The Analysis of Politeness Principles on Literature and Language Teaching in Class Presentation

Alvi Rizqi Barik
English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang
alvirizqibarik@gmail.com

How to Cite: APA Style 7th edition

ABSTRACT

This research examined the deviation of maxims of politeness produced by English lecturers and students of an Islamic University in Malang in class presentation activity. Qualitative design was used in this research. The researcher employed an observation to learn how the deviation occurred based on the fact and reality that happened during the activity. The data of the research were taken from three classes. The research participants were three lecturers and 240 students of the fifth semester. The analysis of the data used the theory proposed by Leech (1983) that classified six maxims of politeness principles including tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim. This research found that there were 18 utterances produced by English lecturers and students in class presentation activity which deviated 3 maxims of politeness principles including: tact maxim, generosity maxim and agreement maxim. It could be concluded that the deviation of maxims of politeness was rarely found in the class presentation because the politeness principle was applied appropriately in academic interaction context. For the future researchers who would conduct similar study about the deviation of maxims of politeness, they can investigate deeply about gender differences that deviates more in class interaction activity to gain more information on the discussion of deviation of maxims of politeness.

Keywords: class presentation, deviation, politeness principles

INTRODUCTION

The politeness principle is often a popular topic in pragmatics research. Meanwhile, it is uncommon to see a discussion of its deviation, especially in academic setting. Politeness deals with the relation between speaker and the hearer as politeness focuses on how the speaker creates acceptable utterances to represent the concept in such a way that the utterance does not hurt the interlocutor's feeling and makes the dialogue comfortable. However, there are a number of situations where the deviation may occur. People often face difficulties in controlling the language at communication, and sometimes it causes

deviation (Raihan et al., 2022). Therefore, to offer fresh perspective in the study of pragmatics, this research examined the deviation of politeness principles.

Pragmatics is understood as one of the linguistics branches which the study relates to human interaction in communication to create positive interactions. According to Leech (1983), pragmatics is a study that focuses on how an utterance has meaning in a case. Thus, it can be understood that pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to communication context and how it is applied to comprehend how language is utilized in communication. Further, in communication, people are supposed to respect to others to minimize misunderstanding during the interaction. One of the discussions about pragmatics which describes the way to construct good communication is called politeness principle.

Basically, being cooperative is needed to construct good communication, minimize conflict in communication and ensure that the context of communication is well shared to the hearer. Putu (1996) stated that people are aware of such communication conventions as the use of intonation and diction. People also have responsibility to what they say based on the norm of linguistics in conversation (Purwanto, 2020). Politeness principle is viewed pragmatically as a system that helps people avoid conflict in communication. Supported by Lech (1983), being polite is defined as using polite word, do not give direct command and respect to others (Haryanto et. al., 2018).

A number of researches were done to look into how the politeness principle was violated in movies. Serly (2018) investigated politeness and maxims violation in movie entitled "Blade Runner 2049". She used two theories proposed by Lakoff (1973) and Grice (1975) and the research found that the character of Blade Runner employed all types of politeness strategies related to the maxim. Putri (2018) investigated the violations of politeness maxims in "Harry Potter and The Chamber of Secrets" movie. The result showed that the researcher found deviations of the six maxims of Politeness Principle proposed by Leech. Arniatika (2019) examined the violation of Grice Maxims and Politeness Maxim proposed by Leech in the movie entitled "Mean Girls 2". The research found that there were 80 violations of Grice Maxim and 48 violations of Politeness Maxims in the movie.

Other researches had looked at how the politeness rule was violated, in movies. Novandini (2020) investigated the violation and the intention of the violation of Politeness Principle used by the characters of *Spongebob Squarepants* cartoon animation. The research found that the character violated all types of maxims and agreement maxim was the most types violated by the character. Hartono and Mulatsih (2021) studied the use of violation of politeness principles in the movie "The Avengers". According to the study, characters frequently violated politeness rules rather than following them, with the tact rule being the most frequently violated.

