Conflict Resolutions in the School Setting: A Study of Politeness Maxims

Ralph Edward J. Lucena, PhD

(Vicente Hizon, Sr. Elementary School, Davao City/University of Mindanao Professional Schools, Philippines
ORCID: 0000-0003-3886-6398)
Corresponding Author: Ralph Edward J. Lucena

Abstract: The objective of this study was to explore the role of language use specifically politeness maxims as a vehicle in conflict resolution in the academic setting. Within the bounds of this articulation, the qualitative study employing content analysis utilized 20 archival data of grievance reports from the Department of Education, Bangoy District, Davao City. The findings untangled the six maxims of the politeness principle namely: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy which minimized the potential for conflict and confrontation in all human interchange when interpersonal relations were interacting. The politeness maxims influenced the participants in communication to avoid communicative discord or conflict and maintain or enhance communicative concord or comity.

Keywords: academic setting, conflict resolution, education, Philippines, politeness maxims

----

I.   INTRODUCTION

Conflicts are ingredients of human activities in the arena of life (Aula & Siira, 2010). It is when points of view, perspectives, and sentiments are opposite in nature and have not been concurred about yet, including: within oneself when you are not living according to one's values; when values and standpoints are in jeopardy; or discomfort from fear of the unknown or from absence of satisfaction (Ramani & Zhimin, 2010). Clearly, conflict is pervasive and ubiquitous in societies and their affairs (Gulti, 2014). This means conflict occurs between individuals in a wide range of human affiliations and in every single social setting (Opoku-Asare, Takyi, & Owusu-Mensah, 2015) such as among organizations, within institutes, among the members of an association, and within the personality of each individual (Gulti, 2014). Consequently, Miller and King (2005) elucidated that conflict is an inevitable and unavoidable concomitant of choices and decision aspects of human interaction.

Conflict-free atmosphere is conducive to a creative and constructive school environment. However, it is undeniable that tensions and conflicts continue to be a factor in academic life (Ghaffar, 2010). Fleetwood (1987) stipulated that schools frequently appear to be centers of conflict and these scenarios are perhaps a manifestation of problems in the community. Likewise, Opoku-Asare et al. (2015) echoed that conflict inherently involves some struggle, incompatibility, or perceived differences in values, goals, or desires; characteristics, beliefs, and lifestyles; and power of influence and action between two or more parties in a relationship, combined with attempts to control each other and antagonistic feelings toward each other.

Pursuing the above concepts further, Gulti (2014) underscored that conflict by itself is neither good nor bad. However, Owens (1998) highlighted that it is in the manner in which conflict is handled determines whether it is constructive or destructive. It is on this premise that language use plays a critical role in conflict resolution. As Johnstone (2008) accentuated that people in every culture can hire politeness markers to use and interpret language appropriately in actual social interaction in order to avoid conflict. In addition, Woods (2006) emphasized that the crucial point in every interaction then can be studied by the amount and type of politeness strategies used by speaker/s and hearer/s in order to construct appropriate interpersonal relationships.

Lakoff (1975) elucidated that politeness has been developed to reduce friction in communication thus, considering politeness theory as one of the essential factors for a successful communication. In like manner, Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki, and Ogino (1986) pointed out that it is one of the constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider others' feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport. On the other hand, Ide (1989) argued that any misuse of these strategies can hinder the effective communication, leading to individuals' dissatisfaction and indifference.

Putting things on a different perspective, politeness as a linguistic phenomenon has directed the attention of researchers (Lakoff, 1973; Geis, 1982; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Scollon & Scollon, 2001) in

---

exploring the different areas and practical issues related to it thus, politeness theory has turned to a cornerstone by which the socially correct and appropriate behavior can be analyzed. Consequently, due to its importance in characterizing the elements specific to polite discourse and behavior, many studies (Matsumoto, 1989; Schmidt, Shimura, Wang, & Jeong, 1995; Pishghadam, 2011; Pishghadam & Navari, 2012) related to politeness theory in pragmatic linguistics has opened the doors to familiarizing the audience with politeness strategies in different cultures.

My qualitative study attempts to bridge the gap and issues on the appalling lack of research on the various aspects of training in the field of conflict resolution predominantly academic institutions run by the government throughout the country. Furthermore, there is a pressing need to gather tangible evidences and heavily documented reports from school systems of the positive effects of conflict resolution initiatives beneficial to the school's stakeholders, hence the conduct of this research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of my qualitative study employing content analysis was to explore the role of language use specifically politeness maxims as a vehicle in conflict resolution in the school setting. Likewise, as I ventured on scanning previous researches, insights and principles from various scholars about politeness maxims in conversation, it provided me a scholarly avenue to conduct a study on politeness maxims in the context of resolving conflict during grievance sessions. The lack of systematic knowledge about diplomatic spoken discourse during grievance proceedings along with a wide gap in the current knowledge about politeness maxims in a real-time face-to-face proceedings was the goal of this study.

Research Questions
1. What politeness maxims are found in conflict resolutions in the school setting?
2. How do the maxims contribute in resolving conflicts?

Theoretical Lens

The study was seen through the lens of Deutsch's (1949) theory of cooperation and competition and Leech's (1983) politeness maxims which are forms of behavior that establish and maintain respect and friendship.

Deutsch (1949) spelled out that the theory equates a constructive process of conflict resolution with an effective cooperative problem-solving process in which the conflict is the mutual problem to be resolved cooperatively. It also equates a destructive process of conflict resolution with a competitive process in which the conflicting parties are involved in a competition or struggle to determine who wins and who loses; often, the outcome of the struggle is a loss for both parties. The theory further indicates that a cooperative-constructive process of conflict resolution is fostered by the typical effects of cooperation.

As Johnson and Johnson (1989) highlighted that these ideas have given rise to a large number of research studies indicating that a cooperative process (as compared to a competitive one) leads to greater group productivity, more favorable interpersonal relations, better psychological health, and higher self-esteem. Additionally, research has also shown that more constructive resolution of conflicts results from cooperative as opposed to competitive processes.

Leech (1983) accentuated that there are six maxims of the politeness principle namely: the maxims of *Tact* (Minimize cost to other; maximize benefit to other), *Generosity* (Minimize benefit to self; maximize cost to self), *Approbation* (Minimize dispraise of other; maximize praise of other), *Modesty* (Minimize praise of self; maximize dispraise of self), *Agreement*, (Minimize disagreement between self and other) and *Sympathy* (Minimize antipathy between self and other).

The theory is supported by Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness account, which builds upon Goffman's concept of 'face' (Goffman, 1967), "the public self-image that every member of a society claims for himself" (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They assume that "people cooperate and assume each other's cooperation in maintaining face in interaction, such cooperation being based on the mutual vulnerability of face", and define two interrelated aspects of face: negative face, "the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others", and positive face, "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others".

In agreement with Brown and Levinson (1987), the present research approaches interaction as the expression of social relationships through strategic language use. The choice of politeness strategies is considered to be influenced by the interplay of three sociological variables, i.e. social distance, and the relative power and size of imposition. In order to maintain or enhance face in interaction, the speaker may use four politeness 'super-strategies', namely bald-on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record. The choice of linguistic means for the realization of positive and negative politeness strategies is context-dependent (Leech, 1983).

Diplomatic discourse is characterised primarily by formal politeness, which to a great extent is predetermined by social norms and is associated with distancing, complex grammatical structures and context-dependent implicature (Urbanová & Oakland, 2002). Nevertheless, the choice of whether or not to observe the norm and to what extent, is a pragmatic and stylistic choice made by the speaker in order to achieve his/her communicative goals. Since politeness is relative to context or situation, "polite language may be seen as deferential and indicative of low status in some situations but as effective and indicative of high status in others" (Ng & Bradac, 1993). In the context of diplomatic interaction, the co-occurrence of polite linguistic features with a speaker's use of a valued variety of language reinforces the impression of gentility, diplomacy and convergence, and it fosters perceptions of high communicator solidarity and persuasiveness of the discourse.

