that are taken as the subject of the research.

By doing this research, the fact is recording. Hopefully the analysis would have some significances and learn weather they (Students and Staff) used the appropriate maxim in their contextual relationship, in their service as the staff of Education and hopefully this research would be useful for the improvement of faculty's administrative services .

In this chapter, the writer presents the theories that are explained by some linguists to support the research. This research is about politeness maxim, so the writer chose the theories relating to Pragmatics as politeness is under pragmatics subject. Then, kinds of politeness maxim are explored.

1.1 Pragmatics

According to Leech (1983:5-6) in the Mey (2001) the problem of distinguishing language and language use has centered on boundary dispute between semantics and pragmatics. Those are concerned with meaning. Mey (2001: 6) says that pragmatics study the use of language in human communication

as determined by the condition of society. Foss and Hakes (1978:54) have summarized the semantic or meaning system as a set of problems to be solved. A successful theory of semantics will state how the meanings of words are characterized and how these meanings are combined when they appear together in sentences. Also, when one knows the meaning of a sentence, one knows something about what the sentence entails and about its true conditions. Clearly, the internal code, meaning, is the last understood aspect of linguistic structure.

Pragmatics is a systematic way of explaining language use in context. It seeks to explain aspects of meaning which cannot be found in the plain sense of words or structures, as explained by semantics. As a field of language study pragmatics is fairly new. Its origins lie in philosophy of language and the American philosophical school of pragmatism. As a discipline within language science, its roots lie in the work of (Herbert) Paul Grice on conversational implicative and the cooperative principle, and on the work of Stephen Levinson, Penelope Brown and Geoff Leech on politeness¹. Searle (1969:17) quoted in a website; Speech Acts explains that pragmatics is an approach which views the theory of meaning (and in fact the whole language) as a sub part of a theory of action (illocutionary) ². In one of the articles which is taken from a website, according to Austin' preliminary informal description, the idea of an "illocutionary act can be captured by emphasizing that "by saying something, we do something" ³. Speech act theory broadly explains these utterances as having three parts or aspects: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.

1. Locutionary acts are simply the speech acts that have taken place.
2. Illocutionary acts are the real actions which are performed by the utterance, where saying equals doing, as in betting, plighting one's troth, welcoming and warning
3. Perlocutionary acts are the effects of the utterance on the listener, who accepts the bet or pledge of marriage, is welcomed or warned

Searle (1975) in the article which has been taken from one of the websites has set up the following classification of illocutionary speech acts:

1. Assertive; speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition.
2. Directives; speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, e.g. request, command and advice.
3. Commissive; speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action, e.g. promises and oaths.
4. Expressives; speech acts that express on the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, e.g. congratulation, excuses, and thanks.
5. Declaratives; speech acts that change the reality in accordance with the proposition of the declaration, e.g. baptisms, pronouncing someone guilty or pronouncing someone's husband and wife.

Thus meaning pragmatically is defined in terms of what the speech acts of speakers perform relatively to hearers. It means that the speaker in fact has the social or legal (or other kind of) standing to accomplish the act depends on some things beyond the mere speaking of the words. Generally pragmatics is how the context influences the way one interprets a sentence. The function of pragmatics is how the language user applies their knowledge to interpret their utterances. It shows how important the pragmatics in conversation.

Politeness in English Conversation

A polite person makes others feel comfortable. Being linguistically polite involves speaking to people appropriately in the light of their (a polite person) relationship to hearer. Holmes (2001:268) has stated that making decisions about what is or is not considered polite in any community involves assessing social relationships along the dimensions of social distance or solidarity, and relative power or status. People need to understand the social values of society in order to speak politely.

An important element in the assessment of a polite act is judging whether an utterance is appropriate or not, either in relation to the perceived norms of the situation, the practices of community or the perceived norms of the society as a whole. The notion of appropriateness is a very difficult one to engage with, as Walsh has noted. It is generally drawn on as a way of avoiding analysis of the structural inequalities in conversation which lead to certain notions of appropriateness being formulated which favor the dominant group's norms. However, it remains a useful term to use with caution when discussing the way that individuals come to an assessment of their own and other's utterances in relation to a set of perceived group norms. It should be noted also that individuals may have misguided notion of what is appropriate within a particular group.