Some studies also investigated about the deviation of politeness principle in educational settings. Haryanto et al. (2018) conducted research on the politeness principle applied by English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers during interactions with students during teaching and learning. Fauzi et al. (2020) study the factors that caused violations in students' speech on multicultural societies. The researchers found there was five of Politeness Principle violated by the students. Mulawarman et al. (2021) investigated language politeness and gender representation in speech at Senior High School and Vocational High School of Samarinda City and Kutai Kartanegara Regency which the researcher found that male students deviate more the maxims of politeness rather than female students.

Correspondingauthor: alvirizqibarik@gmail.com

There were other studies on the deviation from the politeness principle. Purwanti and Herbianto (2021) investigated the types and the effects of violation of politeness principle maxims in a comedy series entitled "Mind Your Language" in which their research found that there were six maxims violated and fourteen effects. Nisa et al. (2022) examined the types of maxims of Politeness Principle violated in the Skinnyindonesian24 YouTube Channel. The research found that all types of maxims of Politeness Principle were violated. Raihan et al. (2022) investigated the form and cause of the deviation of Politeness Principle in CNN Indonesia channel comment column and in the YouTube of Kompas TV. The research found 69 violations from the maxims of Politeness from 54 data collected.

The present researcher had similar study with the research conducted by Haryanto et al. (2018) about the politeness principle used by English Foreign Language (EFL) teacher along the teaching and learning interaction with the student. The previous research had concentrated its examination on the application of the politeness principle in classroom interactions, while this research studied the lecturers and students in classroom presentation activity. Further, the researcher considered the previous research contains a gap in which it needs to fill in case of politeness principle analysis. Thus, the present study aimed to fill the gap by examining the deviation of politeness principle with an aim to develop the understanding on the discussion in the term of politeness principle analysis.

The analysis of the deviation of politeness principle that happened during class interactions, particularly during the presentation process, was the main emphasis of this study. The researcher considered that when people with different social background had time to share idea, the deviation often occurs in their utterance. Thus, the researcher chose class presentation activities as the data source of the research. It focused on finding the deviation of politeness principle produced by three lecturers and fifth semester students of English Literature Department in class presentation activities in three different subjects including History of English Literature, History of American Literature and English Language Teaching (ELT) at Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. The researcher considered those classes met the requirements for this research's necessary qualities.

This research used the theory of politeness principle proposed by Leech (1983) to analyze the data. The theory divided the politeness principle into six maxims, including: tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. People were considered to be impolite when they violate the maxims. Therefore, the researcher considered that the research on politeness principle deviation was important to examine. There are two research questions examined in this research, how the maxims of politeness deviated by the lecturers of English Literature Department of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang at class presentation activity, and how the maxims of Politeness deviated by the students of English Literature Department of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang at class presentation activity. In addition, the researcher aimed to limit the analysis on finding the types of maxims of politeness principle that were deviated in the class presentation activities by lecturers and students by considering the politeness principles theory proposed by Leech.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used descriptive qualitative research design to study the phenomenon happened in the context of Politeness Principle Deviation in class presentation at UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) stated that descriptive research

was the characteristic data in qualitative research, because the data were in the form of documents, audio-video recordings, transcripts, words, pictures, etc. Therefore, this research used descriptive qualitative research design by seeing that the research data were in the form of utterances which deviated the maxims of politeness proposed by Leech. In addition, the researcher collected the data from class presentation activities in three different classes including History of English Literature, History of American Literature and English Language Teaching (ELT) at the English Literature Department of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Meanwhile, the data were in the form of utterances that deviated the maxims of politeness by the three lecturers and 240 students of fifth semester students in the class presentation activities.