Significance of the Study

My qualitative study is focused on politeness maxims as key to conflict resolutions. It helps to establish the dividing line between what is worth or not worth uttering. The careless use of language may create greater effects in communal relations which may lead to failure of settling disputes. That is to say, awareness of how to behave politely according to the dictates of courtesy leads to a resolution between two conflicting parties.

Likewise, results from the study may contribute insights that would greatly help in designing conflict resolution mechanisms considering politeness principle as central in human communication during grievance sessions in order for both parties to air their sides in a more tactful manner.

Definition of Terms

For clarity of the study, the following terms are herein defined operationally.

Conflict Resolution refers to the process of attempting to resolve a dispute or a conflict.

Politeness Maxims are defined as linguistic forms of politeness motivated by general principles which are not a matter of arbitrary convention.

School Setting is the academic institution where conflict and dispute takes place.

Delimitations and Limitations

The nature of my research study discovered the quintessential role of linguistic forms of politeness in grievance reports. In addition, the study provided a foundation in exploring the impact of politeness maxims in grievance redress or mitigation. This research utilized 20 grievance reports from the period 2000 up to the present coming from the Department of Education, Bangoy District Office comprising seven public elementary schools.

On the contrary, this work had a number of weak points. The first was the scarcity of copies of grievance reports stowed in the archive section due to office repairs, transfer, and renovation. A second limitation was on the type of grievance reports being considered as the corpus of the study which included only those that had not been subjected or elevated to administrative cases. Finally, due to the scope of this research which is qualitative in breadth, generalizability of findings is inadequate.

II.   METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Due to the nature of issues explored in this study, a qualitative content analysis was considered an appropriate strategy. Bernard and Ryan (2010), accentuated that the goals of qualitative research are to uncover and describe patterns, use the patterns to compare differences between individuals or groups, and then to test assumptions about the patterns. Withal, the authors pointed out that qualitative data can include physical objects, media images, audio and files, and a range of textual material from the novel to brochures and ads.

In addition, qualitative research seeks to understand a phenomenon by focusing on the total picture rather than breaking it down into variables (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2010; Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Walker, 2013). The goal is a holistic picture and depth of understanding rather than a numeric analysis of data. This means that qualitative researchers may utilize written documents or other artifacts to gain an understanding of the phenomenon under study.

In other words, qualitative research as stipulated by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) is utilized when little is known about a topic or phenomenon and when one wants to know or learn more about it particularly to understand people's experiences and to express their perspectives. Similarly, San Jose (2012) emphasized that qualitative method is more dynamic than the structured format of the quantitative method.

On the other hand, Kerlinger (1973) argued that content analysis is the interface of observation and documents analysis. He emphasized a method of observation in the sense that instead of asking people to answer questions, it gets the communication people are producing and asks questions about the communication. In this way, it becomes a discrete method or non-reactive; that is, a method that rarely interacts with the researcher eliminating potential bias.

In the same way, Lal Das and Bhaskaran (2008) stipulated that content analysis is the scientific study of a communication content, with regards to the meanings, contexts, and intentions contained in a message. Content denotes what is contained and content analysis is the analysis of what is inside in the message. In addition, the materials for content analysis can be letters, diaries, content of newspapers, songs, short stories, messages, radio, television, documents, text, or any other symbol. Hence, content analysis is about making valid, replicable and objective inferences regarding messages based on explicit rules.

Content analysis is a method that can be used to identify patterns across qualitative data, and is sometimes treated as similar to thematic approaches (Wilkinson, 2000). Even so, content analysis tends to focus at a more micro level, often provides frequency counts (Wilkinson, 2000), and allows for quantitative analysis of initially qualitative data (Ryan & Bernard, 2000).

Furthermore, Bauer, Bicquelet and Suerdem (2014) elucidated that the aim of text analysis is to provide expert tools such as literary criticism, philology, or content analysis to decode the texts which would otherwise be inaccessible for a simple reader and to observe and discover the attitudes, behaviors, concerns, motivations, and culture of the text producer from an expert point of view.

Role of the Researcher

In this qualitative inquiry, the researcher served as an instrument through which the data were collected. In this study, I as the researcher facilitated the research procedure, transcribed, and analyzed the data under study. For reader accessibility, I explained the purpose of the study, the procedures of gathering and collecting data, and took hold of the exact documents on file, available upon request.

Research Materials

Despite the multimedia revolution, text is still the dominant type of qualitative data in social sciences, psychology, and education (Kuckartz, 2014). In this undertaking, 20 grievance reports from the Department of Education, Bangoy District, Davao City served as corpora of the study. Putting into consideration the inclusion and exclusion criteria for this study, I established norms to facilitate selection of the corpus as follows: grievance reports from public elementary schools, the seven schools of DepEd Bangoy District to which the researcher is connected, and reports covering the period 2000 onwards were considered. On the other hand, grievance reports which elevated to administrative cases were excluded in this study.

The corpus of this study was doubled as ten is a minimum number of corpora for content analysis of text (Ary et al., 2010). Similarly, Braun and Clarke (2013) espoused that in qualitative research utilizing secondary sources, 10-100 samples are recommended. Also, purposive samples are typically small because of the depth and extent of the information sought in qualitative studies (Ary et al., 2010). It goes to show that the primary criterion of sample size is redundancy of information and as no new information is forthcoming from new units, sampling was terminated as data saturation was achieved.

Such documents as stipulated by Bauer et al. (2014) open up sources of information where data would otherwise be hard to come by because of spatial or temporal distances to which historians claim as witness evidence onto a distant past. In that respect, systematic analysis of texts gives us important clues about the historical and social conditions of the context within which they are produced.

Further, selection of the corpora was done through purposive sampling. Kothari (2003) elucidated that purposive sampling is applied where the researcher intends to pick subjects that satisfy a given criterion. Withal, in purposive sampling or judgment sampling, sample elements judged to be typical, or representative, are chosen from the population (Ary et al., 2010). In this case, grievance reports were believed to be sufficient materials to provide maximum insight and understanding about the study. Likewise, Lichtman (2012) and Creswell (2013) pointed out that purposive sampling gives the researcher an opportunity to choose the most effective informant available for the study.

Data Collection

My qualitative content analysis was based on indirect approach as a method of data collection. As resonated by Bernard and Ryan (2010), data in indirect approach is collected from artifacts, pottery, photographs, archives of written records, and data from other research studies.

A letter of permission was submitted to the office of the District Supervisor, Bangoy District, Department of Education in order to gain access to grievance reports. Once approval was granted, I immediately went to the Office of the District Guidance Counselor to retrieve needed documents from the district's archive section. Retrieved documents were stored in an archival envelope made for such purpose and were kept by the researcher in a secure file cabinet in order to protect its confidentiality and at the same time for easy access whenever cross-checking of data is needed.

Bauer et al. (2014) maintained that documents are produced in naturalistic environments should never suggest that they can be treated as more objective sources of data than other formats. Although documents are

produced outside the specific research purposes of later years, their production, selection and analysis are dependent from thoughts, feelings, ideas, beliefs and intentions of social actors. First of all, documents are produced by individuals who communicate a mode of thinking. Second, they are often produced to give a justificatory account; thus the mind-set of an audience is implicit and rhetorically anticipated. Third, text analysis itself starts with preconceptions that are bounded by the socio-historical context in which it is performed; the mind-set of the analyst frames the data. We must never reify documents in and of themselves as more objective data; they are facts constructed by the intervention of the researcher who selects them into a corpus and interprets them.

Data Analysis

After the collection of data, I sorted, coded, and categorized the documents and were saved electronically in a word document file. In the same manner, I analyzed the data using content analysis. Bernard and Ryan (1998) stated that content analysis as a research strategy permeates the social sciences and the range of methods for conducting text analysis is breathtaking. In this view. I as the researcher examined dialogues or utterances and analyzed by grouping the utterances within the six maxims of politeness principle. Furthermore, I translated and analyzed the data collected following three steps which were patterned from the works of Miles and Huberman (1994) and Gempes, Sayson, Manalaysay, Mejica and Noveno (2009) namely: data reduction, data display, and drawing of conclusion and verification.

