

Politeness Strategy of FTA Receiver:

Pragmatic Study of Speech Act of KBJ VI Participants

Suyami

Postgraduate Program Universitas Sebelas Maret
Solo, Indonesia
suyamibpsnt.jogja@gmail.com

Djarmika

Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret
Solo, Indonesia
djamika@staff.uns.ac.ad

Sumarlam

Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret
Solo, Indonesia
sumarlamwd@gmail.com

Dwi Purnanto

Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret
Solo, Indonesia
dwi.purnanto@yahoo.com

Abstract—This paper discusses about the strategy of politeness for FTA (face-threatening act) receiver in facing and responding ‘face-threatening act’ addressed to them. This article is resumed from research result to speech act of KBJ VI participants. It is known that the speech act of KBJ VI participants were various. Some of them expressed FTA performed by presenters, moderators, or audients. FTA is an inappropriate utterance to be potentially making the receiver feel ashamed and dislike, therefore it is potentially to raise anger for receiver. This problem formulation is how is the reaction of FTA receiver in facing and responding FTA that shame on them. The method of the research is conducted by recording, writing, classifying, choosing. The data collection is conducted by recording and noting participants’ entire speech act of KBJ VI, particularly the discussion in the seminar. The result of the recording and noting is then classified between discussion that contains FTA and not contains. Then, the discussion is classified into speech act which potentially contains FTA. The classification is then reviewed to the FTA receiver reaction in responding FTA. The result shows that the reaction of FTA receiver in facing and responding FTA are various. Some of them are responding with laughing and joking to admit their fault. Some others are silent without reaction as if careless. Some others express low profile respond. Various reactions are more likely as a strategy of politeness from the FTA receivers in keeping harmony and peace to avoid potential conflict. It is similar to the Javanese proverbs “*ngono ya ngono. ning aja ngono*” (to behave as what should behave).

Keywords: *face threatening act; speech act; face-threatening; politeness strategy*

I. INTRODUCTION

FTA (*face threatening act*) is “action to threat face”. “Face” according to Brown and Levinson (1988:61) as originated from Goffman idea (1976) from English people terms, something related to ideas about the existence of ashamed feeling or humiliated or ‘lost face’. Brown and Levinson define ‘face’ as public self-character as expected by everybody. Dealing with it Brown and Levinson differentiate face into two aspects, that is negative face’ and ‘positive face’. In politeness principle, something considered as “Face threatening act” is “speech act”, the speech act that has impact to stimulate ashamed for speech partner.

Kongres Bahasa Jawa VI (KBJ VI) is the place for meeting of practices and Javanese language lovers to discuss anything about the existence of Javanese language nowadays and the probable of its life in future. KBJ VI is the program for the stake holder dealing with the existence of Javanese language performed by distinguished people who are competent in Javanese culture, particularly in Javanese language.

As we know, that Javanese language is not only a communication means, but also the means in portraying situation of familiarities and politeness of the speakers. Javanese language is language that is full of ethic, values of politeness. Material of Javanese language is differentiated in gradation of class level that portrays the regulation of values of Javanese politeness.

Javanese language does not only function as communication means, but also as parameter of mastering level of politeness of its speakers.

Nevertheless, in KBJ VI program, there was impolite action or utterance spoken by some participants in the program that impact to stimulate FTA for the receivers. Dealing with that, this research formulates the problem as 1) how is the reaction of FTA receivers, 2) how is the strategy of politeness applied by the FTA receivers in facing the FTA doers.

This research aims to 1) reveal the reaction of the FTA receivers that make them ashamed, 2) presenting strategy illustration of politeness as applied by FTA receivers in responding the FTA doers to them.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (1995:878), word '*kesantunan*' (politeness) is originated from the word '*santun*' which means 1) soft and good (good in language and attitude); polite, patient, and calm, 2) full of loving; helpful. Dealing with the word '*kesantunan*' can be translated as softness and polite in speaking and manner; about politeness, patient and calm; about loving and helpful.