In the data collection process, the researcher did some steps to collect the data from the utterances produced by the lecturers and fifth semester students in History of English Literature, History of American Literature and English Language Teaching (ELT) classes. First, direct observation was conducted by paying attention to the three classes' class activities. Second, utilizing smart phone recording and record the conversations that took place in the class while the presentation was ongoing. Thirdly, transcribing the communication and checking the transcription with the recording. Fourthly, identifying the data in the form of sentences that deviate the maxims of politeness produced by lecturers and students of English Literature Department in class presentation process based on the theory of Politeness Principle by Leech (1983). Next, in analyzing the data, the researcher did some steps. First, grouping the data according to the many politeness principle maxims. They were the following: tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. Secondly, analyzing the data based on the theory of politeness principle proposed by Leech (1983). Finally, drawing conclusion in which the researcher concluded the finding of this research.

FINDINGS &DISCUSSION

This part displayed all the information regarding the politeness maxims that were deviated during the course of the presentation activity process, which was produced by lecturers and students. The results of this study demonstrated that the lecturers and students at the English Literature Department at UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang violated three maxims during a class presenting activity: the maxims of tact, generosity, and agreement. The following table contains information about how lecturers and students deviate the politeness principle.

Table 4.1. Data of politeness principles deviation by English Literature lecturers and students

Datum	Speaker	Utterances	Types of Deviation
Datum 1	Lecturer	**In English please!**	Tact maxim
Datum 2	Lecturer	Sorry for interrupting, I have to go to the rectorate. **I give the class to you** (the class captain). I'm so sorry, see you next week.	Tact maxim
Datum 3	Presenter	So, to avoid you from sleepy, I want one person to read once more about the title. Farhan, **I want you to read the title!**	Tact maxim
Datum 4	Presenter	**Listen to me**, I as the speaker	Tact maxim
Datum 5	Lecturer	Good? **I actually disagree**, but it's okay	Agreement maxim
Datum 6	Lecturer	Do you agree with Agus answer about student give explanation in front of his friend in young children class? **Personally, I disagree.**	Agreement maxim
Datum 7	Presenter	**10 more? no!!**	Agreement maxim
Datum 8	Audience	**Five!**	Agreement maxim
Datum 9	Presenter	Because the time is very limited, **we're going to take 3 questions**, any of you have question, please raise your hand, mention your name and then your question!	Generosity maxim
Datum 10	Audience	"**10 more,10 more**"	Generosity maxim
Datum 11	Audience	Hmm, **I ask again.** Giving additional question	Generosity maxim
Datum 12	Presenter	**For your question, actually your answer is on previous group presentation, for the explanation you can open the previous presentation from group 4, they also explain about romanticism very completely**. Oke, is that clear?	Generosity maxim
Datum 13	Audience	Hmm, **I ask again** "giving additional question".	Generosity maxim
Datum 14	Presenter	**Make it simple!**	Tact maxim
Datum 15	Presenter	**Stand up please!**	Tact maxim
Datum 16	Presenter	**Louder please!**	Tact maxim
Datum 17	Presenter	**Firda, listen up!**	Tact maxim
Datum 18	Presenter	**Repeat again!**	Tact maxim

The Deviation of Tact Maxim

According to the tact maxim, the speaker must maximize the interlocutor's benefits while minimizing the cost to the other parties (Leech, 1983). When the speaker provided

minimal benefit to the interlocutors at a high cost, such as when the speaker chose direct speech over indirect speech, which was viewed as more polite and had a greater chance of maintaining the interlocutor's feelings, this was regarded as departing from the maxim.

> *Datum 1*
> *(The presenter was answering the question from the audience)*
> *Lecturer: "**In English please!**"*
> *Presenter: "Yes, Ma'am."*

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT). The deviation occurred in the process of question - answer section, especially when the presenter answered the question from a student with Bahasa Indonesia and the lecturer admonished the presenter to use English. Therefore, based on the conversation, the bolded sentence was included into the type of the deviation of tact maxim in which the presenter aimed to answer the question from the student. However, the presenter answered the question in Bahasa Indonesia. After that, the lecturers admonished by saying *(In English please!)* where the lecturer wanted the presenter to use English in the classroom. The phrase *"In English please!"* was commanded in a direct manner, deviating from tact maxim since it compromised the presenter's ability to respond to the question in a way that was natural to them.