The first step was data reduction where I fused the data with the same meaning, organized and classified them accordingly. In data reduction too, I indulged in emergent coding where categories were established based on the research questions and framework of this study. The second step was data display where I transcribed data into table form as found appropriate. For a comprehensive reporting of results, data display assembled and organized information in an immediately accessible, compact form (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

The third step was drawing of conclusion and verification, the categorization of data should be done first using the core ideas parallel to the sub-questions. After knowing all the responses, I counted all the responses with the same idea and combined those responses into one core idea and I repeated the steps until major themes were constructed based on the core ideas. The drawing of conclusion and verification was presented based on my knowledge and ideas from the findings of the study.

Trustworthiness

Qualitative studies used validity and reliability procedures to test the strength of instrument that measure the phenomena under study and qualify findings as accurately representing the data in discernible and meaningful ways. Qualitative research relied on reliability and validity instrument measures. Creswell (2013) accentuated that validity answers the question of whether or not a given instrument consistently yields the same results under like circumstances.

Qualitative research aspires to achieve trustworthiness during evaluation. Validity and reliability in qualitative research is more a matter of consistency in pattern development that statistical validation of an instrument (Creswell, 2013). Procedures, participants, and readers ultimately decide the degree of validity and reliability of the study. Terms often used to convey a sense of believability in a qualitative research design project are credibility, dependability, confirmability, transferability, and authenticity.

Credibility refers to the truth of the data or the participant views and the interpretation and representation of them by the researcher (Cope, 2014). I enhanced credibility by describing my experiences as a researcher and verifying the research findings with the supplied corpora. Moreover, the concept of credibility establishes truth of the findings which makes sense through member checking. It is articulated by Denzin and Lincoln (2005) that credibility requires demonstrating, in one or more ways that the research is designed to maximize the accuracy of identifying and describing whatever is being studied, especially as judge by the groups of people being studied. He added that credibility can be enhanced by using one or more of the following strategies: prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, and/or member checking.

Nevertheless, Creswell (2013) enunciated that credibility can be enhanced by using peer debriefing (i.e., critical examination and evaluation by a qualified outside researcher of the study design, data collection, analyses, etc.); negative case analysis (i.e., intentionally searching for and analyzing examples of data or participants that contradict the overall interpretations in a study); and member checking (i.e., verifying the researcher's interpretations and conclusions with the various groups of participants themselves).

Dependability refers to the constancy of the data over similar conditions (Cope, 2014). I achieved dependability by subjecting the research through an external auditor who concurred with the decision trails at each stage of the research process. In addition, dependability made the research open to external scrutiny and thereby enabled future researchers to use the results of the study as their prototype model.

To establish dependability, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) stipulated that involves accounting for all the changing conditions in whatever is being studied as well as any changes in the design of the study that is needed to get a better understanding of the context. In like manner, Creswell (2013) mentioned that dependability can be enhanced by using overlapping methods, stepwise replications, and/or inquiry audits. Overlapping methods use carefully planned methodological triangulation, or multiple data gathering procedures, in order to create overlapping data. Stepwise replications involve time triangulation in gathering data on multiple occasions, which help in examining the consistency of the data and interpretations over time. Inquiry audits involve enlisting an outside expert "auditor" to verify the consistency of agreement among data, research methods, interpretations, conclusions, etc.

Confirmability refers to the researcher's ability to demonstrate that the data represent the participants' responses and not the researcher's biases or viewpoints (Cope, 2014). I demonstrated confirmability by describing how conclusions and interpretations were established, and exemplifying that the findings were derived directly from the data.

The qualitative work of Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that confirmability entails full revelation of the data upon which all interpretations are based, or at least the availability of the data for inspection. In other words, the reader of the research report should be able to examine the data to confirm the results/interpretations. This idea is enhanced by Denzin and Lincoln (2005) who underscored that confirmability is sometimes enhanced by using audit trails. According to them, confirmability builds on audit trails and involves the use of written field notes, memos, a field diary, process and personal notes, and a reflexive journal. Clearly, Creswell (2013) suggested that thorough record keeping and preservation of data for potential inspection are crucial to this strategy. He mentioned that some researchers will append their data to their report, or at least include crucial examples for inspection by the reader. Naturally, if the reader can inspect the data, the interpretations and results will be maximally confirmable.

Transferability refers to findings that can be applied to other settings or groups (Cope, 2014). I established transferability by providing sufficient descriptive data and an immense rhetoric through an emic standpoint. This qualitative study met this criterion because the results entailed meaning to individuals not involved in the study and readers can associate the results with their own experiences.

In like manner, Marshall and Rossman (2010) highlighted that transferability involves demonstrating the applicability of the results of the study in one context to other contexts. Transferability can be enhanced by providing what is often referred to as thick description. They explained further that thick description involves an emic perspective, which demands description that includes the actors' interpretations and other social and/or cultural information. At the same rate, they noted that transferability is the responsibility of the person seeking to apply the results of the study to a new context or phenomenon.

Authenticity refers to the ability and extent to which the researcher expresses the feelings and emotions of the participants' experiences in a faithful manner (Cope, 2014). By reporting in this descriptive approach, readers grasp the essence of the experience through the participant quotes.

Ethical Considerations

The manner of this study was within the bounds of seven key principles of ethical research, as spelled out by McLeod (2009), which includes the following: informed and voluntary consent, respect for rights of privacy and confidentiality, minimization of risk, truthfulness, social and cultural responsibility, research adequacy, and avoidance of conflict of interest in the conduct and practice of the study. The Treaty Principle of Participation as cited by McLeod (2009) is reflected in the invitation to participate which ensured that any participation is completely voluntary in nature, and based on an understanding of adequate information.

Maintaining confidentiality is often a major ethical concern of interpretative research because of its delicate nature. Consequently, privacy and confidentiality were maintained in my study through the use of pseudonyms in the research reporting and by changing specific contextual details that could have compromised my research material.

Further, ethical approval for this research was obtained from the University of Mindanao Research Committee and from the Department of Education, Bangoy District, Davao City from which data were collected. For the protection of those involved in this study, this piece of work has been subjected to the Ethics Review Committee of UM.

III.   RESULTS

Politeness Maxims in Conflict Resolutions
Tact Maxim

The tact maxim is the most essential and important maxim among the six maxims developed by Leech (1983) because it is mainly applied to directive, commissive utterance, which are the kinds of linguistic behavior that most embody politeness in communication, and hence need politeness most.

In the conversation CRSS 1, the tact maxim is applied since the hearer gets more benefit and has more freedom in choice of act, and thus it is more polite as exhibited in the following:

Mrs. A: Mr. B, I just want to verify the petition of the parents if there is any. Mr. XA told me that the parents are going to petition me as well as the barangay. I went to see the barangay captain and he said no petition so far. Mr. XB, I want to know how true is this (CRSS 1).

In a similar wavelength, in CRSS 3 the request for cooperation minimizes cost to other (hearer) and maximizes benefit to other (hearer) because it mainly establishes the premise of choice on the part of the hearer as reflected in the following:

At this time, the principal spoke up for reconciliation and she said that anyway we have expressed all the sentiments and all that is not supposed that we should say and do, let us end all this feud and conflict because I have so many plans for the school and the pupils and I just want to establish harmonious relationship with nobody is being stepped upon. Then she asked Mrs. XC if she is willing to cooperate and work harmoniously with her (CRSS 3).

In addition, in CRSS 7 the tact maxim is manifested because such utterance is polite and takes the form of a request which applies to the perspective of the hearer as shown in the following:

Sir XD thought that the groupings in this school was already stopped. He requested both parties to be responsible with their words and actions. If we insist on digging the issue, another problem will come out (CRSS 7).