Holmes (2001: 268) has also given the two dimensions as the basis for a distinction between two different types of politeness. Positive politeness is solidarity oriented. It emphasizes shared attitudes and values. When the boss suggests that a subordinate should use the first name (FN) to him/her, this is a

positive politeness move, expressing solidarity and minimizing status differences. A shift to a more informal style using slang and swear words will function similarly as an expression of positive politeness. By contrast, negative politeness

pays people respect and avoids intruding on them. Indirect directives such as 'Could you stay a bit later tonight, or do you think, and finish this job?', 'that job's taking longer than we predicted', 'I don't know what we'll do if it isn't ready for tomorrow', express negative politeness. Negative politeness involves expressing oneself appropriately in terms of social distance and respecting status differences.

Using title + last name (TLN) to your (the speaker's) superiors, and to older people that you (the speaker) do not know well, are further examples of the expression of negative politeness.

In the article of Brown and Levinson (1987) formulate a detailed, cross-linguistics taxonomy of politeness strategies. The politeness is inclined by two kinds of "face" and two related kinds of politeness, they are:

1. Negative politeness

It is used by a speaker to satisfy a hearer's negative face. It functions to avoid or minimize the imposition of a face-threatening act on a hearer. Negative politeness is characterized by speaker self-effacement, formality and restraint and conventionalized indirectness. Example: 'I'm sorry I'm late; I miss the bus this morning.' (Apologize).

2. Positive politeness

It is used by a speaker to satisfy a hearer's positive face. The speaker indicates solidarity with the hearer's positive self-image. Its function is more subtly than negative politeness, to satisfy the hearer's need for approval and belonging. Example: 'I'll bring the book tomorrow' (promise).

Brown and Levinson (1987) in Cutting (2002: 45-48) also propose both types of politeness interaction in complicated ways, according to the nature of the act and the status of the speaker and the hearer. Here are some Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies that manifest in several languages they examine:

Politeness Strategies

1. Notice, attend to hearer's interest, wants, etc
2. Use in- group markers
3. Be optimistic
4. Seek agreement
5. Indicate common ground
6. Offer, promise
7. Give and ask reason
8. Common statements
9. Include the speaker and the hearer in a conversation

Negative Politeness Strategies

1. Be conventionally indirect
2. Question, hedge
3. Be pessimistic
4. Minimize the imposition
5. Give deference
6. Apologize
7. Hesitation
8. Avoid pronoun, I, you and we
9. Give impression as a cost

Those strategies are operated in a conversation of non-native speaker in their daily activities. In this research, the researcher shows how the non-native speakers apply the strategies of Negative Politeness and Positive Politeness.

The Necessity of Politeness Principles in the Conversation.

People talk with the intention to communicate something to somebody; this is the foundation of all linguistic behaviors. This is called as the Communicative Principle: when communicating, speakers try to be understood correctly, and avoid giving false impression. It is given that I 'want' to communicate, what I 'do' communicate depending on what I 'can' communicate, (given my

circumstances), and on what I must communicate (given my partner's expectation). Communication is not a matter of logic and truth, but of cooperation. The Communicative Principle is unlike a grammatical rule, operates in concrete context, rather than in the abstract space of linguistic speculation.

Communication, furthermore, requires people to cooperate; the bare facts of communication come alive only in a mutually accepted, pragmatically determined context. In social science generally and linguistics specifically, the Cooperative Principle describes how people interact with one another. Mey (2001: 72) has written that Grice's theory in Grice (1975,1989) states that cooperation has itself been elevated to the status of an independent principle, whose Cooperative Principle (CP) consists of four pragmatics sub principles, or 'maxims', namely :

The maxim of *quantity*: Information

1. Make your contribution as informative as required for the current purposes of the exchange.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than required.

The maxim of *quality*: Truth

3. Do not say what you believe to be false;
4. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The maxim of *relation*: Relevance

Make your contribution relevant.

The maxim of *manner*: Clarity

1. Avoid obscurity of expression. ("Eschew obfuscation").
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief ("avoid unnecessary prolixity").
4. Be orderly.

Cutting (2002: 34-36) writes the observation of the four maxims that has listed been above.

1. The maxim of quantity, which says that speakers should be as informative as is required, that they should give neither too little information nor too much. Some speakers like to point to the fact that they know how much information the hearer

requires or can be bothered with, and say something like, 'well, to cut a long story short, she didn't get home till two'. People who give too little information risk their hearer not being able to identify what they are talking about because they are not explicit enough; those who give more information than the hearer needs risk boring them.

