

Politeness Strategies in Directives Speech Acts Found in Daily Conversations among Students of Senior High School of Daarul Huda in the Academic Year of 2017/2018.

Nana Supriatna¹, Adi Irfan Marjuqi², Pandu Pribadi³

STIT Muhammadiyah Banjar^{1,2,3}

alularajwamauludiah2016@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Politeness is an essential thing in communication. It helps humans to maintain good relationships among themselves. English Department students are also expected to maintain their relations by showing politeness. However, politeness seems not important since the students did not consider their hearers. This study aims to find out the kinds of Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy among the Senior High School Daarul Huda and how they use those strategies in their daily conversations. In this study, I use Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy because their rules serve as the most influential theory on politeness. This study uses a qualitative approach. It means the writer uses the descriptive method. The subject of this study is the Senior High School Daarul Huda in the academic year 2017/2018. The source of the data is the students' spoken expressions which the writer transcribes into conversational texts. Together with the data, the writer observes the students' speaking classes, comes to their classes before lecturing, and goes to their boarding houses. The writer records their conversation and transcribes all the conversations the writer gets. Then, I analyze the data based on Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy. The result of the study is there are 166 utterances of Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy that are used by the students in their daily conversations. They are (1) a bald on-record strategy, (2) a positive politeness strategy, (3) a negative politeness strategy, (4) an off-record strategy and (5) a do not do FTA/ keep the quiet strategy. Bald on record strategy is the most strategy preferred since it is the easiest way to convey messages in communication. Yet, this strategy is not appropriate to use if the students face the elder in their communication. Come up next are the negative politeness strategy, positive politeness strategy, off-record strategy and the least is do not do FTA/ keep the quiet strategy. The writer suggests for other researchers in the future could make more complete research about politeness. The subject of the data could be taken from all levels of English Department students, so various ways of politeness strategies could be found

Keywords: *Politeness, Speech Act, Conversation, Qualitative Research*

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Basically, humans are social beings. They cannot live alone. In

order to survive and get their needs, they communicate to others. Communication is the process of transmitting one's messages to

others. To convey the message in communication, human beings use language, either verbal or non-verbal language. Verbal language is the spoken one. Speech is its example. Non-verbal language is such language like gesture, writing, drawing, and expressions of face. According to Ramelan (1992: 25)

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Humans do conversation every day to get their need, exchange information, and maintain social relationship. But sometimes when they do it, they threaten someone's face. The act of threatening someone's face called Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). To minimize conflict as a result of FTAs, Brown and Levinson introduce five strategies. They are bald on record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, off-record strategy, and do not do FTA/keep quiet.

Bald on Record Strategy provides no effort by you to reduce the impact of the FTAs. The speaker will most likely shock the persons to whom s/he is speaking to, embarrassed them or make them feel a bit uncomfortable.

Positive Politeness Strategy is redress directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants should be thought of as desirable.

Negative Politeness Strategy assumes that you may be imposing in the hearer, and intruding on her/his space.

Off-record Strategy uses indirect language and removes the

speaker from the potential to being imposed.

Do Not Do FTA/ Keep Quiet means the speaker chooses to remain silent and don't want to do anything to avoid FTA.

METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

Subject of the Study

The subject of the study was the students of DAARUL HUDA OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL in the academic year 2017/2018. I chose students in this level because they have already learnt the basic social purposes of communication in Speaking I and II.

Qualitative research cannot be separated from data trustworthiness. It makes a research can be justified. One way to make a research can be justified is by using triangulation. Triangulation is the technique which uses something outside the data as comparison to the data. Denzin (1978) in Moleong (2004: 330) differentiates four kinds of triangulation that are by using *sources*, *methods*, *researchers* and *theories*. Triangulation by using *sources* tries to compare information the researcher get through different time and tool (Patton in Moleong, 2004: 330). In using *methods*, trustworthiness is obtained by using several sources with the same methods. The third kind of triangulation is by using other *researcher* or colleague to recheck trustworthiness. This way will help the researcher to reduce mistakes while collecting the data. The last is by using *theories*. Patton in Moleong (2004: 331) states that this way can be done by rival explanation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the results of data analysis and the discussion of research findings. The discussion of Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy is divided into five sections. The first section is the discussion of bald on record strategy. The second section is the discussion of positive politeness strategy. The third section is the discussion of negative politeness strategy. The next section is the discussion of off-record strategy and the last section is the discussion of do not do FTA strategy. In each strategy, the discussion is divided into sub strategies. Not all utterances are discussed. For each sub strategy, I only take some utterances to be discussed because they have similarities.