> *Datum 2*
> *(The question - answer section)*
> *Lecturer: "Sorry for interrupting, I have to go to the rectorate. **I give the class to you***
> *(The class captain). I'm so sorry, see you next week."*

The situation happened in History of English Literature (HEL) B, the remark that contained of the deviation of politeness principle occurred in the section of question and answer was going. The deviation was produced by the lecturer with an aim to leave the class.

Based on the interaction, the bolded sentence was included into the types of the deviation of tact maxim. The lecturer had intended to leave the class for a particular reason, but since the question - answer portion was still in progress, the lecturer gave the class's leader instructions and delivered a directive speech to keep the class moving. Based on the highlighted phrase *(I give the class to you)*, the lecturer deviates the tact maxim since it places responsibility on the interlocutors.

> *Datum 3*
> *Presenter: "Everyone, are you sleepy?"*
> *Audience: "No"*
> *Presenter: "So, to avoid you from sleepy, I want one person to read once more about the title.*
> *Farhan, **I want you to read the title!**"*
> *Audience: "Read"*

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) B1. The deviation occurred when the presentation activity was going on, especially when the second presenter started to present the material. The presenter aimed to make sure that the students still focused in joining the class. Therefore, the second presenter asked to the students if the students were sleepy or not, but the presenter was not satisfied on the

answer. Finally, she chose and ordered one of the students in class to read the title of the presentation. Based on their interactions, the second presenter created a tact deviation that sought to determine whether the students were still paying attention to the subject matter or not. As a result, the second presenter selected one of the class members to read the presentation's title. However, the presenter gave direct order to the interlocutor by saying, *"Farhan, I want you to read the title!"* This utterance deviates the tact maxim because it gives pressure to the students. According to the highlighted utterance, the speaker produced the utterance *"Farhan, I want you to read the title!"* Because the second presenter was not satisfied with the students' answer. Thus, the speaker ordered one of them with an aim to ensure that the students were not sleep

> *Datum 4*
> *(Presenter informing the role and the example of the game)*
> *(Audience Crowded)*
> *Presenter: "**Listen to me**, I as the speaker."*

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) B1. The deviation occurred in the section of ice breaking when the presenters informed the role and example from the game. However, the situation was not conducive because the class was so crowded. Thus, one of the presenters admonished the student to keep silent and listened to her. Based on the interaction, the presenter deviated the tact maxim in which the presenter aimed to make the condition of the class conducive which could make the activity ran well. Thus, the presenter instructed the students to pay attention to the speaker in order to minimize misunderstanding when the game was begun. The presenter instructed the students with a direct order in which the utterance deviated the tact maxim of politeness. The highlighted utterance *"Listen to me"* deviated the tact maxim because the utterance contained direct order to the student in which the utterance also gave pressure to the students.

The Deviation of Agreement Maxim

Agreement maxim required both the speaker and the interlocutor minimized disagreement and maximized agreement one another (Leech, 1983). Further, the speaker was not supposed to rebut directly as it considered to be impolite. Therefore, the maxim of agreement considered to be deviated when each of the speaker and the interlocutor maximized disagreement and minimized agreement one another.

> *Datum 5*
> *Lecturer: "Do you have any comment about the presenters, what do you think?"*
> *Audience: "Good"*
> *Lecturer: "Good? **I actually disagree**, but it's okay".*

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) A1, the remark which contained of deviation of agreement maxim occurred in the evaluation section in which the lecturer gave her comment on the presentation that had been done in the class especially when the lecturer asked the student about the presenter performance. Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of the deviation of agreement maxim. The lecturer asked to the student about presenter performance to make sure that the student paid attention to the speaker during the class activity, and the student gave an

answer that made the lecturer not satisfied and uttered her disagreement. Based on the highlighted utterance *(I actually disagree)*, the lecturer deviated the agreement maxim as it significantly maximized disagreement to the interlocutor.