2. The maxim of quality, says that speakers are expected to be sincere, to be saying something that they believe corresponds to reality. They are assumed not to say anything that they believe to be false or anything for which they lack evidence. Some speakers like to draw their hearers' attention to the fact that they are only saying what they believe to be true, and that they lack adequate evidence.

3. The maxim of relation, which says that speakers are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been said before. Thus, if we hear 'The baby cried. The mommy picked it up', we assumed that the mommy was the mother of the crying baby and that she picked the baby up because it was crying.

4. The maxim of manner, which says that the utterance should be brief and orderly, and avoid obscurity and ambiguity. In this exchange from a committee, the speaker points to the fact that he is observing the maxim: 'Thank you Chairman. Jus-just clarify one point. There is a meeting of the police committee on there is an item on their budget for the provision of their camera.' Grice (1975) says that hearers assume that speakers observe the cooperative principle, and that it is the knowledge

of the four maxims that allows hearers to draw inferences about the speakers' intention and implied meaning. The meaning conveyed by speakers and recovered as a result of the hearer's inferences, is known as 'conversational implicature'. Based on Grice's theory, those four conversational maxims arise from pragmatics of natural language. Those maxims may be better understood as describing the assumptions listeners normally make about the way speakers will talk, rather than prescriptions for how one ought to talk. Grice does not, however, assume that all people should constantly follow these maxims. Instead, he found it interesting when these were "flouted" or "violated" (either purposefully or unintentionally breaking the maxim) by speaker, which would imply some other, hidden meaning. The importance was in what was not said. For example: "it's raining" is in violation of quality of spoken language; however, in context (e.g. when someone has suggested a game of tennis) the reasoning behind this 'fragment' sentence become clear. Unfortunately Leech insists that there are some objections to Grice's maxims, there are

1. The conversational constraints such as those of the CP do not work because the majority of declarative sentences do not have an information bearing function.
2. The CP maxims are not universal to language, since there are linguistic communities to which not all of them apply.

Therefore, it shows that the CP is in a weak position, as a matter of fact the Politeness Principle (PP) can be seen not just as another principle to be added to the CP, but as a necessary complement, which rescues the CP from serious trouble. Leech's Politeness Principle is supposed to collaborate with, and even rescue, the Cooperative Principle and its associated maxims. Grice does not only introduce this kind of principle, but also the politeness principle. He explains that we also need it in our conversations.

According to Leech (1983) that has been summarized by Cutting (2002: 49-50), there is a politeness principle with conversational maxims similar to those formulated by Grice. He lists six maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. The first and second ones form a pair, as do the third and the fourth. These maxims vary from culture to culture, meaning, what may be considered as polite in one culture, may be strange or downright rude in another.

1. The Tact maxim

The Tact maxim states: 'minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other; maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other.' The first part of this maxim fits in with Brown and Levinson's negative politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interest, wants, and needs:

- Could I interrupt you for a second?
- If I could just clarify this then.

2. The Generosity maxim

Leech's Generosity maxim states: 'minimize the expression of benefit to self; maximize the expression of cost to self.' Unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker, and says that others should be put first instead of the self. For example,

- You relax and let me do the dishes.
- You must come and have dinner with us.

3. The Approbation maxim

The Approbation maxim states: 'minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other.' The operation of this maxim is fairly obvious: all thing being equal, we prefer to praise others and if we cannot do so, to sidestep the issue, to give some sort of minimal response (possibly through the use of euphemisms

or to remain silent). The first part of the maxim avoids disagreement; the second part intends to make other people feel good by showing solidarity. For example,

- I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. It was,
um...different.

- John, I know you're a genius – would you know how to solve
this math problem here?

4. The Modesty maxim

The Modesty maxim states: 'maximize the expression of praise of self; maximize the expression of dispraise of self.' Modesty is possibly a more complex maxim than the others, since the maxim of quality can sometimes be violated in observing it. For example,

1) Oh, I'm so stupid

2) I didn't make a note of our lecture! Did you?

5. The Agreement maxim

The Agreement maxim runs as follows: 'minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximize the expression of agreement between self and other.' It is in line with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies of 'seek agreement' and 'avoid disagreement', to which they attach great importance. However, it is not being claimed that people totally avoid disagreement. It is simply observed that they are much more direct in expressing agreement, rather than disagreement. For example,

A: I don't want my daughter to do this; I want her to do that.