Pursuing the ideas above, CRSS 17 exhibited the maxim of tact because the utterance of the social worker is polite enough so that she can't threaten or traumatize the students during the process of inquiry. This is strengthened through her actuations of introducing herself and making a request to the parents to be with the students who are still minor. Through this, the benefit is to the hearer whether they are going to respond or not to the questions raise by the social worker as presented in the following:

Mrs. AA introduced herself to the pupils and said that they don't need to be afraid about the queries to be made. The parents are also requested to be with their children because all of them are minors in order to avoid trauma in their part for whatever question of the social worker representative would like to ask. She said that she just wanted to ask about the case of XE. She asked the pupils if they know something. She also told the pupils not to be afraid of the police officer. She just emphasized that they will just answer all the questions that she will be going to ask (CRSS 17).

Finally, CRSS 20 displayed tact through the use of imperative please thus increasing benefit to the hearer whether to accept or not the advice or the assurance made by the speaker as relayed in the following:

Please be assured, however, that the ratings that I gave are based on my honest and sincere consideration of his competence and characteristics. Please allow me to justify the ratings I gave (CRSS 20).

Generosity Maxim

Different from the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker and says that others should be put first instead of self.

In the utterance CRSS 1, the speaker admits his wrongdoing which minimizes benefit to self and his willingness to be reassigned in another school maximizes cost to self. These actuations of the speaker in the form of offer adhere to the maxim of generosity as revealed in the following:

Mr. XF: To end the talk, let's stop here. I will admit my fault. I am willing to transfer to another school. I hope you will not hold grudge against my wife. She is not included in this case (CRSS 1).

Thereupon, the speaker in CRSS 5 offers forgiveness which is a generous act since the speaker is after the welfare of the other. This act lessens benefit to self (speaker) and at the same time increases cost to self (speaker) as shown in the following:

Mrs. C said, she was in favor to extend forgiveness yet she said, that it's hard to forgive especially if one doesn't accept mistakes (CRSS 5).

This runs parallel to the statement in CRSS 9 to which the principal offers a suggestion to the teacher to find another technique to manage the class in order for the teacher to avoid the same problems in the future that might put a stake the welfare of the students. Such actuation lessens benefit on the part of the principal and places the burden or cost to herself upon exercising command responsibility towards the teacher and answering towards the stakeholders who are the parents as reflected in the following:

She clarified that what the teacher did is a Child Protection Policy (CPP) Offense. She said that whatever the child did in her class does not justify the disciplinary actions she did against them. She also suggested that the teacher must look for another classroom management strategy in dealing with her students to avoid such problems (CRSS 9).

Accordingly, in CRSS 10 the promise made by the speaker towards the hearer minimizes benefit and maximizes cost to self/speaker because she has to make actions to fulfill that promise as shown in the following:

Mrs. AB promised to be fair and to be with the one who did the right thing. Further, she asked the parents for their understanding and cooperation (CRSS 10).

Wherefore, in CRSS 17 the speaker who is a police officer makes an offer to assist or help the hearer who is victim or aggrieved party in filing a case to those who are involved. This entails cost to the police officer who will act on the said complaint. However, in order to establish comity and as part of doing her duty such utterance exhibits the maxim of generosity as revealed in the following:

Police Officer D said, that they can file a case to those they thought were involved but we cannot tap the children. We need to provide intervention for children at risk (CRSS 17).

Approbation Maxim

The approbation maxim makes the hearer as the departure point, involving the speaker's judgment and criticism. Likewise, this maxim follows the principle of avoidance in uttering unpleasant things about others (hearer).

In the utterance CRSS 1, the speaker avoids saying unpleasant things about others specifically about the hearer, thus, denying about any petition in order to minimize dispraise of the hearer. In addition, the speaker maximizes praise towards the hearer by emphasizing that their relationship is good which can be clearly observed in the following transcripts:

Mr. E: I have not heard of any petition going on. As far as I know, our relationship here is good. I believe there's no petition going on (CRSS 1).

Moreover, the utterance in CRSS 4 minimizes dispraise of other (hearer) as the speaker provides justifications for such changes on school policies and maximizes praise of other (hearer) through observance of solidarity with the hearer by pointing out that such changes implemented were for the good of the school as manifested in the following:

Mrs. F as the respondent was also given an ample time to express her side in relation to the said complaint. She gave her point that as a principal of the school, she wanted to create a change on the school's set-up through restructuring the staffing pattern which resulted to the reassignment of Mrs. XG. This particular change was taken by the complainant personally and indeed she couldn't accept. Mrs. F expressed her justifications why she did such change and pointed out that it was ultimately for the good of the school (CRSS 4).

In CRSS 5, the speaker gives a partial agreement by emphasizing that her colleague has manifestations of changing for the better. This means that the speaker minimizes dispraise and maximizes praise by not uttering unpleasant expressions but rather focusing what is good and cordial to the other as manifested in the following:

Mrs. AC reinforced on what Ma'am AD's explanation, for she had observed some changes on some ways of Mrs. AE which were improving and Mrs. AC is hoping that it shall continue for the better (CRSS 5).

Additionally, in the utterance CRSS 7, the speaker gives a minimal or limited response towards the hearer about the issue to lessen or reduce the tension and avoid further confrontation and conflict as reflected in the following transcripts:

Mrs. G just want to emphasize that she knew Mrs. H better regarding this issue (CRSS 7).

Hence, in CRSS 10 the speaker engages in minimal talk to avoid insulting or humiliating anybody in the course of confrontation and focuses on asking an apology about the incidents that happened thus, polite as shown in the following:

Mrs. AF introduced herself, the adviser and greeted the parents. She told them the issue about Mrs. AG's letter. Moreover, she clarified the issue and asked for an apology that these issues/incidents happened (CRSS 10).

Modesty Maxim

In this maxim, participants (speaker and hearer) are expected to be humble by reducing their own praise. People are considered arrogant, when in the activity they always speak their own pride.

In the utterance CRSS 2, the speaker minimizes praise of self by showing willingness to apologize. On the contrary, the speaker maximizes dispraise of self by accepting that he has committed mistakes and is exhausted thinking about these problems as shown in the following transcripts:

He said, he is very much willing to apologize to Mrs. I for the things he had done wrong during their togetherness at V. Hizon Elem. School. He is already tired of thinking about these problems for all he wants is to concentrate to the good things he has already started which was attested by his present principal (CRSS 2).

In addition, utterance CRSS 3, the speaker acknowledges the pain she has inflicted and minimizes praise of self by asking an apology highlighting that such actuations were unintentional as expressed in the following:

Mrs. J, just asked an apology because she has pained Mrs. K and that was unintentionally done (CRSS 3).

In consonance above, utterance in CRSS 8, the speaker minimizes praise of self and maximizes dispraise of self by admitting her faults and willingness to make amends towards the hearer as manifested in the following:
Mrs. L accepted that she had done something bad to Mr. M and she is willing to ask for forgiveness if given a chance to talk to him (CRSS 8).

Thus far, CRSS 10 adheres to maxim of modesty since the speaker assumes full responsibility and at the same time accepts her fault by saying sorry thus, minimizes praise and maximizes dispraise of self as exhibited in the following:
She assured the parents that she will take responsibility of everything that has happened. She reiterated that she knows it was her fault and she is sorry for what she has done (CRSS 10).

Further, the statement in CRSS 18 bears the modesty maxim at work when the speaker enunciates her apology, shows regrets, and acknowledges the significant contribution of the hearer regarding the school's progress. By uttering the words little token, the speaker humbles herself including what the school has attained in the recent years as shown in the following:
Mrs. AH has expressed her apology to your wife, Mrs. AI for the way she asked Mrs. AI regarding the stealing of mango fruits and was not so much aware that her art of questioning is accusing the latter. In addition, we would like to thank you for leaving the school and to the district as well, a very lucrative legacy for the present generation and for the coming next generation. We too request that you will accept wholeheartedly the little token that the school may share for the harvest of the mango fruits (CRSS 18).