> *Datum 6*
> *(The evaluation section)*
> *Lecturer: "Do you agree with Agus answer about student give explanation in front of his friend*
> *in young children class?* **Personally, I disagree.***"*

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) B1, the deviation itself occurred in the evaluation section especially when the lecturer asked the student about the opinion of Agus at the presentation. The lecturer felt not satisfied and she uttered her disagreement on the Agus's opinion. Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of the deviation of agreement maxim. The lecturer asked to the student about one of the presenter's answers at question - answer section, the lecturer also stated that she did not really agree with the answer. Thus, the lecturer asked student's opinion about Agus's statement. Based on the highlighted utterance *(Personally, I disagree)*, the lecturer deviates the agreement maxim as it showed significantly lecturer's disagreement on Agus's opinion.

> *Datum 7*
> *Presenter: "You want it more?"*
> *Audience: Yes "10 more,10 more"*
> *Presenter: "***10 more? no!***"*

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) B1 class. The deviation in the term of agreement maxim occurred in the ice breaking section especially when the presenter gave a chit-chat by asking the student either the student wanted to have more ice breaking or not. According to those conversations, the utterance *"10 more? no!!"* that was produced by the presenter significantly deviated the agreement maxim as the presenter rejected student's request in the section. Thus, based on the datum above there was no match between presenter and the student in which the presenter gave direct denial to student's request.

> *Datum 8*
> *First presenter: "Opening. So, we're from group five".*
> *Third presenter: "Four"*
> *Audience: "***Five***"*

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) A1. The remark that deviated the maxim of agreement occurred in the beginning of the presentation especially when the first presenter opened the presentation. Based on the conversation, the students were considered deviating the agreement maxim as the data had already shown that there was no match between the presenter and the student as the third presenter rebutted first presenter statement that the group was group five. However, the other students in classroom gave direct denial to the third presenter by saying "*five*". Thus, both the third

presenter and students deviated the maxim of agreement as they maximized disagreement between self to others.

The Deviation of Generosity Maxim

Generosity maxim is one of the maxims of politeness which required the speaker to minimize their own profits and maximize cost to themselves (Leech, 1983). Based on this, generosity maxim considered to be deviated by speakers when they gave lightest benefit to themselves while reducing their cost in communication.

> Datum 9
> Presenter: "So, we've done watching the movie"
> Audience: "Yes"
> Presenter: "Because the time is very limited, **we're going to take 3 questions**, any of you have question, please raise your hand, mention your name and then your question!"

The situation happened in History of American Literature (HAL) A class. The remark which was considered deviating the generosity maxim occurred in the beginning of question - answer section in which the section was begun after the student watched a movie that was presented by the presenter as additional information from the material. Based on the interaction, the utterance that was produced by the presenter deviated the generosity maxim as the presenter limited the student to express their initiative through asking question. However, the presenter burdened the student by just giving chance to ask for three questions as in the previous datum *"We're going to take 3 questions"*, the decision which was taken by the presenter was considered giving lightest benefit to the presenters themselves rather than taking self-sacrifice by giving chance to the students to ask more question.

> Datum 10
> Presenter: "You want it more?"
> Audience: Yes "**10 more, 10 more**"
> Presenter: "10 more? no!!"

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) B1 class. The utterance deviated the generosity maxim occurred in the ice breaking section in which the section was in the form of answering question that had been prepared by the presenter. The deviation occurred especially when the presenter gave a chit-chat by asking to the student what they want to have more questions? And the student answered that they wanted to have more. Based on the interaction, the utterance *"10 more, 10 more"* that was produced by the student deviated the generosity maxim as in the presentation activity, presenter had a right to control the presentation process in the classroom. Thus, the presenters had their own policy whether the ice breaking section was done or not. However, when the presenter gave a chit-chat by asking the student to have more time, the students argued that they wanted to have ten more question and gift. Thus, the student deviated the generosity maxim because the decision significantly gave lightest benefit to the speaker.