B: Yes, but ma'am, I thought we resolved this already on your last
visit.

6. The Sympathy maxim

The Sympathy maxim states: 'minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other.' This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration, and expressing condolences 1) all of which is in accordance with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interests, wants, and needs:

2) I was sorry to hear about your father.

2. Methodology Of Research

This research is a qualitative research because in this research, the data of this research are not in the form of numbers. It is also an interpretative research. So the writer used qualitative method. The researcher considered four parameters that has been suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984) in Craswell's (1994: 149), these are the setting (where the researcher will take place), the actors (who will be observed doing or interviewed), the events (what the actors will be observed doing or interviewed about) and the process (the evolving nature of events undertaken by the actors within the setting). The setting is at the office area of Language and Arts Faculty office. The actors are the three administrative staffs. The event is the finding of the maxim of politeness principles in the daily conversation. The process is observing the maxim of politeness principles found in the conversation in order to know what conversation mostly used that show the maxim of politeness principles in the academic services.

Participants

The data are obtained from some conversations of the staffs of Language and Arts Faculty of HKBP Nommensen University Medan, with some students. The researcher observed them in the context of Indonesian.

The writer ask the students to used hand phone recorder as the instrument to get data on whether the maxim of politeness principles were found in the conversations which was recorded and the data is transcribed into words.

The Procedures of Data Analysis

The writer transcribes the data of the recording conversation and analyze them to get an answer on how they apply the maxim of politeness principles. After getting the data, the writer checked which Maxims were commonly used and which Maxims were left behind. After that, the researcher checked which maxims of politeness were more often used when the respondents make utterances in the conversation. The writer also counts the applications of the Maxims of the politeness principles. Thus the final result showed the total using of the maxim of politeness principles.

The Procedure of Analyzing Data

In qualitative research, collecting the data can be done in various setting, various resources and various techniques. Based on the setting, this research use natural setting as the location is at the FBS office.. The research conducted until the researcher gets enough data which started from the end of June 2015. The following chronological steps are undertaken to obtain the data of this study:

Recording the staffs' utterances in the office and also the students' responses to the utterances or the request. 2. Transcribing the recording. 3. Identifying the staff's directives and expressive speech acts and also politeness strategies that are used. 4. Analyzing the effect of politeness strategies used by the staff

Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging the observation transcripts, audio visual transcripts, and other materials that the researcher accumulate to increase her own understanding of them and to enable her to present what she has discovered to others (Bogdan and Bilden, 1992). The analysis involves three concurrent flows of activity, namely, data reduction, data display, and conclusion.

The researcher first identified data. summarizing the data which is in the form of words, subsuming which means grouping the data into the similar category. Afterwards the researcher displayed the data as an organized assembly of information that permits conclusion and action taking (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). The last activity is conclusion which was done through deciding what the data means of finding pattern or regularities after reading the matrices or display.

The background of the 3 of interviewee or Staffs,

There are 3 Staffs that become the subject of research, they are working on the same office room and they have the different job description. They serve all the administrative affair and also serve the students .

According to Leech (1993), there are six maxims used in politeness principle in analyzing politeness. Politeness involves minimizing the cost and maximizing the benefit to speaker. Theoretically, the politeness consists of six maxims namely' tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim. Tact maxim is a

strategy when the speakers try to minimize cost to others and maximize the benefit to others. The generosity maxim is used when the speakers try to maximize profits by adding cost for him. Approbation maxim is to dispraise of others and try to maximize praise of others. Modesty maxim is to minimize the expressions of praise of self and maximize the expression of dispraise of self. Agreement maxim is used by the speakers to build their agreements so that they will be polite each other. And the last is sympathy maxim This is used to minimize antipathy between self and others and try to maximize sympathy between self and others. The staffs used politeness principles in their speech. From the observation conducted it was found that the staffs used four types of politeness strategies in their communication.

The following are the frequency of the four types of politeness principles used by the teachers according to the theory of politeness principles

Table 1. The Occurrence of Different Types of Politeness Principles of the FBS staffs

To be more details, there was data presented on the following page about which politeness

| Types of Politeness | NS | MT | SiM |
|---------------------|----|----|-----|
| Principles | | | |
| Tact maxim | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| Generosity Maxim | 3 | - | 3 |
| Approbation Maxim | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Modesty Maxim | - | - | - |
| Agreement Maxim | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Sympathy Maxim | - | - | - |

principles used by each subject and how many times they used each politeness principles which was delivered according to the sequence of number of all data.