Agreement Maxim

This maxim pays close attention to whether the opinion of the speaker is in accordance with the hearer's. If it is kept in accordance, the agreement maxim is observed. Thus, there is a tendency to exaggerate agreement with other people and to mitigate disagreement by expressing regret, partial agreement, etc.

In CRSS 4, affirmative responses such as restoring harmonious relationship coming from conflicting sides signals a pact or agreement between communicators. This decreases the possibility of misunderstanding and increasing the connectivity of existing gaps in relationship despite differences in opinion and belief such as the following:
Both parties manifested affirmative response on resolving the problem as they agreed to restore the harmonious relationship between the two of them and for the rest of the teachers. Their reconciliation was shown through an embrace with each other (CRSS 4).

In connection, the mention of arriving to a treaty or agreement in CRSS 5 manifests the willingness of both sides to settle issues in order to have a conducive school environment. Such actuations are polite in nature as exhibited in the following:
Mrs. AJ asked further of what assurance the school can have that Mrs. AK will go for peace in the school. Mrs. AL answered that all of us including Mrs. AK have to come up of an agreement with some conditions that it will bring good results in the school environment (CRSS 5).

Besides, the statement in CRSS 8 maximizes agreement between communicators (self and other) through the disposition of the speaker to solve and settle issues soonest. By uttering the words, if possible, there is already that partial agreement being reached by both parties as expressed in the following:
Being the chairman, Mr. N wanted, if possible, that this will be settled at this level. Sir N asked Mrs. XH what solution should be afforded to restore the relationship (CRSS 8).

All the same, the conversation in CRSS 9 mitigates disagreement through a partial agreement to which a condition is set and stipulated in order to resolve the conflict as demonstrated in the following:
Mrs. O does not intend to go to the higher office to complain anymore about the offense made by Mrs. P provided that Mrs. P will not repeat her offenses and learn her lesson (CRSS 9).

Hence, CRSS 18 conforms to the agreement maxim when the speaker who is the school administrator shows recognition to a great effort done by the hearer. The recognition or acknowledgment exhibits comity and oneness towards the other; thus, polite in its way as reflected in the transcripts:
The school principal recognizes the AM family especially on you who made such a great effort to plant those mango trees in school for which the recent administration including the past four administrators had reap the harvest and made some projects of the school possible (CRSS 18).

Sympathy Maxim

The maxim of sympathy involves the relationship between the speaker and hearer especially the psychological feeling.

In the utterance CRSS 8, the speaker demonstrates sympathy by giving advice to the hearer to humble herself and ask forgiveness for the annoyance and disturbance she instigated. Such actuations of the speaker lessens the antipathy, grudge, and tension between parties involve thus, putting an end to conflict as revealed in the following:

Mr. Q asked Mrs. R to humble herself and asked forgiveness to Mrs. S first, for eventually Mrs. S will help Mrs. R to talk to Mr. T. Sir Q asked Mrs. S what solution should be afforded to restore the relationship (CRSS 8).

Apparently, the speaker in CRSS 11 exhibits commiseration towards the hearer (complainant) showing sympathy to the situation they are experiencing. This means minimizing antipathy or dislike between them; thus, is polite because the speaker is attending to the hearer's wants and needs as shown in the following:

Mr. U introduced the Child Protection Policy Committee to Mrs. V during the third day of the dialogue so that she will feel that we are giving actions immediately on her complaint (CRSS 11).

In addition, the speaker in CRSS 17 maximizes sympathy towards the hearer (parents) by expressing and saying how sorry she is that unfortunate events took place. By doing so, the speaker condoles the bereaved family exhibiting the sympathy maxim as reflected in the following:

Mrs. W said sorry to the parents for what had happened. Sir XI conducted an investigation last January 04, 2017 as stated on the documents submitted to the division office. He also commented that we will not focus on the victim alone, but we need to protect all the pupils who are still alive. The school is fair for this investigation (CRSS 17).

Accordingly, CRSS 18 minimizes indifference and maximizes concord as the self and other share the success and victory of each one as they are able to come up for a settlement or resolution of the issue at hand. The willingness of both parties to have a peaceful talk is a gesture of politeness as shown below:

This office is happy to inform you that after the peaceful talk of the concerned parties with much willingness of the parties, reconciliation and settlement have been attained (CRSS 18).

Hence, the discourse in CRSS 19 follows the maxim of sympathy in the sense that Mrs. AO and Mrs. AP attend to the needs of Mrs. AN to show sympathy to the unfortunate situation they are in as revealed below:

Mrs. AN went to the office of the principal to inform that her grandchild still hesitated to go to school. So, Mrs. AO and Mrs. AP went to their house and conducted a home visitation. During the home visitation, they have arrived to an agreement that the child will not attend Mrs. AQ's class anymore instead she will be transferred to another class. The day after the home visit the child went back to school. She was accompanied by Mrs. AP to her new class (CRSS 19).

Contribution of the Maxims in Resolving the Conflict

The principle of politeness popularly known as politeness maxims is a constraint observed in human communicative behavior, influencing participants in the arena of discourse to avoid communicative discord or conflict and maintain or enhance communicative concord or comity. Through the maxims, conflicts in the school scenario are resolved and enough knowledge of the maxims can be a potential vantage point in mitigating conflicts decreasing its destructive effect in the school environment.

The tact maxim which is a familiar aspect of politeness takes the form of a request which is often indirect, tentative, giving an opportunity to refuse, and also softening or mitigating speaker's imposition on hearer such as: He requested both parties… (CRSS 7); The parents are also requested… (CRSS 17) as spelled out in the following:

Sir XA thought that the groupings in this school was already stopped. He requested both parties to be responsible with their words and actions. If we insist on digging the issue, another problem will come out (CRSS 7).

Mrs. AA introduced herself to the pupils and said that they don't need to be afraid about the queries to be made. The parents are also requested to be with their children because all of them are minors in order to avoid trauma in their part for whatever question of the social worker representative would like to ask. She said that she just wanted to ask about the case of XB. She asked the pupils if they know something. She also told the pupils not to be afraid of the police officer. She just emphasized that they will just answer all the questions that she will be going to ask (CRSS 17).

There is an evidence that it utilizes embedding statements which intensifies politeness such as: I just want to verify… if there is any… (CRSS 1); I just want to establish… if she is willing to cooperate… (CRSS 3) and the word please plus verb as in: Please be assured… (CRSS 20) as enumerated in the following:

Mrs. A: Mr. B, I just want to verify the petition of the parents if there is any. Mr. XC told me that the parents are going to petition me as well as the barangay. I went to see the barangay captain and he said no petition so far. Mr. XD, I want to know how true is this (CRSS 1).

At this time, the principal spoke up for reconciliation and she said that anyway we have expressed all the sentiments and all that is not supposed that we should say and do, let us end all this feud and conflict because I have so many plans for the school and the pupils and I just want to establish harmonious relationship with nobody is being stepped upon. Then she asked Mrs. XE if she is willing to cooperate and work harmoniously with her (CRSS 3).

Please be assured, however, that the ratings that I gave are based on my honest and sincere consideration of his competence and characteristics. Please allow me to justify the ratings I gave (CRSS 20).

This indicates that the tact maxim gives a low value to speaker's wants thus, increasing the probability on the part of the hearer to make his/her own choice reducing imposition and avoiding conflict.

On the other hand, the generosity maxim which is manifested through offers, invitations, and promises are generous acts and somehow can be direct or even impositioning such as presented in CRSS 9 and CRSS 17 which utilized the insistent directive features: must, can, cannot as reflected below:

She clarified that what the teacher did is a Child Protection Policy (CPP) Offense. She said that whatever the child did in her class does not justify the disciplinary actions she did against them. She also suggested that the teacher must look for another classroom management strategy in dealing with her students to avoid such problems (CRSS 9).

Police Officer D said, that they can file a case to those they thought were involved but we cannot tap the children. We need to provide intervention for children at risk (CRSS 17).