> Datum 11
> Presenter: "Answering the question, that's it".
> Audience: "Hmm, **I ask again.** Giving additional question".

The situation happened in English Language Teaching (ELT) B1, the remark that contained deviation occurred in the question and answer section especially after the presenter answered the question, but the student asked more question to the presenter. Based on the data, the utterance "*I ask again*" that was produced by the student was included into the deviation of generosity maxim in which the student maximized benefits to herself by asking more questions after the first question had been answered. However, the presenter had already limited the question. Thus, the highlighted utterance was considered deviating the generosity maxim.

Deviation of Maxims of Politeness by the Lecturers during Teaching and Learning

Based on the finding on the previous chapter, the researcher found that the utterances produced by the lecturers of English Literature Department of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang which deviated the maxims of politeness were rarely found. The lecturers rarely deviated the maxims because lecturers considered passive where lecturers had a role to evaluate the result of the discussion after the presentation done. Thus, lecturers had a limitation in which it made lecturers rarely deviated the maxims of politeness. The finding supported that the researcher found only a few utterances that were spoken by lecturers which deviated the politeness principles along the observation, there were two maxims deviated by lecturers those were tact maxim and agreement maxim.

The researcher found two utterances produced by the lecturers which deviated tact maxim in which the deviations had different factors. First, the deviation occurred because the lecturers aimed to admonish the student in order to apply English along the presentation activity as in datum 1. Second, the utterance that deviated the tact maxim because the utterance considered maximized cost to the interlocutor as in datum 2. In addition, the researcher also found that the lecturers deviated agreement maxim. There were two utterances found along the observation in which the utterances aimed to gain information about the discussion that had been done as in data 5 and 6.

This research also found that the lecturers tended to deviate the maxims of politeness for two reasons. First, the lecturers tended to deviate to control the discussion when it has been unconducive. Second, the lecturers also tended to deviate the maxims to express disagreement on the statement or answer which was uttered by the presenter. Therefore, lecturers' deviations on maxims of politeness were rarely found.

Deviation of Maxims of Politeness by the Students during the Presentation Activity

Based on the previous chapter, the students deviated politeness principles more than the lecturers. In presentation activity, the students were supposed to be more active where the student had an authority to control the discussion. Thus, the researcher found more maxims deviation produced by students than the lecturers. The researcher found that students deviated three maxims along the observation, they were tact maxim, generosity maxim and agreement maxim.

The previous chapter had already showed that students often deviated tact maxim especially the students who became the presenter in which they often commanded the interlocutor with direct order in which it considered impolite and it could hurt the

interlocutors. The examples of data analysis in the form of utterances which included the deviation of tact maxim that were produced by students could be seen in the data 3, 4, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. The researcher also found that, in presentation activity, the deviation of agreement maxim was rarely found. The finding of the research showed that there were only two utterances which deviated the maxim of agreement as in data 7 and 8. The researcher found that the agreement maxim considered rarely applied because presentation activity consisted of consistent concept as the activity was begun with the presentation and closed by the evaluation from the lecturers. Therefore, the deviation of agreement maxim produced by students found only in certain condition. In addition, the researcher also found some utterances which deviated generosity maxim as it meant by maximizing cost to self and reduce benefit to self as in data 9, 10, 12, and 13.

The deviation of tact maxim, generosity maxim, and agreement maxim were investigated in this research. Tact maxim became the most common politeness principles which were deviated in the process of presentation activity. Sometimes, the leader argued a direct order to control the activity process or the utterance which was spoken that burdened the interlocutor. Besides, the deviation of agreement maxim was rarely found in this research because the utterances related to the maxims of agreement produced in a certain condition.