There were data presented on the table about how much compliance that the students gave to the teachers' utterances in politeness and which politeness strategies didn't get the compliances from the students.

Based on the data, the staffs used tact maxim in their communication to the students because they want to reduce or minimize their benefit and maximize the benefit to students. Because of the researcher focused on the directive speech, the staffs used tact maxim when they are commanding, questioning, begging, and instructing, requesting, warning to the students. It can be seen in the data below.

The examples of tact maxim used by the students and Staffs as follows:

Politeness on FBS staff:

1. There are good and patient if anyone asks
2. There are getting annoyed if the students come together ask questions
3. There are always like to make a joking if anyone asks

1. Interviews to FBS Administrative Staff:

1. Mr. MT

A student : Excuse me Sir, I would like to ask you about something?

Mr.MT : Hey Yanti, what do you want to ask about?

A student : Is there have scholarship from Bank BCA or from another bank, Sir?

Mr.MT : Nothing on this year but later i will find out who knows there is a scholarship again, why?

A student: Nothing Sir, I just wanted to know because I wanna get a scholarship hahaha

Mr.MT : Oh ha ha ha ha

A student : Yes Sir that's it. Thank you so much

Mr.MT : Okay Yanti, no worries.

2. Ms. NS

A student: Excuse me Miss, I would like to ask you about something?

Ms. NS : what would you like to ask about?

A student : Is there any TOEFL try out?

Ms. NS : Oh it was a month ago from *Primus Interpares*, but no TOEFL try out on this month. If it have, later we will tell you

A student : Oh I see.

Ms. NS : Why? Who wants to join TOEFL?

A student : My sibling Miss, she wants to join TOEFL and wanted to know her TOEFL score achievement .

Ms. NS : Tell her to find out from another university such as USU, that university also have TOEFL try out event.

A student: Okay Miss ,thanks for your information

Ms. NS: Your welcome

3. Ms. SiM

A student : excuse me, Ms. Sinta, do you see Ms Hotnida?

Ms. SiM : I saw her in here but maybe she was go home, why?

A student: Nothing Ms, because Miss. Hotnida told us if she isn't here, submit our assignment to Ms. Sinta

Ms. SiM: What kind of assignment?

A student: Assignment from her, Ms

Ms. SiM : Oh, where is it?

A student : Here, please give this to her tommorow okay Ms

Ms. SiM : Okay

A student : Thanks Ms

Ms. SiM : Hmm okay okay

From the conversation it is learned that,

Mr. MT : Notice, exaggerate, intensify interest, seek agreement, jokes and be optimistic.

Ms. NS : Notice and give reasons

Negative Politeness : Question ,hedge, minimize imposition, impersonalize, nominative
Ms. SiM : Notice, intensify interest, seek agreement, offer, promise, be optimistic.

There are good and patient if anyone asks, there are quick to feel annoyed if anyone asks and there are like to make a joking if anyone asks.

4. With Mr.MT

Student 1 : sir ,I 'd like to ask you something

Mr.MT : what's that?

Student 1 : about PPL Sir

Mr.MT : what semester you are now?

Student 1 : semester 4. But i want to know about PPL

Mr.MT: A PPL for semester 6 and it doesn't held in here but in office, hotel during one month

Student 1 : ok, that's right

Mr.MT : do you understand?

Student 1 : yes Mr. Thank you

Mr.MT : ok

5. With Ms.NS

Student 1 : Ms, I'd like to ask you about my writing and communicative skill score because my score is not available on website.

Ms.NS: how could it be?

Have you seen on FBS blackboard?

Student 1 : I've checked it, but I couldn't see my score

Ms.NS : are you sure?

Student 1 : yes, I'm sure

Ms.NS : let me check your score. Wait a minute

This is your score, you can see it.

Student 1 : yes Mrs,thankyou.

6. With Ms.SiM

Student 1 : Ms SiM,can you see Ms Nova?

Ms.SiM : Ms Nova still free

Student 1 : why Ms Nova leave?

Ms.SiM: Ms Nova wanna giving a birth

Student 1 : how long Ms Nova took a leave ?