The aim of politeness is to keep social relationship harmoniously (Cruse, 2000:362; in Gunarwan, 2007:164). Cruse states that for the sake of politeness in speaking we need to choose the expression with the minimal potential for the partner to lose their faces. In the politeness principle, speaking is not just speaking but also choosing strategy mainly in maintain speaking partner's face, avoiding the action of speaking which threaten face or humiliate the speaking partner, so that the partner feel to lost their faces (Brown and Levinson 1987: 61; in Yan Huang, 2007:116).

Asim Gunarwan (2007:164), in his book *Kelana Bahana Sang Bahasawan* with subtitle "*Rasa Kejawaan dan Pengungkapan Tindak Tutur Pengancam Muka di Kalangan Orang Jawa*" (Gunarwan, 2008; in Katharina E.S. (editor), 2008: 427-458). states that the aim of politeness is maintain social relationship harmoniously. Like the principle of Brown and Levinson to keep the face of speaking partner. In discussing 'politeness' there are four models as the guides a) 'social norm' model, b) 'maxim discussion' model (Leech 1983, 2003), c) '*face-saving*' model (Brown and Levinson 1978, 1987), and d) 'discussion contract' model (Fraser 1990).

This research refers to the politeness theory by Brown and Levinson about '*face-saving*' (*penutup malu*). There are two face aspects, 'positive face' and 'negative face'. 'positive face' is something which portrays willingness of individual to be accepted and liked by others. Politeness orientation to keep positive face of the others is shown when someone tends to choose speaking strategy to express solidarity feeling to the partner of speaking, delivering that the speaker and partner are in the co-operator and the speaker aims to satisfy the speaking partner (Brown and Levinson 1987: 101-29).

Negative face refers to individual to free his action out of others distinction. Positive politeness orientates to the maintain negative face to speaking partner that appears when someone tends to have speaking strategy to press his self-defensive of speaking partner.

Actions potential to threat positive face such as expression of calling down, accusation, critic, disagreement, and humiliation.

Action to threat negative face such as advice, order, asking, suggestion, and warning. Action to threat positive and negative faces such as complain, interruption, and threatening.

Speaker can threaten his own face if he does an action to receive compliment, thank you, and confession. Action which threats face of speaking partner is action like giving advice, reminding, and strong emotion. It really threats face of the preferred speaking partner (Brown and Levinson 1987: 67-8).

Researches about politeness have been conducted by previous researchers, such as, Asim Gunarwan (2008), Sumarlam (1994), Anat Zajdman (1994), Bavelas, J. et.al. (2017), Gil, J.M. (2012), Kienpointner, M. (1997), and Maria Sifianou (2012). Nevertheless, the research about politeness strategy from FTA receivers, particularly performed by KBJ VI participants has not been conducted yet.

III. METHOD

This is a qualitative research. Data collecting technique is conducted by observing and collecting document, covers speech act that potentially threat the face of speaking partner and reaction and politeness strategy as conducted by the FTA receiver in responding FTA that embarrassing them. This research is conducted in natural setting as what it is without manipulation.

Sample choice uses purposive sampling, so that numbers of sample is not considered important, when the important data has been represented. Data in the research is speech act performed by KBJ VI participants that is organized in Yogyakarta on 8-12 November 2016, particularly about reaction and strategy of politeness as implemented by the FTA receivers to FTA they received.

Data source is obtained from the formal speaking or formal discussion during the program of KBJ VI, occurred in the seminar, either the speech act of master of ceremony, moderator, speakers, or audient. Method and technique of data providing use recording, noting, and listening.

Method and data classification technique is conducted by grouping and choosing all of speech act as reaction and strategy of FTA receiver to FTA that embarrassing him. From all of the data, then it is chosen some data sample which then analyzed to find conclusion of the research. The method and data validation technique is conducted by returning the data to its context.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the research it was found 5 contexts of dialogues containing FTA, either performed by moderator, speakers, or audient that is directly or indirectly influence to the appearing of embarrassing for the receivers.

FTA context occurs between moderator (P1) and Speakers (M1). In that context the speakers are wrong in mentioning name of year in Javanese language. Year 1928 in Javanese language should be said *sewu sangangatus wolulikur*, but by the speaker it was said *sewu sangangatus kalihdasa wolu*. The mistake was then criticized by moderator by mentioning the mistake many times and finally the speaker realizes his mistake and then laugh a lot by asking for apology. Action of FTA conducted by P1 is involved in positive face FTA category, that is critical expression to the misspelling by M1. While the conduct of M1 in responding FTA from P1 is strategy of politeness to maintain the positive face of P1.

