

Politeness principle Analysis In Javanese Daily Conversation

Buntara Adi Purwanto¹, Shonu Shams²

buntara@unsiq.ac.id¹

danishattari16@gmail.com²

Universitas Sains Al-Qur'an, Wonosobo, Indonesia¹

Al Fatima Educational Society B.Ed. College, India²

Abstract

Politeness has an important role in javanese society. The norm of politeness stands in the highest level of javanese society. There are many unwritten norms which people apply it in their daily life, especially in a conversation. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to describe and explain the use of politeness in javanese daily conversation and understanding the politeness used in relation with the background culture and situation when the conversation happened. It can be found in this study that javanese politeness use indirect speech, especially when people accept an offer. In relation with Leech's maxim, Javanese people tend to use the maxim of modesty. In this case they will minimize the prise to self, especially whan they are talking about what they have and what they do.

Keywords: *politeness, Javanese, maxim*

Introduction

In conversation, speaker and hearer realize that there are rules that organize their speech, the use of diction, intonation, and the interpretation to what the others express. Every speaker has a responsibilities in what they do and what they say to the norm of linguistics in the coversation. (Putu, 1996)

Pragmatics covers the use of linguistics items in relation with the context of situation in conversation. One branch of pragmatics which undertakes the role of expression in politeness. Politeness is understood in terms of conflict avoidance. In a pragmatic perspective, Lakoff (1990:34) states that politeness “facilitate(s) interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange”. It is assumed that people follow; Politeness Principle by engaging with each other for meaningful communications in which they act as rational agents (Grice, 1975). According to Brown and Levinson (1986), linguistic strategies are employed by speakers to realize politeness, which manifests one’s respect and recognition of another’s face – self-image. The

choices of such strategies depend on the power and personal relationship between the speaker and hearer, and the degree of negativity of the message. B&L (1986) think that the analysis of politeness is to access the actors' intentions. Speaker strategically manages his/her face-threatening acts" (FTA) to account for either "positive" or "negative" face. Positive face is the desire to have social approval and acceptance, and negative face is the need to have independence and freedom in action. Hence FTA is performed with redress in positive or negative politeness.

Politeness is a branch of pragmatics and sociolinguistics whose science and scholars often analyzed. However the use of language in a specific region has its own term to express politeness. Ning Zhao (2008) who studied the politeness in *Scent of a Woman* (a film), found that politeness in action in this film uncovers both the informational and affective dimensions of language use in structuring human relationship and friendship. Landeegaard (2004) who studied politeness in young children speech, found out that There is no doubt that in the context of the kindergarten and the pre-school class, children socialize each other, for example in establishing and maintaining their gender identity, in the acquisition of social routines and in the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence. And a study was done by Gea Valor (2001) who analyzing the politeness in the book review found that positive politeness strategy is used with two main purposes; to maintain the harmonious relationship with reviewee and to mitigate the negative force in the critical statements. Another interesting study in politeness has been done by Chun (2003) who studied at "A Contrastive Study on Disagreement Strategies for Politeness between American English & Mandarin Chinese" and found that Positive correlation is found between the rates of disagreement and the change of the social distance for the Chinese students while negative correlation for the American students.

As others region who has specific term to show politeness, javanese politeness hold very important role in society. Language and manner in javanese politeness is a heritage and it can show the javanese status and social class. It also can be said that Politeness stands in the first position in social life, of course for those who wants a prosperity and harmony in their life.

In javanese, politeness involves a very wide range of the life sectors faced by people. It involves mental (idea, invention, intention, etc) and factual (every day life"s problem which involved politeness). (Maryono, 2010)

In the aspect of language used, Suwadji (1985, 14-15) stated that politeness in javanese language is a life-long cultural heritage which people must use it. In details, javanese politeness teaches us to regard others, generally it applied for the youger to the elder, between person in their first time meeting or for those who has unclosed relationship. Politeness in javanese give a guarantee to smoothness of communication in conversational javanese society. So, we can conclude that there is a close relationship between the role of piliteness in javanese culture with the politeness principle.

This study is going to do with (1) the use of politeness in javanese daily conversation and (2) understanding the politeness used in relation with the background culture and situation when the conversation happened.

Literary Review

Politeness Principle

A concept of Politeness Principle in Pragmatics has been pointed out by Leech Goeferry Leech (1983). His major contribution to the politeness principle is his conversational maxim which teach us about minimizing the face threatening act. It is am act that threaten to damage the face of the person addressed or the speaker by acting in position to the wants and desires of the other.

“Acts that infringe on the hearers’ need to maintain his/her self-esteem, and be respected.” (Hellen and Spencer, 2005)

According to him there are six maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy.

1. The Tact Maxim: Minimize the expression of belief which imply cost to the other, and maximize the expression of belief which imply benefit to the other.
2. Generosity maxim : Minimize the expression of benefit to self, and maximize the expression of cost to self.

