Introduction: Language is a social association. Participants in linguistic exchange work on the basis of an implied or unspoken agreement that one reacts to the other. In everyday situations people communicate to get information, to gain knowledge about a topic or to reach a variety of goals. To be successful, one has to follow some important strategies. There exists a concept that serves as a bridge among the people when they are talking. It is called the Politeness Principle which has been developed by Geoffrey Leech. In the centre of this concept does not stand the information of a conversation, but the effect of what is said to the people. The following paper deals with Leech’s Politeness Principle and the Maxims of Politeness.

Need and Importance of Politeness Principle

Politeness principle can be explained in terms of two major purposes of human interaction:

A) act efficiently with other people.
B) create or maintain healthy social relationships.

While interacting, a teacher who believes in the communicative approach to teaching does not only appreciate but also encourages frequent interruptions. A question demands some kind of answer - positive or negative, declarative or interrogative and so on. In a dialogic classroom discussing things in pairs and groups accounts to be polite. In this way politeness phenomenon varies from situation to situation. In day–today conversation, the politeness principle manifests itself through both positive and negative modes. Whether one expresses agreement or disagreement, approval or disapproval acceptance or rejection is of secondary importance. What essentially required is that a communication should continuously contribute to the development of effective and healthy relationship through politeness principle. Thus, the essence of Politeness is the upholding of pleasant and smooth social relations.

Theories of the Politeness Principle

Referring to Searle’s categories of illocutionary acts, Leech points out a subdivision into negative and positive politeness. The negative politeness belongs
eminently to the directive group, while positive politeness is dominant in the expressive group. Among those groups there exists a variety of theories and maxims which are to deal with in the following paper.

Negative politeness dilutes the effect of decline expressions. Negative politeness is found in the various ways of mitigating an imposition. An example for this would be the following: (directive)

Help me to clean up the kitchen!

Other types of examples denoting negative politeness would be the following:

Pessimism: I don’t suppose you could close the window, could you?

Indicating deference: Excuse me, sir, would you mind if I asked you to close the window?

Apologizing: I’m terribly sorry to disturb you, but could you close the window?

Impersonalizing: The management requires all windows to be closed.

Positive politeness emphasizes the hearer’s positive status. It also means being complimentary and gracious to the hearer (but if this is overdone, the speaker may alienate the other party). An example for positive politeness would be the following:

Thank you very much, that was extremely helpful (Cruse 2000: 362).

Hearer-orientated politeness is more crucial in developing harmonious relations rather than speaker oriented.

There are certain language expressions specialized for polite use (for example: please), but the bigger part comes across in the form of implicatures (Cruse 2000: 362).

Leech defines the Politeness Principle as “Minimize the expression of impolite beliefs” (Leech 1983: 81), for Alan D. Cruse this is not the best formulation, he prefers the statement: “Choose expressions which minimally belittle the hearer’s status” (Cruse 2000: 362). Therefore, Alan D. Cruse defines politeness as “first and foremost, a matter of what is said, and not a matter of what is thought or believed” (Cruse 2000: 362).

Things which may be thought to belittle the hearer’s status are:

Treating the hearer as subservient to one’s will, by desiring the hearer to do something which will cost effort, or restrict freedom, etc.

Saying bad things about the hearer or people or things related to the hearer

Expressing pleasure at the hearer’s misfortunes.

Disagreeing with the hearer, thus denigrating the hearer’s thoughts.

Praising oneself, or dwelling on one’s good fortune, or superiority. (Cruse 2000: 362).
In this way, the purpose of Politeness is the maintenance of harmonious and smooth social relations in the face of the necessity to convey decrease messages.

**Delimiting the politeness concept**

1. **Deference and politeness**

Before giving an outline it may be necessary to delimit the concept of politeness first to be not confused. In general Politeness is understood as the desire to be pleasant to fellow men. It is often wrongly connected with deference, although deference is a distinct phenomenon. It is the opposite of familiar relations. If one is polite, consideration and affection are shown, whereas deference refers to the respect that is given to other people (for example: of greater age or higher status). This is signaled by the form, the hearer is addressed and that is why the relationship between hearer and speaker plays an important role. Both theories have something in common. They appear through the linguistic means and the general social behavior of a human being. The base of their usage is sociolinguistic norms, but they are not dependent from each other. (It is for instance possible to be deferential without being polite.)

