

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Background of the Study

By and large, communication is a purposeful activity of exchanging information and meaning across space and time using various technical or natural means, whichever is available or preferred (Craig, 1999: 10). Communication makes information can easily be delivered from the speaker to listener. Communication requires a sender, a message, a medium and a recipient, although the receiver does not have to be present or aware of the sender's intent to communicate at the time of communication; thus communication can occur across vast distances in time and space. Communication requires that the communicating parties share an area of communicative commonality. The communication process is complete once the receiver understands the sender's message.

In the communication, politeness is the important aspect in human life, to make good communication between addressor and addressee. A politeness strategy uses more respect for other people or their selves. In the communication we can not convey utterance using politeness strategy, that case may hurt the addressee. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 60), the politeness strategy is used by addressee to avoid face threatening act toward addressee's face. According to Brown and Levinson (187: 60) is FTA (Face Threatening Act). If speakers say something

that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image, it is described as a face threatening act (Yule. 1996: 61).

People are not always polite or truthful in a conversation. Every conversation may contain the purpose of the speakers. These purposes can be good or bad from both of the speaker and listener. According to Peccei (1999: 27), violation is quiet in the sense that is certain at the time of the utterance that the speaker has deliberately lied, supplied insufficient information or been ambiguous, irrelevant or hard to understand (Anneke H 2008: 63). Cook (1989: 31-32) stated that there are five purposes that can be achieved by violated maxims, namely: to create hyperbole and irony, to change the topic, to keep secret and to create humor.

According to Ide (1989: 223), violation in politeness aims to save face. It is something emotionally invested, can be lost, maintained, or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interaction (Brown and Levinson, 1978: 66). Face', the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting in two related aspects:

- (a) Negative face: the basic claims to the territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
- (b) Positive face: the positive, consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire for this self – to be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.

In other words, it indicates the speaker's intention as s/he wants to be in a given situation. While Grice (1975) stated that violation takes place when speakers

intentionally refrain to apply maxims in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participants' part or to achieve some other purposes in the interaction.

A debate is a brainstorm activity between two or more, each is trying to influence people to accept the proposal which is submitted (Simon, 2005: 3). Or debate can be interpreted also as a specific theme disagreement between the supporters and the buffers through formal organized dialogue (Depdiknas, 2001: 2). While Andrew (1996: 82) stated debate is a method of interactive and representational argument. It is a formal contest of argumentation between two teams or individuals. More broadly, and more importantly, it is an essential tool for developing and maintaining democracy and open societies. More than a mere verbal or performance skill, it embodies the ideals of reasoned argument, tolerance for divergent points of view and rigorous self-examination. Debate is, above all, a way for those who hold opposing views to discuss controversial issues without descending to insult, emotional appeals or personal bias. A key trademark of debate is that it rarely ends in agreement, but rather allows for a robust analysis of the question at hand.

The researcher is interested in conducting a study to find out as expressed in the dialogue of the debate, particularly in presidential debate. We slightly do not see any politeness principle in any debate; however, it still works in it. She chooses to analyze since last general election, Indonesians chose their president by making presidential debate for the first time held by the government.

Dialogue is a conversation in which people think together in relationship (William, 2008: 19). Thinking together implies that person no longer take his or her own position as final. He/she relaxes his or her grip on certainty and listens to be the possibilities that result simply from being in a relationship with others. Dialogue addresses problem farther upstream than conventional approaches. It attempts to bring about change at the source of our thoughts and feelings, rather than at the level of result our ways of thinking produce.

When the researcher watched the “Indonesian Presidential Debate”, she paid attention to the conversation that happened in there. The conversation in the debate is similar with the real conversation since it needs good pronunciation, articulation and voicing to make an interaction among the characters. While the participants communicate in debate, they use utterances to express what in their mind toward the listener. Utterance produced by the speaker is not the function to explain in the speaker’s mind but also means to show the relationship between them as we can see it in speech act.