Results of Data Analysis

After analyzing the data which were taken from the daily conversations done by the fourth semester students of the English Department, I found 166 utterances of Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies that were used. These strategies consist of sixty five utterances of bald on record strategy, forty utterances of positive politeness strategy, forty six utterances of negative politeness strategy, ten utterances of off-record strategy and five utterances of do not do FTA strategy. These all strategies can be described on the chart below:

No	Strategy	Freq.
----	----------	-------

1	BALD ON RECORD	
	In the Case of Urgent Situation	4
	In the Case S emphasizes his word	1
	In the Case Task Orientation	28
	Giving Advice	11
2	POSITIVE POLITENESS	
	Noticing	
	Exaggerating	
	Using in Group Identity	4
	Markers	3
	Seeking Agreement	3
	Avoiding Disagreement	1
	Offering, Promising	1
	Being Optimistic	4
	Including Both S and H in the Activity	2
	Giving (or Asking for) Reasons	16
3	NEGATIVE POLITENESS	
	Being Conventionally Indirect	
	Questioning, Hedging	22
	Minimizing Imposition	4
	Giving Deference	4
	Apologizing	3
	Impersonalizing the S and the H	5
	Stating the FTA as a General Rule	1
	Going on Record or Incurring a Debt or as not Indebting the H	6
		1
4	OFF-RECORD	
	Giving Hints	6
	Giving Association Clues	3
	Overstate	1
5	DO NOT DO FTA/KEEP QUITE	5
Total		165

Discussions

As stated before, this study intends to describe the ways in which the students use Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies in their daily conversations. The following are the discussions of each strategy which is arranged based on the chart above.

Bald on Record

Humans use bald on record when they think that it is not necessary to redress other's face as the effect of FTAs. This case happens among close friends or people who have higher status. In the data, I found sixty five utterances of bald on record strategy. These all utterances belong to two cases, forty four utterances were *the case of non-minimization of the face threat* and the others were *the case of FTA-oriented bald on record usage*.

Case of Non-Minimization of the Face Threat

In this case, there are some occasions where S forced not to speak politely. In urgent situation, in the situation where S emphasizes his words, S has higher status than H, recipes and instruction are the examples of this case. These all situations were applied in students' daily conversation. Some of the examples are below:

In the Case of Urgent Situation

In the case of urgent situation, it is unnecessary to use politeness strategy. When people get into urgent situation, they do not have time to think about politeness. The students made utterances in this case four times. Some of them are:

- (1) B: OK... OK... I will
five minutes... oh...
give me five minutes!

[Transcription 5 line
29]

In utterance (1), S and H were classmates. S who borrowed H's book asked H to give her some minutes to take the book in her boarding house. Because they would have a class at that time, S was in hurry. She could not make this utterance polite. Yet, it was alright since in urgent situation face redress could be ignored.

In the Case S Emphasizes his Word?

In this case, S provides metaphorical urgency for emphasis. S speaks as if maximum efficiency is very important. This expression is usually found in attention-getters in conversation. The students utilized this expression once, that is:

- (1) J : I don't have enough
money... *look* at my
purse, it's empty!
[Transcription 26 line
7]

Citation (1) happened between senior and junior in the same boarding house. The junior was the subject of the data. S emphasized her word by saying "look." This word indicated that S wanted to get H's attention because she did not have any money and she wanted to borrow H's motorcycle to go to the ATM to take money.

Giving Advice

An advice is usually conveyed immediately. Face redress is also unnecessary to use in this case. The fourth semester students of English Department used this strategy eleven times. Here are three examples of them:

(4) B : At 3... *and don't forget to bring your helmet!*

[Transcription 4 line 18]

Case of FTA-Oriented Bald on Record Usage

The case of FTA-oriented bald on record usage is actually oriented to face. In this case both S and H attempt to respect each face, so that each participant attempts to foresee what the other participant is attempting to foresee. This case was also found in students' daily conversation in the form of welcoming and offering. I found thirteen utterances of welcoming strategy and eight utterances of offering strategy.

Welcoming

In *welcoming* S insists that H may impose on his negative face. In this case, when S says an utterance, he will consider who actually his H is. For instance:

(5) P: And now the last...

Oki!

[Transcription 15 line

13]

Offering

In offering, S insists that H may impose on S's negative face. S does not want H insult his freedom. In the data, the students used this strategy eight times. Two of them are:

(6) P: *Second question?!*

[Transcription 15 line

8]

Citation (12) happens in formal discussion where the presenter offered her classmates to ask the second question. She offered it because her classmates were silent.