Ms.SiM : three months

Student 1 : alright Thank you Ms SiM

Ms.SiM : yah

Ms.MT : jokes, be optimistic, give reasons, seek agreement, apologize, notice, exaggerate, intensify interest

Ms.NS : give reasons, question, hedge, notice, minimize imposition impersonalize, nominative
Ms.SiM : seek agreement, be optimistic, give reasons, notice, intensify interest, offer, promise.

In this conversation it is found that the staffs used tact maxim to the students. The staffs minimize her cost and maximize the students benefit by uttering In the conversation, it is found. that MT used tact maxim in order to maximize benefit for others and minimize her own benefits. The utterance produced by the staffs showed tact maxim as the teacher expressed indirectly that usually more polite than the speech acts expressed directly.

Based on the phenomena, the researcher found that the subjects also used generosity maxim. The intent of this maxim is to make the advantages of the speaker as small as possible. In this maxim, the participants are expect substitutions being respectful of others. Respect for others happened if people can reduce profits for himself and maximize profits for others.

In one the conversation, the staff tried to advice the students about Toefl Try out . In getting the staffs' response, the staffs used generosity maxim by giving them more information . The staff tried to reduce profits for her and maximize profits for the students.

In this conversation, the staff commanded the students to prepare for the PPL . So, the staffs with minimizing profits for her .The other conversation showed the staffs used generosity maxim by saying *let me check your score. Wait a minute.* The staff was willing to help the students In this conversation, the teacher tried to reduce her profit and to maximize profits by saying In this situation, the staff reduced her profits to students by willing to tell him the answer of her score so as to help the students

After analyzing the data, the researcher also found that the subjects also used approbation maxim as their politeness principle. This approbation maxim is to maximize respect for others and minimize the disrespect to others that expressed by expressive speech such as congratulated, thanked, praised, and express condolence (Isdianto,2008:11).

After analyzing this utterance, it was showed that the staff used approbation maxim to praise the students' right answer by saying In this conversation, the teacher tried to maximize respect to the students in order to get respect which then caused compliance for the next command from them.

There are six maxims as the types of politeness strategies. They are tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim. In this study, the researcher analyzed the data and found one kind of those politeness strategies was dominantly used in the staffs' utterances in directive and expressive speech acts. The researcher tried to show the dominant

The percentage of Politeness Principles in MT's utterances

The matrixes above showed that tact maxim was dominantly used in teachers' utterances in directive speech when communicating to their students. This was because the teachers were easier and felt more appropriate of using this type in directive speech as the researcher mostly focused.

Students' Compliance in Staffs' Utterances by Using Politeness Principles

Compliance refers to a particular of response to a particular communication (Cialdini, 2003:592). After receiving a request or command, targets use their feelings as cues for effective responding.

According to Zhang. (2009:350), the more polite someone's request, it will elicit positive emotions (e.g. happiness) then cause compliance and the more impolite someone's request, it will elicit negative

Discussions

After analyzing the data, there were some points that were considered as the important things to be discussed.

The types of politeness principles were uttered by the staffs of FBS – UHN . Those types namely tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, and agreement maxim. These types of politeness principles were uttered by the teachers to the students in their communication in directive speech acts and expressive speech acts. There are two other types of politeness principles that were not found in this study. They were modesty maxim and sympathy maxim. Based on the data, the teachers did not utter those two types of politeness principles. It is similar to Yadi (2012) in his paper that he also found four types of politeness strategies in his study, namely tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim and agreement maxim. These types of politeness have their own functions when they were uttered. In Yadi (2012), tact maxim was usually used in giving command in daily conversation at home. Agreement maxim was used to propose a deal or agreement. Generosity and approbation maxim were used in giving suggestion in daily conversation.

In line with the previous study) in. this research the researcher found that tact maxim was used when the teachers commanded, instructed, requested and questioned the students especially in directive speech acts. Agreement maxim was used to propose and suggest something to the students through making an agreement. The approbation and generosity maxim were used in praising and giving suggestions to the students.

It is similar to Zhang (2009) in her paper, suggest to use high politeness then caused compliance. She stated that giving request or utterance to the students with high politeness will evoke positive emotions then caused compliance and vice versa, giving request or utterance to the students with low politeness will evoke negative emotions and then caused resistance. Her study also indicates that positive emotions mediate the effects of teacher request politeness on student compliance intention. In other words, staffs' request politeness first elicits positive emotions from students, which then affect their compliance intention. While, strong and impolite languages are found to evoke negative emotions (e.g., anger), which then cause resistance.