The deviations in the term of maxims of politeness principle were often produced by the students especially the students who became the presenters in which they had an authority to lead the presentation process rather than the other students and the lecturers. In the context of presentation, lecturers rarely deviated the maxims because the lecturers rarely interacted with the students when the presentation was ongoing. However, the lecturers had an authority in the evaluation section, to evaluate the activity that had been done. Thus, the deviation of politeness principles rarely found in the lecturers' utterances. In addition, this research also provides a uniqueness that an utterance may deviate two maxims of politeness principle. In the datum 1 on the deviation that was produced by students in class presentation activity, the utterance "*We're going to take 3 questions*" deviated two types of maxims. The first type was generosity maxim which means by maximizing profits to the speaker by limiting the question. The second type was tact maxim, the speaker maximizes cost to the interlocutor in which the utterance burdens the students by inhibiting students to explore the material deeply through asking a question.

This research used the same theory as Novandini (2020) who studied about the violations and the intention of the violation of politeness principles used by the characters of Spongebob Squarepants cartoon animation but the findings are different. The present research and the previous research used the theory of politeness principle by Leech. This research found that there were two types maxims of politeness principle deviated by the lecturers and three types of maxims deviated by the students of English Literature Department of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang at class presentation activity including: tact maxim, generosity maxim, and agreement maxim. Meanwhile, the previous study found six kinds of violation of maxims in which agreement maxim is the most frequently deviated by the characters to show disagreement toward the interlocutor.

This research also had similarity object with the study conducted by Anjarani (2022) which investigated the violation of maxims of politeness in classroom interaction between teacher and English student, in which the previous research also used the theory proposed by Leech. However, Anjarani (2022) found that all maxims of politeness were

deviated during the interaction and tact maxim, generosity maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim were frequently deviated. Meanwhile, this present research found three types of maxims including tact maxim, generosity maxim, and agreement maxim. Those maxims were frequently applied in the interaction of class presentation.

The researcher considers that the deviations which occur in movie and class interaction were different because the deviations that occur in movie are based on the intention of the writer on how the characters should be in the movie but the deviations which occur in class interaction was based on the condition that happen during the activity. The researcher also realized that the findings found in this research did not consist of complete maxims based on the research that did not contain of the analysis of three maxims remaining, including approbation maxim, modesty maxim, and sympathy maxim as what had been proposed by Leech because the deviation of those maxims were not found during the observation done by the researcher relating to the interactions consist of those three maxims were hard to find in the interaction of presentation activity.

The utterances that deviated the politeness principles which were produced by both lecturers and students in class presentation were included into three maxims, namely the deviation of tact maxim, the deviation of agreement maxim, and the deviation of generosity maxim. However, the finding that focused on examining the deviation produced by lecturers were less than the finding on students' deviation because the lecturers were considered passive rather than the students. But this research was considered enough to fill the gap as the aim of the research was to find the deviation produced by lecturers and students in presentation activity.

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION

Based on the finding, the researcher concludes that there were three maxims of politeness proposed by Leech deviated by both lecturers and students of English Literature Department of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang at class presentation activity. The researcher found eighteen data in the term of utterances deviated the maxims in which the data were classified into two parts. First, the data that were found from the utterances of the lecturers which deviated two maxims of politeness principle including: two data of tact maxim and two data of agreement maxim. Second, the data that were found from the utterances of the students that deviated three maxims of politeness principle including: eight utterances deviated tact maxim, four utterances deviated generosity maxim, and two utterances deviated agreement maxim.