FTA context II occurs between speaker (P2) and moderator and audient (M2). In the context P2 criticized theme of KBJ VI. According to P2, theme of KBJ VI “Basa Jawa Triwikrama” is not appropriate. In the case, M2 as the organizer and the idea maker only smile without words. FTA action as conducted by P2 is included in category of positive face FTA, that is calling down expression. In responding that thing, M2 reacts with smile without words in positive face. Here, the conduct of M2 in responding FTA from P2 is politeness strategy by maintaining P2 positive face.

FTA context III occurs between (P3) speakers with young woman audient (M2). In this context, P3 asks M3 to move forward before him to receive gift of money Rp200.000 with the message to buy milk for her sons, for P3 needs milk. In this context, FTA action has been conducted including in FTA category of negative face by giving order to do by M3. In responding his, M3 reacts with smile without words by obeying what P3 ask. Here the conduct of M3 in responding FTA from P3 is strategy of politeness by maintaining positive face of P3.

FTA context IV occurs between moderator (P4) with the speaker (M4). In this context P4 gives comment the speaker action who says the materials using Javanese language in *ngoko* style, like Javanese in Suriname who only know Javanese language in *ngoko* style. The action conducted by P4 including positive face of FTA category, that is the comment of soft critics to the action of M4. In responding that thing, M4 reacts by smiling without words. The conduct of M4 in responding FTA from P4 is politeness strategy to maintain P4 positive face.

FTA context V occurs between P5 audient that consist of 5 people (P5.1, P5.2, P5.3, P5.4, P5.5) with speaker (M5). In the context P5 (P5.1, P5.2, P5.3, P5.4, P5.5) criticize the conduct of M5 who gives materials using Javanese language in *ngoko* style and the statement of M5 who states that Javanese language in *krama* style does not need to be preserved. Javanese language in *krama* style is considered old and irrelevant with the life of people nowadays, particularly people in Surabaya district.

FTA action of P5 is including in FTA category of positive and negative FTA. The positive face is conducted by P5.1 and P5.3 where both of them honestly disagree with the argumentation of M5. FTA negative face is conducted by P5.2, P5.3, P5.4, and P5.5. P5.2 by giving advice and suggestion to M5 to review his statements that Javanese language to be preserved is only Javanese language in *ngoko* style. According to P5.2, P5.3, P5.4, Javanese language, besides as communication means also the means of courtesy education, as implemented in the stratification of Javanese language as Javanese language of *ngoko* and *krama* style. If the Javanese language in *krama* style is forgotten, value of politeness in Javanese language will be forgotten as well. Therefore, the use of Javanese language has to be *empan papan*, or suitable with the situation and need for basically in Javanese system of Javanese language, between spoken and action can be differentiated but it cannot be separated.

In responding that, M5 reacts with hard opposition that what has been stated is not modification, but facts on field. Here the conduct of M5 in responding FTA from P5 is strategy of politeness to maintain negative face. It can be seen that he takes attitude to defend himself in his attitude that does not want to be defined by others. On the other side, M5 also agrees some of the argumentation of P5, but he cannot do that.

V. CONCLUSION

The result shows about politeness strategy of KBJ VI participants who receive FTA in responding FTA addressed to them are 4 people chose strategy of speaker of positive face politeness, namely: M1 to P1, M2 to P2, M3 to P3, and M4 to P4. They tend to choose cooperative attitude with the speakers who sent FTA to them. Among them, there are who respond with fun and laugh, or

smiling without words. Except M5 in responding FTA as given by P5 that consist of 5 people. He responded using politeness negative face politeness strategy.