4 Conclusions

After analyzing the data, the conclusions were stated as follows:

1. The staffs of FBS – UHN Medan used four of six types of politeness principles in directive and expressive speech act to communicate with the students at their services. They were tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim and agreement maxim.
2. The dominant type of politeness principles used by the staffs of FBS – UHN was tact maxim. The staffs were easier and felt more appropriate in using this type in directive speech acts as mostly focused on by the researcher.
3. The students didn't comply with all the staffs' utterances although they were already in polite way. They gave their compliances to some staffs' utterances or commands but in other way

they ignored the some else staffs' utterances to them. This was because of the influence of positive emotions and also strongly affected by their limited of pragmatic competence.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, this research has some suggestions to the staffs who have important role in giving services to the students as follows:

1. It is suggested to staffs to use politeness strategy in order to make them acquired and understood in communicating with people
2. In order to make the students are able to acquire and understand by using politeness, it is suggested to the staffs to use the maxim in communication with students.
3. In relation with the findings of this research, it is suggested to other researchers to use typology of politeness principles by Geoffrey Leech in classifying politeness since it can be found in any other context.

References

- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Bogdan, C.R Bikien, K.S. 1992. *Qualitative Research for Education. An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. United States of America: Allyn and Bacon
- Burroughs, N. F. (2007). *A reinvestigation of the relationship of teacher Nonverbal immediacy and student compliance-resistance with learning*. *Communication Education*
- Cialdini, B. Robert and Noah J. Goldstein.2003. *Social influence: compliance and conformity*. Arizona State University: Arizona
- Gibson, Emma Katherine.2009. *Would you like manners with that? A study of gender, polite questions and the fact food industry*. Giffith Working Papers
- Glaser, Karen. 2009. *Acquiring Pragmatic Competence in a foreign language- mastering preferred speech acts*. Chemnitz University of Technology:
- Guerrero, L. K., & La Valley, A. G. (2006). *Conflict, emotion, and communication*. In J. G. Oetzel & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Communication*
- Hunter, 3. E., & Boster, F. J. (1987). *A model of compliance-gaining message selection*. Communication Monographs
- Jiang, Xiaoqing. 2010. *A case of study of teacher 's politeness in EFL class*. Academy Publisher Manufactured: Findland
- Jin, So Ahn. 2007. *Korean ESL learner 'pragmatics competence: motivation, amount of contact and length of residence*. Texas A & M University.

- Kulka, Blum. 1987. *Indirectness and politeness in request. same or different*. Journal of Pragmatics: North Holland.
- Lamria, Mei Entalya. 2012. *Kesantunan Verbal dan Nonverbal pada Tuturan Direktf dalam pembelajaran di SMP Taman Rama National Plus Jimbaran*. Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Leech, G. 1993. *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press Markus, Marcie. (2011). *Politeness in Interaction*. Journal of Politeness Press.
- Miles, M., Huberman, A.M. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Beverly Hills: California Sage Publication. In Sibarani 2011.
- Pinter A. 2006. *A Review of Teaching Young Language Learners*. Oxford University Press
- Regan, T. Dennis. 1971. *Effects of a favor and liking on compliance*. Cornell University
- Reyes, Fabiola. (2008). *Polite Request in the Classroom: Mixing Grammar and Pragmatic Instruction*. University de Los Vandes: Venezuela
- Scott, A Wendy and Lisbeth H Ytreberg. 1990. *Teaching English to Children*. Longrnan: New York
- Situmeang, Canra. 2013. *The Politeness Strategies of Seven Years Old Children*. University of Medan: Medan
- Suparno.20 13. *Teacher's Directive Utterances in English Class*. Journal of Education and Practice. Sebelas Maret University
- Yadi, Ahmad. 2012. *Kesantunan berbahasa Mandailing dalam tindak tutur direktf anak kepada orang tua di Nagari Ujung Gading Kecamatan Lembah Melintang Kabupaten Pasaman*. Universitas Negeri Padang
- Yuka. Akutsu.2009. *Positive Politeness strategies in oral communication I text books*. Takasaki City University
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Zhang, Qin. (2009). *Teacher Request Politeness: Effect on students 'positive emotions and compliance intention*. Fairfield University : Mexico