In this research, the researcher also found a uniqueness that a sentence could deviate two types of maxims of politeness principle. The researcher found that tact maxim was mostly deviated by the students, especially the students who became the presenter in the presentation activity, where the students had an authority to control the process of presentation was conducive. The research also found that agreement maxim rarely found during the observation considering that the implication of an agreement maxim was only in certain condition of the presentation activity. In addition, the researcher concludes that the deviation of the maxims of politeness can be found in a communication that is conducted either in formal or informal communication. The deviation occurs based on the situation when the communication is ongoing. However, the researcher concludes that in the context of academic interaction, especially in the presentation activity process which was conducted in the fifth semester classes at English Literature Department of UIN Maulana

Malik Ibrahim Malang, the deviation of maxims of politeness rarely found as it meant that politeness principle was well applied in the interaction of the communication.

This research suggests the students of English Literature Department of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang to understand how to communicate well by avoiding the usage of words that could lead to misunderstanding or conflict in a communication. Next, for further researchers, especially for the researchers who would conduct similar study about the deviation of maxims of politeness, they can investigate deeply about gender differences that deviates more in class interaction activity. The researcher considered that the gap needed to be filled by the further researchers to gain more information on the discussion of deviation of maxims of politeness.

REFERENCES

Anjarani, D. R. (2022). *The Violating of Politeness Maxims Found in Classroom Interaction Between Teacher and English Students*. *The Ellite of Unira*, *5*(2), 60-65. 10.53712/ellite.v5i2.1856

Arniatika, S. (2019). *An Analysis of Violating Grice's Maxims and Politeness Maxims by the Characters in the Movie "Mean Girls 2 (2011)"*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348951755_An_Analysis_of_Violating_G rices_Maxims_and_Politeness_Maxims_by_the_Characters_in_the_Movie_Mean_Girls_ 2_2011

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and method (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education Group

Fauzi, A., Zulaeha, I., & Pristiwati, R. (2020). Violation of Politeness Principle On Students Speech In Multicultural Society: Sosiopragmatic Study. *Journal EUDL*, 3–9. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.29-6-2019.2290327

Hartono, M. B., & Mulatsih, S. (2021, July). The vioalation of Politeness Principle Used in Movie Entitled "The Avengers" (2012). *UNCLLE (Undergraduate Conference on Language, Literature, and Culture)* Vol. 1, No. 1.

Haryanto, H., Weda, S., & Nashruddin, N. (2018). Politeness Principle and its implication in EFL classroom in Indonesia. XLinguage *"European Scientific Language Journal"*, *1*(4); 90-112.

Leech, G. (1983). *The principle of pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mulawarman, W. G., Hudiyono, Y., Andri, A., &Ningsi, H. W. (2021). Gender representation and language politeness in speech acts: A Pragmatic Study. *Society, Culture and Politics*, 34(3), 329-339. https://ojs2.e-journal.unair.ac.id/MKP/article/view/17825/0

Nisa, E. K., Rustono, R., & Haryadi, H. (2022). The violation of Politeness Maxim Principles found in Skinnyindonesian24 YouTube Channel. *Seloka: Indonesian Language and Literature Education Journal*, 11(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v10i3

Novandini, S. H. (2020). *The violation of politeness principles used by the characters in Spongebob Squarepants cartoon.* Unpublished Dissertation. Surabaya: UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Purwanto, B. A. (2020). Politeness principle analysis in Javanese daily conversation. *Metaphor*, *2* (1), 12-20.

Purwanti, E., & Herbianto, H. (2021). Politeness principles violation of "Mind Your Language" comedy series: A pragmatic analysis. In *International Conference on*

Sustainable Innovation Track Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICSIHESS 2021) (pp. 79-86). Atlantis Press.

Raihan, R., Morelent, Y., & Thamrin, T. (2022). Deviation of politeness principles in the comments column of CNN Indonesia and Kompas TV in the social media Youtube Channels. *Journal of Cultura and Lingua*, *3*(1), 22-30.

Serly, A. T. Y., & Supeno, S. (2018). An analysis of Politeness and Maxim Violated in "Blade Runner 2049" Film. *Inference: Journal of English Language Teaching, 1*(2), 12-16.

Correspondingauthor: alvirizqibarik@gmail.com