On the surface, the maxim of generosity can also be seen at work in positive compliant replies to requests, which can show intensified equivalents of yes as in: I will admit... I am willing... (CRSS 1); She was in favor to extend... (CRSS 5); She promised to be fair... (CRSS 10) as showed in the following:

Mr. XF: To end the talk, let's stop here. I will admit my fault. I am willing to transfer to another school. I hope you will not hold grudge against my wife. She is not included in this case (CRSS 1).

Mrs. C said, she was in favor to extend forgiveness yet she said, that it's hard to forgive especially if one doesn't accept mistakes (CRSS 5).

Mrs. AB promised to be fair and to be with the one who did the right thing. Further, she asked the parents for their understanding and cooperation (CRSS 10).

The use of such expressions gives a high value to hearer's wants and preference which is polite and therefore exhibits comity towards the hearer and lessens conflict. Scrutinizing further, the approbation maxim gives a high value to the hearer's qualities. This can be seen through praises, approval, and compliments. By doing so, one avoids misunderstanding as shown in CRSS 1 and CRSS 5:

Mr. E: I have not heard of any petition going on. As far as I know, our relationship here is good. I believe there's no petition going on (CRSS1).

Mrs. AC reinforced on what Ma'am AD's explanation, for she had observed some changes on some ways of Mrs. AE which were improving and Mrs. AC is hoping that it shall continue for the better (CRSS 5).

Obviously, criticisms of hearer are hedged and muted in order to decrease tension and conflict build up as manifested in CRSS 4, CRSS 7 and CRSS 10. But the requirement of politeness is lessened: either where speaker had dominant social role or where the hearer is absent during speaker's utterance.

Mrs. F as the respondent was also given an ample time to express her side in relation to the said complaint. She gave her point that as a principal of the school, she wanted to create a change on the school's set-up through restructuring the staffing pattern which resulted to the reassignment of Mrs. XG. This particular change was taken by the complainant personally and indeed she couldn't accept. Mrs. F expressed her justifications why she did such change and pointed out that it was ultimately for the good of the school (CRSS 4).

Mrs. G just want to emphasize that she knew Mrs. H better regarding this issue (CRSS 7).

Mrs. AF introduced herself, the adviser and greeted the parents. She told them the issue about Mrs. AG's letter. Moreover, she clarified the issue and asked for an apology that these issues/incidents happened (CRSS 10).

This indicates that by adherence to the maxim of approbation which is avoidance of uttering unpleasant things about the hearer, one contributes to the resolution of conflict.

Seemingly, modesty maxim gives a low value to the speaker's qualities; thus, indulging into self-deprecation which is a manifestation of politeness. Self-deprecation is the act of reprimanding oneself by belittling, undervaluing, or disparaging oneself, or being excessively modest as emphasized in CRSS 2, CRSS 3, CRSS 8, CRSS 10, and CRSS 18:

He said, he is very much willing to apologize to Mrs. I for the things he had done wrong during their togetherness at V. Hizon Elem. School. He is already tired of thinking about these problems for all he wants is to concentrate to the good things he has already started which was attested by his present principal (CRSS 2).

Mrs. J, just asked an apology because she has pained Mrs. K and that was unintentionally done (CRSS 3).

Mrs. L accepted that she had done something bad to Mr. M and she is willing to ask for forgiveness if given a chance to talk to him (CRSS 8).

She assured the parents that she will take responsibility of everything that has happened. She reiterated that she knows it was her fault and she is sorry for what she has done (CRSS 10).

Mrs. AH has expressed her apology to your wife, Mrs. AI for the way she asked Mrs. AI regarding the stealing of mango fruits and was not so much aware that her art of questioning is accusing the latter. In addition, we would like to thank you for leaving the school and to the district as well, a very lucrative legacy for the present generation and for the coming next generation. We too request that you will accept wholeheartedly the little token that the school may share for the harvest of the mango fruits (CRSS 18).

It may be presumed that in keeping with the maxim of modesty, apologies for offenses, wrongdoings, misconducts, and misdemeanors by speaker to hearer are examples of polite speech acts giving high prominence to speaker's fault and obligation to hearer. Such overt apologetic statements restore harmony and accord between people involve in conflict.

On the other hand, the agreement maxim gives high value to hearer's opinions. Thus, in responding to opinions and judgments of others, to agree rather than to disagree is preferred and is polite in nature. In addition, recognition of each other's efforts to settle misunderstandings and affirmative responses coming from parties involved to deal with conflict maximizes agreement eventually attaining resolution as revealed in CRSS 4 and CRSS 18:

Both parties manifested affirmative response on resolving the problem as they agreed to restore the harmonious relationship between the two of them and for the rest of the teachers. Their reconciliation was shown through an embrace with each other (CRSS 4).

The school principal recognizes the AM family especially on you who made such a great effort to plant those mango trees in school for which the recent administration including the past four administrators had reap the harvest and made some projects of the school possible (CRSS 18).

In the same way, setting of conditions is crucial to reach a pact or an agreement in order to lessen friction in relationship. Further, in a society where differences in opinion occur, cooperation can be achieved through negotiation and compromise such as noted in CRSS 5, CRSS 8, and CRSS 9:

Mrs. AJ asked further of what assurance the school can have that Mrs. AK will go for peace in the school. Mrs. AL answered that all of us including Mrs. AK have to come up of an agreement with some conditions that it will bring good results in the school environment (CRSS 5).

Being the chairman, Mr. N wanted, if possible, that this will be settled at this level. Sir N asked Mrs. XH what solution should be afforded to restore the relationship (CRSS 8).

Mrs. O does not intend to go to the higher office to complain anymore about the offense made by Mrs. P provided that Mrs. P will not repeat her offenses and learn her lesson (CRSS 9).

Likewise, this indicates that the maxim of agreement serves as a leeway to bridge the gap between conflicting parties and come up with a resolution that is acceptable and amenable to both sides. Ostensively, the sympathy maxim gives a high value on hearer's feelings. It is polite to show others that you share their feelings: feeling sad when they have suffered misfortune as showed in CRSS 8, CRSS 11, CRSS 17, and CRSS 19; and feeling joyful when they have cause for rejoicing as provided in CRSS 18:

Mr. Q asked Mrs. R to humble herself and asked forgiveness to Mrs. S first, for eventually Mrs. S will help Mrs. R to talk to Mr. T. Sir Q asked Mrs. S what solution should be afforded to restore the relationship (CRSS 8).

Mr. U introduced the Child Protection Policy Committee to Mrs. V during the third day of the dialogue so that she will feel that we are giving actions immediately on her complaint (CRSS 11).

Mrs. W said sorry to the parents for what had happened. Sir XI conducted an investigation last January 04, 2017 as stated on the documents submitted to the division office. He also commented that we will not focus on the victim alone, but we need to protect all the pupils who are still alive. The school is fair for this investigation (CRSS 17).

This office is happy to inform you that after the peaceful talk of the concerned parties with much willingness of the parties, reconciliation and settlement have been attained (CRSS 18).

Mrs. AN went to the office of the principal to inform that her grandchild still hesitated to go to school. So, Mrs. AO and Mrs. AP went to their house and conducted a home visitation. During the home visitation, they have arrived to an agreement that the child will not attend Mrs. AQ's class anymore instead she will be transferred to another class. The day after the home visit the child went back to school. She was accompanied by Mrs. AP to her new class (CRSS 19).

Admittedly, the maxim of sympathy is intrinsically courteous speech acts and need no mitigation. Thus, they can be made more pragmalinguistically polite by intensification and heightening the degree of gradable expressions they contain such as in: much willingness of the parties… (CRSS 18) above. In doing so, concord rather than discord is achieved.

Politeness plays an integral part in verbal interaction. Politeness norms and conventions serve to govern what is viewed as co-operative behavior in conversation. In addition, the general strategy of politeness echoed that in order to be polite, speaker expresses or implies meanings that associate a favorable value with what

pertains to hearer an unfavorable value with what pertains to speaker. Finally, it is useful to note that the hearer-oriented maxims are generally more powerful than the speaker-oriented ones.