2. **Politeness as an utterance level phenomenon**

Another fact that has been connected with Politeness is utterance. Generally it was found out: "...the more grammatically complex or elaborate the strategy, the more highly it was rated for politeness." Example: (1) I wonder if you could ..........?

2) Please ..........!

(3) Do ..........!

The example presents different possibilities of expressing one ask. **It develops from a polite request (1) to an order (3).** The first relevant issue in this case is the context, because the hearer can just make sense out of the words when he knows the required context and the speaker may achieve his goal. Having further a look at the speech act in context and finding out which function a particular form in a language has to reach the speaker`s goal, it becomes obvious that there is no necessary connection between the perceived politeness of a speech act and the linguistic form. Therefore, there are several reasons like the relationship etc. Now, one can assume that it is not just the linguistic form which renders the speech act polite or impolite, but the linguistic form, the context of utterance, the relationship between hearer and speaker.

3. **Politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon**

Politeness, a conversational principle comes under pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study of communicative action in its socio-
cultural context which has many definitions. According to David Crystal, "Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (Crystal 1985, p. 240).

Leech isn’t concerned to create highly precise formalized rules such as those in the syntactic or semantic components of a grammar. (Watts 2003: 63) “Semantics is rule-governed (=grammatical), rather he deals with general pragmatics which is principle-controlled (=rhetorical)”. Leech clears concept of “general pragmatics” as the “general condition of the communicative use of a language” (Leech 1983: 5).

According to Leech, Grice’s Cooperative Principle (CP) is necessary and helps to account for the relation between what an utterance means in a particular context and what a Speaker intends to mean in a particular conversation. But Leech reveals a few problems with Grice’s Cooperative Principle.

A first problem is that the CP itself can’t explain why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean. And second the CP can’t explain what the relation between sense and force is when non-declarative types of sentences are being considered (Cruse 2000: 362).

For these reasons Leech proposes the Politeness Principle

**Maxims of Politeness Principle**

An important starting point for analysis of dialogue can be Leech’s politeness principle. There are six maxims of the politeness principle that are used to explain relationship between sense and force in daily conversation.

These are idea of mutual, reciprocal interactive helpfulness. And what is immediately apparent as we look at novels is often far removed from these ideals. Such distance need not imply complete absence of relation, however, between character’s actual speech and these ideals. The expectation of rational behavior is so strong that when we find one of the maxims not being evidently observed, we assume that the speaker is merely violating or disregarding it, but that – still politely – he or she is productively exploiting it, giving rise to some conversational implicature.

Conversational implicature denotes the intended meaning of an utterance which is not conveyed by the conventional meaning of the words used, but which is deducible from the utterance. This is so because the interpreter works at seeing how the speaker might still be being polite indirectly.
Leech lays down six important maxims of polite principles. They are as follows

1) The Tact Maxim
2) The Generosity Maxim
3) The Approbation Maxim
4) The Modesty Maxim
5) The Agreement Maxim
6) The Sympathy Maxim

1) The Tact Maxim

The tact maxim is minimizing cost to other and maximizing benefit to other. This maxim is applied in Searle’s speech act, commissives and directives called by Leech as impositives. Commissives is found in utterances that express speaker’s intention in the future action. Then, Directives/impositives are expressions that influence the hearer to do action. The example of the tact maxim is as follows:

“Won’t you sit down?”

It is the directive/impositive utterance. This utterance is spoken to ask the hearer sitting down. The speaker uses indirect utterance to be more polite and minimizing cost to the hearer. This utterance implies that sitting down is benefit to the hearer. This utterance implies that sitting down is benefit to the hearer.

2) The Generosity Maxim

The generosity maxim, the generosity maxim occurs in commissives and to self. Like tact maxim, the generosity maxim occurs in commissives and directives/impositives. This maxim is centered to self, while the tact maxim is to other. The example will be illustrated as follows:

“You must come and dinner with us.”