3. Approbation Maxim : Minimize the expression of belief which express dispraise of others, and maximize the expression of belief which express approval of others.
4. Modesty Maxim : Minimize the expression of praise to self, and maximize the expression of dispraise of self.
5. Agreement Maxim : Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other, and maximize the expression of agreement between self and other.
6. Sympathy Maxim : Minimize antipathy between self and other, and maximize sympathy between self and other. (Leech in Yanagiya, 2009; 9-10).

Another concept of politeness is proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). They defined politeness strategies which contains of four terms; Bold On-Record Strategies, Positive Politeness Strategies, Negative Politeness Strategies, and Off-record (Indirect) strategies.

1. Bold On-Record Strategies : They are strategies that usually make no or little attempt to minimize the threat to hearer's face.
2. Positive Politeness Strategies : It seeks to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face. These strategies are supposed to make the hearer feel good about himself, his interests and possession. The are used among people who know each other well. (Moore; 2001)
3. Negative Politeness Strategies: It also recognize and want to save hearer's face, but they also recognize that you are in some way imposing on them.
4. Off-Record (Indirect) Strategies : The are strategies that make use of indirect language in order to minimize the threat on imposing on the hearer. The main purpose is to take some of the pressure from from the speaker so that he does not seem imposing.

However, Brown and Levinson (1987) have criticised Leech's (1983) politeness maxim for several reasons. Firstly, they point out, in the current formulation, there is no motivated way of restricting the number of maxims.

Clearly, it is unacceptable for new maxims to be invented every time new regularities are noticed in 'polite' language use. Secondly, They argue that the politeness maxims function at a more superficial, less fundamental level than the cooperative maxims, and are therefore more easily undermined than the cooperative maxims. As they criticise Leech's maxim, they also accepted the term of maxims proposed by Leech.

Research Methodology

This is a qualitative research. The data was taken in Ngembik, Magelang, Jentral Java in December 24th 2019. The sources was a a local ngembik and has an important role in village "kepala dusun". The data was taken by using unstructured interview which was recorded and then transcribed, so that the data was natural in a flowing conversation. Reseacher went directly to the field and get an interaction with the people naturally. The natural conversation was recorded with the concious understanding of the interviewee. Then the data was analyzed by using "politeness principle".

Discussion and Finding

The data of this research is the form of recorded conversation which was transcribed.

(In the yard btween researcher (guess) and a villager of Desa Ngumbulan (host); July 1, 2012)

A : Assalamuailkuam Pak, pun tepangaken nami kulo Adi saking UNSIQ Wonosobo. Badhe nyuwun data pemuda kalian remaja ingkang kuliah kalian mboten kuliah.

(Assalamualaikum sir, I am Adi from Unsiq Wonosobo. I want to know the amount of youngsters who study in university)

B : Njih. *(while nooding of head)*

(Ok)

A : Pak, pemuda mriki kathah gih? Nanging kok sepi?

(Sir, There are many youngsters here, right? But it is quite?)

B : Kathah, sami ngempal wonten Karang Taruna.

(We have many, they are gathering at Karang Taruna)

A : Kathah ingkang Kuliah nopo nyambut damel gih?

(Which one has a greater quantity between employers and scholars?)

B : Ingkang Kuliah wonten, Ingkang nyambut damel njih wonten, Anak Bapak wonten ingkang Kuliah ting UNY.

(We have both, employers and scholars. My son is studying in UNY)

A : Ohhh, Jurusan napa pak?

(What's the subject subject, sir?)

B : Menawi mboten klintu semester kaleh. Ah, mas bapak meksa'aken nguliahke anak, mugi-mugi mawon saged gih mas.

(May be smester two. Ah, I try hard to send him to campus, I wish I can do it.)

A : *(Tersenyum kecil)*

(smile)

B : Injih mas, Bapak mboten ngangloh kagungan putro kathah, mugi-mugi sami sukses gih maz. Monggo, Kulo aturi pinarak wonten nglebet gubuk !

(Right, I never beefed that I have many children. I hope they will success, right. Would you like to have a sit inside my hut?)

A : Njih Pak, maturnuwun. Kulo terasan mawon.

(Thanks, sir. I'll just continue my way)

B : Monggo lho nak, njengan kados kesel sanget saking Temanggung.

(It's okey. You looks so tired from Temanggung)

As we can see at the dialogue above that B's speech is more dominant than A. Every single question uttered by A, B answers it with more than one information needed by A. Generally, the length of an utterance determine the level of politeness of that utterance. Putu Wijana (1996) said that the longer utterance of someone, there is a bigger willingness of that person to be polite to the hearer. As the dialogue above, it happens in unclosed relationship conversation between speaker and hearer. It is possible because speaker and hearer do not recognize each other. In another hand, B is older than A, besides he is roled as host and A is roled as guest. But as we can see. That the next conversation senses more familiar/closer. This is the role of politeness. It is needed to avoid face threatening act so it can reduce the link between speaker and hearer. In another hand, both speaker use *kromo alus*. This is a language level to regarding someone else during a conversation.