IV. DISCUSSION

Politeness Maxims in Conflict Resolutions

The maxims in the politeness principle termed as politeness maxims served as a vehicle in conflict resolution. In addition, Dyatmawan (2015) purported that these maxims explain how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. In showing politeness, speakers adhere to the six maxims of the politeness principle advanced by Leech (1983). They are the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. Moreover, these maxims as elucidated by Wang and Wei (2016) are intended to make communicators feel good which is considered as an extension of Lakoff's three conditions for politeness.

The results disclosed that the tact maxim is demonstrated in CRSS 1, 3, 7, 17, and 20. This involves minimizing cost to other and maximizing benefit to other. It applies in Searle's speech act, commissives and directives called by Leech (1983) as impositives. Bhise (2015) indicated that commissives are found in utterances that express speaker's intention in the future action and directives or impositives are expressions that influence the hearer to do action. Moreover, it implies that requests are often indirect, tentative, giving an opportunity to refuse, and also softening or mitigating speaker's imposition on hearer. This is in consonance to the study of Katz (2016) which stipulated that the speaker may phrase the request indirectly to give the addressee (hearer) greater freedom in their choice of act or response. Thus, Mulyono (2016) maintained that in this maxim participants are expected to be humble by reducing their own praise.

The generosity maxim is exhibited in CRSS 1, 5, 9, 10, and 17. This involves minimizing benefit to self and maximizing cost to self. Like the tact maxim, the generosity maxim occurs in commissives and directives or impositives (Bhise, 2015). Moreover, it implies that offers, invitations, and promises are generous acts. In addition, Katz (2016) asserted that offers, invitations, and promises are commissives or obligative speech acts in which an obligation is placed by the speaker on herself or himself. This limits the speaker's freedom of action by setting a time limit within which the action must be performed. Furthermore, Haryono (2013) and Mulyono (2016) stressed that unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker and says that others should be put first instead of the self.

On the other hand, the approbation maxim is manifested in CRSS 1, 4, 5, 7, and 10. This involves minimizing dispraise of other and maximizing praise of other. It instructs to avoid saying unpleasant things about others and especially about the hearer. The maxim of approbation occurs in assertive or representative utterances that express true proposition and expressive utterances that show the speaker's feelings (Bhise, 2015). Moreover, it implies that in some activity types complimentary language is a virtual necessity, as when guests praise a hotel's meal or an academic introduces the lecture of a visiting senior professor. Thus, Felemban (2012) claimed that compliments are highly valued as manifested in the maxim of approbation.

Additionally, the modesty maxim is revealed in CRSS 2, 3, 8, 10, and 18. This involves minimizing praise of self and maximizing dispraise of self. Moreover, it implies that self-deprecation even if sincere or exaggerated is often felt to be polite in nature. Consequently, Felemban (2012) pointed out that this maxim concentrates on self thus, self-dispraise is considered polite.

The agreement maxim is stipulated in CRSS 4, 5, 8, 9, and 18. This involves minimizing disagreement between self and other and maximizing agreement between self and other. The disagreement in this maxim, is usually expressed by regret or partial agreement. It occurs in assertive or representative illocutionary act (Bhise, 2015). Moreover, it implies that in responding to others' opinions or judgments, agreement is the preferred response and disagreement is dispreferred. In this maxim, it is emphasized that the participants are said to foster mutual compatibility or agreement between the speakers and the hearers (Haryono, 2013).

Finally, the sympathy maxim is observed in CRSS 8, 11, 17, 18, and 19. This involves minimizing antipathy between self and other and maximizing sympathy between self and other. In this case, the achievement being reached by other must be congratulated. On the other hand, the calamity that happens to other, must be given sympathy or condolences. This maxim is applicable in assertive or representative utterances (Bhise, 2015). Moreover, it implies that it is polite to show others that you share their feelings: feeling sad when they have suffered misfortune and feeling joyful when they have cause for rejoicing. Congratulations, good wishes, and condolences are all intrinsically courteous speech acts and need no mitigation. This runs parallel to the study of Handayani (2013) which stated that in the maxim of sympathy the speakers are suggested to give their sympathy or commiseration to the hearer especially when the hearer is in the bad condition or situation.

Contribution of the Maxims in Resolving the Conflict

Pursuing the above concepts further, Hao and Chi (2013) averred that the politeness principle known as politeness maxims plays a crucial role in human communication especially in enhancing interpersonal relationship. The moment people adhere to the maxims, they make their utterances more tactful establishing harmony and comity with each other. On the other hand, if people violate the maxims, they may make the hearers feel unacceptable; thus, increasing the probability of discord and conflict. In addition, Brown (2015) stressed that the conversational maxim approach shares with the social norm approach the emphasis on codified social rules for minimizing friction between interactors, and the view that deviations from expected levels or forms of politeness carry a message.

As conveyed by, Ramani and Zhimin (2010) conflict comprises the actions that we take to express our feelings, articulate our perceptions, and get our needs through interfering with someone else's ability to get his or her needs met. It is on this premise that Mulyono (2016) emphasized that the utilization of politeness maxims can avoid conflict and create an environment that is comfortable in communication.

Moreover, Lakoff (1990) defined politeness as a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange. In the same manner, Widyasari (2016) stated that politeness principle can be defined as the principle which can minimize the potential for conflict and confrontation in all human interchange when interpersonal relations are interacting. Hence, politeness maxims play a pivotal role as the key to resolve the numerous conflicts in schools. Further, the goal of politeness principle is to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in their communication with us (Subertova, 2013).

Implications for Practice

Grievance reports from academic institutions under the auspices of the Department of Education embody politeness maxims such as tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy that all contributed to conflict resolution. As Leech (1983) averred that his theory of politeness influences the participants in communication to avoid communicative discord or conflict and maintain or enhance communicative concord or comity. Further, discord and concord are scalar phenomena in terms of their degree and significance. However, politeness is concerned with avoiding discord and fostering concord during communication.

In addition, the arena of education is constantly plagued with challenges that threaten its very existence including the myriad conflicts it has to deal with every single moment just to produce peace-mobilizing-surroundings to attain and achieve quality. That being said, Jija (2012) stipulated that language use can be a venom that fuels conflicts or a panacea that ignites conflict management and resolution. This is in conjunction with the statement of Ani (2015) who pointed out that language is a driving force of preserving people's culture, enhancement of peace and conflict resolution in the society. Pursuing the above concepts further, Opara (2016) emphasized that conflict resolution relies heavily on words which carry meanings that make sense to members of a shared social environment. Through this work, educational practitioners specifically grievance officers or conflict mitigators may find solace and redemption as mechanism for conflict redress is achievable through politeness maxims that may soothe an aching heart and heal relationships on the rocks.

Implications for Further Research

The arena of politeness has long been studied for its multifaceted in nature. As Senowarsito (2013) argued that politeness is based on intimacy, closeness, and relationships, as well as the social distance between the speaker and the hearer. Therefore, one good study in the academic setting is to look at closely classroom interactions and assess manifestations of politeness maxims potential for exploration.

Likewise, research on linguistic politeness is foreign in theory and scope. Getting into account the landscape of local politeness as practice by Filipinos may be a good starting point for an exclusive truly rich Filipino linguistic politeness.

REFERENCES

[1]. Ani, C. O. (2015). The role of language for peace and conflict resolution. *Journal of Research Development*, *24*(2), 1-6.

[2]. Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Razavieh, A. (2010*). Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Wardswoth Cengage Learning. Canada: Nelson Education ltd Exotic Classic.

[3]. Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K. & Walker, D. (2013). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.

[4]. Aula, P. & Siira, K. (2010). Organizational communication and conflict management systems: A social complexity approach. *Nordicom Review*, *31*(1), 125-141.

[5]. Bauer, M. W., Bicquelet, A. & Suerdem, A. K. (2014). *Text analysis: An introductory manifesto.* Sage, London, UK.