The preliminary data taken from written utterances of Indonesia’s Presidential Candidates Debate, section four, namely the participants give question and answer each other. The section of question-answer should have describe how someone respond the question or statement, does s/he speak politely or violate the politeness principle to achieve her/his purpose, as the example below:

Prabowo : Jokowi yang saya hormati, saya agak kaget. Dalam kampanye di Indramayu tanggal 17 Juni. Bapak mengatakan bahwa petani tidak perlu koperasi. Padahal kita mengetahui bahwa koperasi adalah soko guru bagi

ekonomi bangsa Indonesia. Apa maksud pertanyaan ini? **Kenapa bapak katakan petani tidak perlu koperasi.** Yakalau kami dengan tegas mengatakan koperasi vital bagi kehidupan petani-petani dan nelayankita. Jadi mohon dijelaskan kenapa sampai bapak mengambil sikap yang seperti itu, menganggap bahwa koperasi itu tidak perlu bagi petani-petanikita. Terimakasih.

(Mr. Jokowi whom I respect, I am quite surprised. In the campaign in Indramayu, June 17th. You said that farmers do not need Koperasi. Yet we know that the Koperasi is the pillar for the economy of Indonesia. What is the purpose of this question? **Why do you say that farmers should not need Koperasi.** Yes, if we firmly say that Koperasi is vital to the lives of farmers and our fishermen. So please explain why you take a stand like that, consider that the Koperasi was not necessary for our farmers. Thank you)

Moderator : Baik, dipersilahkan pak Jokowi – Jk untuk menjawab, waktunya dua menit, dipersilahkan.

(Well, Mr. Jokowi-Jk, you are welcome to answer in two minutes, please)

Jokowi : Terima kasih pak Prabowo. Mungkin bapak salah baca atau salah dengar. Saya kira semua orang tahu bahwa yang namanya koperasi itulah soko guru ekonomi kita. Semua orang tahu. Jadi tidak mungkin seorang Jokowi mengatakan seperti itu.

(Thank you Mr. Prabowo. Perhaps you misread or misheard. I think everyone knows that Koperasi that is the pillar of our economy. Everybody knows. So it is not possible to say such a Jokowi himself)

To analyze the utterances above, the researcher selected the question of Prabowo “**Kenapa bapak katakan petani tidak perlu koperasi**” (**Why do you say that farmers should not need Koperasi**) and the response of Jokowi “Mungkin bapak salah baca atau salah dengar. Saya kira semua orang tahu bahwa yang namanya koperasi itulah soko guru ekonomi kita. Semua orang tahu. Jadi tidak mungkin seorang Jokowi mengatakan seperti itu” (Perhaps you misread or misheard. I think everyone knows that Koperasi that is the pillar of our economy. Everybody knows. So it is not possible to say such a Jokowi himself). Finding out the purpose of the

Prabowo's question is firstly done so we can understand why Jokowi answers so. It is an evident that Prabowo wants to maximize the cost to the hearer and minimize the benefit to the hearer. He discredits Jokowi by asking why Jokowi stated farmers do not need Koperasi instead koperasi has been the pillar of Indonesia's economy as is it stated in Indonesia's law. **He obviously violates tact maxim.**

After reviewing relevant study by Sandra (2001) about Date Night movie, the researcher found the similarities of kinds of processing analyzing the data namely selecting, focusing, summarizing, coding, sorting the irrelevant data or even cluster of themes.

1.2 The Problems of the Study

Based on the background above, the following questions were forwarded as the research problems:

1. What are the types of maxims violation occurred in the context of politeness are used by the Indonesia's Presidential Candidates Debate?
2. How are the violations realized?
3. Why did the participants violate maxims of politeness principle in Indonesia's Presidential Candidates Debate ?

1.3 The Objectives of the Study

In relation of the problems, the objectives of the study are:

1. to describe the types of maxims violation are occurred in Indonesia's Presidential Candidates Debate.
2. to elaborate the linguistic realization.

3. to reason for the participants why they violated maxims of the politeness principle in Indonesia's Presidential Candidates Debate.

1.4 The Scope of the Study

This study applies the concept theories of the politeness principle proposed by Geoffrey Leech (1983). This analysis is pointed to investigate the politeness principle realized in "Presidential Candidates", namely subjective/objective explicit and subjective/objective implicit.

1.5 The Significance of the Study

Findings of the study are expected to offer theoretical and practical significance.

a. Theoretically

Findings of the study can add up theories of pragmatics particularly those related to the use of the language outside English. In addition to it, finding of the study can a reference for further study.

b. Practically

1. The finding can be useful for lecturer to enrich the scientific knowledge on pragmatics study, especially in the area of politeness.
2. For the student of English department who are interested in politeness and it has significance as an effort to study discourse analysis through pragmatic approach.
3. Other researchers to conduct other research on politeness maxim in doing similar research in future which the finding can give benefit progress in linguistic field.