It is an advice utterance that is involved in directive illocutionary act. In this case the speaker implies that cost of the utterance is to his self. Meanwhile, the utterance implies that benefit is for the hearer.

3) The Approbation Maxim

The approbation maxim requires to minimizing dispraise of other and maximizing praise of other. This maxim instructs to avoid saying unpleasant things about others and especially about the hearer. This maxim occurs in assertive / representatives and expressive. Assertives / representatives are utterances that express the true propositional. Meanwhile, expressive are utterances that show the speaker feeling. The example is sampled below.

A: “The performance was great!”
B: “Yes, wasn’t it!”

In the example, A gives a good comment about the performance. He talks the pleasant thing about other. This expression is a congratulation utterance that maximizes praise of other. Thus this utterance is included the approbation maxim.

4) The Modesty Maxim
In the modesty maxim, the participants must minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self. This maxim is applied in assertive / representatives and expressive like the approbation maxim. Both the approbation maxim and the modesty maxim concern to the degree of good or bad evaluation of other or self that is uttered by the speaker. The approbation maxim is exemplified by courtesy of congratulation. On other hand, the modesty maxim usually occurs in apologies. The sample of the modesty maxim is below.

“Please accept this small gift as prize of your achievement.”

In this case, the utterance above is categorized as the modesty maxim because the speaker maximizes dispraise of himself. The speaker notices his utterance by using “small gift”.

5) The Agreement Maxim

In the agreement maxim, there is tendency to maximize agreement between self and other people and minimize disagreement between self and other. The disagreement, in this maxim, usually is expressed by regret or partial agreement. This maxim occurs in assertive / representatives illocutionary act. There example will be illustrated below.

A: “English is a difficult language to learn.”
B: “True, but the grammar is quite easy.”

From the example, B actually does not agree that all part of English language difficult to learn. He does not express his disagreement strongly to be more polite. The polite answer will influence the effect of the hearer. In this case, B’s answer minimize his disagreement using partial agreement.

6) The Sympathy Maxim

The sympathy maxim explains to minimize antipathy between self and other and maximize sympathy between self and other. In this case, the achievement being reached by other must be congratulated. On other hand, the calamity happens to other, must be given sympathy or condolences. This maxim is applicable in assertive / representatives. The example is as follows.

“I’m terribly sorry to hear about your father.

There is solidarity between the speaker and the hearer. It is a condolence expression which is expressed the sympathy for misfortune. This utterance is uttered when the hearer gets calamity of father’s died or sick. This expression shows the solidarity between the speaker and the hearer.

Analysis of Maxims

In stating his maxims Leech used his own terms for two kinds of illocutionary acts. He calls representatives or “assertive”, and calls directives “impositives”. 
Each maxim is accompanied by a sub-maxim, which is of less importance. They all support the idea that negative politeness (avoidance of disagreement) is more important than positive politeness (seeking agreement).

Not all of the maxims are equally important. For instance, tact influences what way say more powerfully than does generosity, while approbation is more important than modesty.

Speakers may adhere to more than one maxim of politeness at the same time. Often one maxim is on the forefront of the utterance, while a second maxim is implied. Speakers may adhere to more than one maxim of politeness at the same time. Often one maxim is on the forefront of the utterance, while a second maxim is implied.

Conclusion

This study makes an attempt to analyze a relationship between self and other from Politeness perspective. In conversation, self is identified as the speaker and other is the hearer. Besides that, the speaker also shows politeness to the third parties who may be present or not. The politeness principle (pp) is introduced by Geoffrey Leech. PP is Minimizing (other things being equal) the expression of impolite belief, and there is a corresponding positive version (maximizing (other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs) which is somewhat less important. There are certain language expressions specialized for polite use, for example: ‘please’, which always go with politeness. PP proposes how to produce and understand language based on politeness. The purpose of PP is to establish feeling of community and social relationship. Thus, PP focuses on process of interpretation that the center of the study is on the effect of the hearer rather than the speaker. It emphasizes on minimizing dispraise of other and maximizing praise of other.

From the analysis above, a conclusion can be drawn that politeness does promote the mutual understanding and harmonious relationship between the speaker and hearer; politeness does contribute to the effective interaction and friendly, lively atmosphere in the society.
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