[6]. Bernard, H. R. & Ryan, G. (1998). Text analysis: Qualitative and quantitative methods. In *Handbook of methods in Cultural Anthropology* (pp. 595-645). Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.459.7613&rep=rep1&type=pdf

[7]. Bernard, H. R. & Ryan, G. W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

[8]. Bhise, D. M. (2015). Importance of politeness principle. *International Journal of Multifaceted and Multilingual Studies*, *1*(7), 1-8.

[9]. Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners.* London: Sage.

[10]. Brown, G. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[11]. Brown, P. (2015). Politeness and language. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences (IESBS)* (2nd ed., pp. 326-330). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

[12]. Cope, D.G. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41,* 89-92.

[13]. Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

[14]. Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

[15]. Deutsch, M. (1949). An experimental study of the effects of co-operation and competition upon group process. *Human relations, 2*(3), 199-231.

[16]. Dyatmawan, I. (2015). Politeness maxims applied by characters in movie My Week with Marilyn. *Humanis*, *13*(2), 1-8.

[17]. Felemban, F. H. (2012). Building up learners' communicative competence: The politeness principle. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 70-76.

[18]. Fleetwood, K. L. (1987). *The conflict management styles and strategies of educational managers.* (Master's thesis, University of Delaware, USA). Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com.ph/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Fleetwood%2C+K.+L.+%281987%29.+The+conflict+management+styles+and+strategies+of+educational+managers.+Doctoral+Dissertation%2C+University+of+Delaware.&btnG=

[19]. Geis, M. L. (1982). *The language of television advertising*. New York: Academic Press.

[20]. Gempes, G., Sayson, A., Manalaysay, P., Mejica, D. & Noveno, D. (2009). Locus of control and work commitment of baby boomers and generation x. *The Frontier, 8,* 122-160.

[21]. Ghaffar, A. (2010). Conflict in schools: Its causes & management strategies. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, *3*(2), 212-227.

[22]. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

[23]. Gulti, B. T. (2014). *Conflict and its management styles: Teachers, students, and principals perceptions, the case of Kolfe Keranyo sub-city government secondary schools of Addis Ababa* (Doctoral dissertation, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia). Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com.ph/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=+Gulti%2C+B.+T.+%282014%29.+Conflict+and+its+management+styles%3A+Teachers%2C+students%2C+and+principals+perceptions%2C+the+case+of+Kolfe+Keranyo+sub-city+government+secondary+schools+of+Addis+Ababa+%28Doctoral+dissertation%2C+Addis+Ababa+University%2C+Ethiopia%29.&btnG=

[24]. Handayani, T. (2013). Violating politeness principles in cellular phone provider. *Journal of English Language, Culture and Literature*, *2*, 293-303.

[25]. Hao, Y. & Chi, R. (2013). Politeness principle in human communication. *Studies in Sociology of Science*, *4*(3), 54.

[26]. Haryono, P. (2013). The use of politeness principles in look ahead an English course for senior high school students. *Magistra*, *25*(86), 11.

[27]. Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A. & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics, 10*, 347-371.

[28]. Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua, 8*, 223-248.

[29]. Jija, T. (2012). Language as a tool for conflict management and resolution. *Journal of Igbo Language and Linguistics, 5,* 112-120.

[30]. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research.* Interaction Book Company.

[31]. Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

[32]. Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. Malden: Blackwell.

[33]. Katz, M. (2016). *Politeness theory and the classification of English speech acts.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania). Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com.ph/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Katz%2C+M.+%282016%29.+Politeness+theory+and+the+classification+of+English+speech+acts.+Doctoral+Dissertation%2C+Arts+%26+Social+Sciences%3A+Department+of+Linguistics.&btnG=

[34]. Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

[35]. Kothari, C. (2003). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques.* HS poplai New Delhi.

[36]. Kuckartz, U. (2014). *Qualitative text analysis: A guide to methods, practice and using software*. Sage.

[37]. Lakoff, R. (1973, April). The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's. Paper presented at the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, USA.

[38]. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and women's place.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

[39]. Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking power: The politeness of language.* New York: Basic Books.

[40]. Lal Das, D. K. & Bhaskaran, V. (Eds.). (2008). *Research methods for social work*. New Delhi: Rawat.

[41]. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* London and New York: Longman.

[42]. Lichtman, M. (2012). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

[43]. Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

[44]. Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2010). *Designing qualitative research.* Sage.

[45]. Matsumoto, Y. (1989). Politeness and conversational universals-observations from Japanese. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Communication, 8*(2), 207-222.

[46]. McLeod, I. A. (2009). *Leaving the ship but staying on board: A multiple case study of the voluntary shift from the position of leader to teacher within the same educational institution.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand.

[47]. Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

[48]. Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

[49]. Miller, C. A. & King, M. E. (2005). *A glossary of terms and concepts in peace and conflict studies*. San Jose, Costa Rica: University for Peace.

[50]. Mulyono, E. (2016). Politeness principle analysis in cartoon movie entitled Stand by Me Doraemon. *Premise Journal, 5*(1), 9-23.

[51]. Ng, S. H. & Bradac, J. J. (1993). *Power in language.* Newbury Park/ London/ New Delhi: Sage.

[52]. Opara, C. G. (2016). Language and culture as conflict resolution tools: Rethinking English as lingua franca. *British Journal of English Linguistics, 4*(5), 11-15.

[53]. Opoku-Asare, N. A. A., Takyi, H. & Owusu-Mensah, M. (2015). Conflict prevalence in primary school and how it is understood to affect teaching and learning in Ghana. *SAGE Open, 5*(3), 2158244015592935.

[54]. Owens, R.G. (1998). *Organization behavior in education* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

[55]. Pishghadam, R. (2011, July). An analysis of the realization of politeness markers in official letters: A cross-cultural study. Paper presented at the 6th International Symposium on Politeness: Corpus Approaches, Ankara, Turkey.

[56]. Pishghadam, R. & Navari, S. (2012). A study into politeness strategies and politeness markers in advertisements as persuasive tools. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(2), 161-171.

[57]. Ramani, K. & Zhimin, L. (2010). A survey on conflict resolution mechanisms in public secondary schools: A case of Nairobi province, Kenya. *Educational Research and Reviews, 5*(5), 242.

[58]. Ryan, G. W. & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp.769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[59]. San Jose, A. E. (2012). Linguistic experiences of adult dyslexic learners. *UIC Research Journals, 18*(1), 101-120.

[60]. Senowarsito, S. (2013). Politeness strategies in teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom context. *TEFLIN Journal, 24*(1), 82-96.

[61]. Schmidt, R., Shimura, A., Wang, Z. & Jeong, H. (1995). Suggestions to buy: Television commercials from the U.S., Japan, China, and Korea. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts cross cultures*: *Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 285-316). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

[62]. Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (2001). *Intercultural communication* (2nd ed.). London: Blackwell Publishing.
[63]. Subertova, A. (2013). *Aspects of politeness in a classroom of English as a second language* (Master's thesis, Charles University, Prague). Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com.ph/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Subertova%2C+A.+%282013%29.+Aspects+of+politeness+in+a+classroom+of+English+as+a+second+language+%28Master%E2%80%99s+thesis%2C+Charles+University%2C+Prague%29.+&btnG=
[64]. Urbanová, L. & Oakland, A. (2002). *Úvod do anglické stylistiky.* Brno: Barrister & Principal.
[65]. Wang, J. & Wei, F. (2016). The application of politeness principle in the analysis of drama: Take teahouse as an example. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, *12*(5), 35-38.
[66]. Widyasari, F. E. (2016). Problems on implementing the politeness principle in teaching and learning speaking. *Jurnal Penelitian LPPM (Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat) IKIP PGRI MADIUN, 4*(1), 68-75.
[67]. Wilkinson, S. (2000). Women with breast cancer talking causes: comparing content, biographical and discursive analyses. *Feminism & Psychology, 10*(4), 431-460.
[68]. Woods, N. (2006). *Describing discourse*. London: Hodder Arnold.