Based on the politeness principle proposed by Leech (1983), B's utterances express many kinds of maxims. The example bellow expresses the maxim of modesty.

"B : Menawi mboten klintu semester kaleh. Ah, mas bapak meksa'aken nguliahke anak, mugi-mugi mawon saged gih mas."

(*Maybe semester two. Ah, I try hard to send him to campus. I wish I can do it*).

B's utterance above shows that B minimize the expression of praise to self, and maximize the expression of dispraise of self. Here the researcher cannot measure B's financial condition, but what is stated by B is not match with the fact that he can sent his son to college. The purpose of B to express that unttrence is to be modest/ to reduce the sense of arogan.

Another modesty maxim is shown when B lets A to enter his house.

*B : Injih mas, Bapak mboten ngangloh kagungan putro kathah, mugimugi sami sukses gih maz. Monggo, Kulo aturi pinarak wonten nglebet **gubuk** !*

(*Right, I never beefed that I have many child. I hope they will success, right brother. Would you like to have a sit inside my **hut**?*)

He calls his house as hut. What he means is not merely a real hut like in the ricefield, but it is a house, in fact, he has normal beatiful house. B's utterance here shows that B minimize the expression of praise to self, and maximize the expression of dispraise of self. He wants to reduce the sense of show off.

The next expressions of politeness maxim is shown inside the house. The conversation is between researcher (A) and B's wife (C).

(Inside the house; the host provide a cup of tea and snack. It was in Javanese family environment, between host and guest)

C : Monggo dipun kedhapi, nak!

(Let's eat these. please!)

A : Sampun to bu, sampun repot-repot.

(It's okey, mam. Don't be so busy)

C : Namung toya kok nak.

(It is just a water)

The modesty maxim is shown In the last line of C's utterance. "*Namung toya kok nak. (It is just a water)*". In fact, C gives a cup of tea and snacks to A, and she said that it is just a water. What is uttered by C here means that she want to minimize the expression of prasio to self, she wants to be modest to A.

Politeness principle is needed in every context of utterance, moreover it happens in javanese culture which is characterized by politeness. In javanese culture the A's utterance can be said as polite, since it is not directly accept what C offers ti him.

It is different when A said “*O.. gih bu,, kulo langsung maem njih*” (*Okey mam,, I will eat it now*). Based on javanese culture the answer is too “directly”. However, it is not polite, because there is no closer relationship between speaker and hearer. In another hand, the conversation is between host and guest who have not see each other before. In another culture, they can accept the “direct” answer. It is different in javanese culture, people tend to do a small talk first before they do what they want.

Conclusion

The scope of pragmatics is not only arrest the mening of an utterance, but also it is related with the context of the utterance. So, it able to explain the meaning that cannot be explained by the others linguistics branches.

Politeness in pragmatics regards how the meaning of an utterance is appropriate for people who used it in relation with the context of situation. In the discussion above, what Leech (1983) said that there are context of culture that emphasize politeness principle in a certain situation, and there are some culture that tend to emphasize one kind of politeness maxim than the other. It is because the influence of the context where the conversation happened. In the dialogues above, the context of conversation is in javanese culture in which the people tends to behave as polite as possible to the others.

It can be seen that in javanese culture, people tend to express the maxim of modesty (minimize the expression of praise to self, and maximize the expression of dispraise of self) in the conversation, especially in the condition that there is no close relationship between speaker and hearer or both never see each other before.

References

Ashcraft . 1994. *Human Memory and Cognition*. Newyork: Harper Collins.

Ba,,dulu , Adb Muis. 2004. *Introduction to linguistic*. Makassar: UNM.

Beard, A. 2000. *Language in Politics*. London: Routledge.

Bei Zang. 2013. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 834-838, July 2013. Finland: Academy Publisher.

Crystal, D.(2005). *How Language Works: How Babies Babble, Words Change Meaning, and Languages Live or Die* .Woodstock, NY: Overlook

Edelman, M .1971. *Politics as Symbolic Action*. Chicago: Markham.

Kulo, Ieno. 2009. *Linguistic Feature in the Political Speeches*. Lulea University of Technology.

Kenechukwu S. A.2013. *Behind Advertising: The Language of Persuasion*. <http://www.aessweb.com>.

Mio, Scott Jefrei. 1997. *Methaphor and politics*. Carlifornia: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.

Yule, G. 1996. *The Study of Language 2nd ed*. Trumpington Street, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.