References

- Bavelas, J.; Gerwing, J.; Healing S., 2017. "Doing Mutual Understanding. Calibrating With Micro-sequences in Face-to-Face Dialogue" dalam *Journal of Pragmatics* 121 (2017) 91-112.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C.. 1978. "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena". In E.N. Goody.ed. *Questions and Politeness*. 56-289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1987. *Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage*. Great Britain: Redwood Burn Ltd., Trowbridge, Wiltshire.
- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Fraser, B. 1990. "Perspectives on Politeness". [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 219-236, Retrieved Oktober 16, 2011 From <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/037821669090081N>
- Geertz, Hildred. 1961. *The Javanese Family. A Study of Kinship and Socialization*. The Free Press og Glncoe.
- Gil, J. M. 2012. "Face-Threatening Speech Acts and Face-Involving Speech Acts: An Interpretation of Politeness Phenomena" dalam *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vo. 4. No. 2.
- Goffman, E., 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. University Of Edinburgh: Social Sciences Research Centre.
- Goffman, E., 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face to Face Behavior*. New York: Garden City.
- Gu, Yueguo, 1990, "Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14.2: 237-257.
- Guan, X. and Lee, H. E. 2017. "Fight and Flight: A Multilevel Analysis of Facework Strategies in Intercultural Face-Threatening Acts" dalam *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 58 (2017) 60-81.
- Gunarwan, Asim, 2007. *Pragmatik, Teori dan Kajian Nusantara*. Jakarta. Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1990. "Perspectives on Politeness", *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 219-236.
- Harjawiyan, H. 2001. *Marsudi Unggah-Ungguh Basa Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- Huang, Y.. 2007. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: University Press.
- Ide, Sachico. 1989. "Formal Forms and Discemment: Neglected Aspects of Linguistic Politeness. *Multilingua* 8 (2), 223-248.
- Kedves, A. 2013. "Face Threatening Acts and Politeness Strategies in Summer Scholl Application Calls" dalam *Jezikoslovlje*. 14.2-3 (2013):431-444.
- Kementerian Pengadjaran Pendidikan dan Keboedajaan. 1947. *Karti Basa*. Djakarta: Kementerian Pengadjaran Pendidikan dan Keboedajaan.
- Kienpointner, M. 1997. "Varieties of Rudeness Types and Functions of Impolite Utterances" dalam *Functions of Language* 4:2 (1997), 251-287.
- Lakoff, G. 2011. *Politeness Theory*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Leech, G..1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Magnis-Suseno, F., 1988, *Etika Jawa: Sebuah Analisis Falsafi tentang Kebijakan Hidup Jawa*. (cetakan ke-3), Jakarta: P.T. Gramedia.
- Mangkunegara IV, K.G.P.A.A., 1921, *Wedhatama* (Cetakan II), Solo: Boekh M. Tanoyo.
- Mangkunegara IV, K.G.P.A.A., 1922. "Wedhatama", dalam *Serat Piwulng Warni-Warni*. Surakarta: Perpustakaan Museum Reksupustaka Mangkunegaran (Koleksi No. A 115).
- Matsumoto, Y. 1988. Reexamination of the Universality of Face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12, 4: 403-426.
- Poerwadarminta, W.J.S. 1939 *Boesastra Djawa*. Batavia: J.B. Wolters Uitgevers Maatschapij.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes". In: Alkinson M., Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-103.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1984. "Jewish Argument as Sociability". Dalam *Language in Society* 13. 311-335
- Scollon & Scollon. 1995. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. 2nd ed. (first ed. 1995), Blackwell Publishers.
- Sifianou, M., 1992. Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-cultural Perspective. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Sifianou, M. 2012. "Disagreements, Face and Politeness" dalam *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (2012) 1554-1564.
- Sumarlam, 1994. "Skala Pragmatik dan Derajat Kesantunan Tindak Tutur Direktif", dalam jurnal *Klitika*. Sukoharjo: Univet.
- Suwadji. 2013. *Ngoko Krama*. Yogyakarta: Balai Bahasa Prov. DIY.
- Suyami, 2001. *Serat Cariyos Dewi Sri dalam Perbandingan*. Yogyakarta Penerbit Kepel Press.
- Thomas, J. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Tim Penyusun Kamus Badan Bahasa, 2008. *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa
- Watts, Richard J., 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Zajdman, A.. 1995. "Humorous face-threatening acts: Humor as strategy". In *Journal of Pragmatics* 23 (325-339). Israel:Elsevier