She did not wish for being insulted because of her friends' silence.

In the data, bald on record was the strategy that was mostly used by the students. It might be because the strategy provided no effort to redress someone's face, so it was the easiest strategy used. However, the students should also consider their hearer when they talked to someone, whether they talked to their friends or their senior.

POSITIVE POLITENESS

When people try to redress someone's positive face, it means they use positive politeness. In this strategy, S respects H's wants. This wants should be thought of as desirable. The students used positive politeness strategy forty times. It consists of two ways: *claiming common ground* was found sixteen times and *convey that S and H are cooperators* was found twenty four times.

Claiming Common Ground

This type indicates that S and H both belong to a group of persons who share the same wants, and have the same goal. It means that S place himself in the same position with H. The students used this strategy in various ways including noticing, exaggerating, using in group identity markers, seeking agreement, avoiding disagreement, offering and promising

Noticing

In this strategy, S takes notice of H's condition as the result of his desire that S and H both belong to the same group who share the same wants. For example:

- (7) B: ...***“It’s better for you to not attend the course!”***...

[Transcription 14 line 6]

Using in Group Identity Markers

Another way to show positive politeness is by calling H’s identity markers. In students’ daily conversations, I found three utterances reflected this strategy. They are:

- (8) B: Oh... common ***girl***. I just borrow it.

[Transcription 27 line 10]

Seeking Agreement

The case of S tries to seek agreement from H is another way to show positive politeness. The students produced this strategy once. It could be seen in utterance below:

- (9) A: We have a duty ***right?***
We have to find a property for ESA week.

B : ***Yes... and I think that we have to finish it this day...***

[Transcription 20 line 7-8]

In citation (22), S and H had the same duty. S tried to seek agreement by asking question “We have a duty right?” to H. It means that S needed to be sure of her duty. She asked H to fix it. Then, H made her believe that they had to finish their job as soon as possible.

Avoiding Disagreement

If S tries to avoid disagreement, he also does positive politeness strategy. This strategy is the effort of softening disagreement of someone’s utterances. For example:

- (10) Q : Can you explain about how the government solves that problem?

P : ***I think I will answer your question first.***

[Transcription 15 line 67]

Offering, Promising

Offering in positive politeness strategy is different from offering in bald on record strategy. In positive politeness, offering is more polite because S delivers offering indirectly by noticing on H’s face. It could be seen in utterance below:

- (11) B : OK, I borrow one and ***you can borrow it from me.***

[Transcription 3 line 8]

In this case, S and H were close friends. H wanted to borrow S’s dictionary because she did not have dictionary. Citation (24) showed that S offered her dictionary after she knew that H found difficult word.

Being Optimistic

Being optimistic is another way of showing positive politeness strategy. S is optimist that H wants to help him. The students used this strategy twice. They are:

- (12) B : So, you will go with me tomorrow, ***will you?***

[Transcription 8 line 9]

In citation (28), S and H were friends. S asked H to watch “*Ayat-Ayat Cinta*” in the theater. S was optimistic that H wanted to go with her. By emphasizing her words, she assumed H would do what she wanted to do.

Including Both S and H in the Activity

It was mentioned above, if S and H get involved in the same activity, it means both of them have the same needs. The use of “we” and “let’s” show cooperation among them. In positive politeness, the students mostly used this strategy. They used it sixteen times. Some of them are:

(13) C : OK... *Let’s try to watch it tonight!*

[Transcription 2 line 10]

The word “let’s” in citation (30) showed that S wanted H to watch the movie together with her. She wanted to share her wants and cooperated with H. The italic words might be the substitution of the utterance.

Not Presuming/ Assuming

To redress negative face, humans can use the strategy of not presuming or assuming. By avoiding presumption or assumption S would avoid conflict among them. In this strategy, S keeps distance from H by giving question and hedge.

Questioning, Hedging

Here, to watch autonomy, S asks H’s condition and gives hedge. I found four utterances represented this strategy. They are:

(14) A : *Are you free today Aan?* ...
OK... May I ask you to accompany me to go downtown this evening?

[Transcription 19 line 13]

Not Coercing

By not coercing and taking care of H’s condition, conflict is not expected to come. S can do it by minimizing imposition and giving deference. The students used this strategy seven times.

Minimizing Imposition

Minimizing the imposition means trying to minimize an annoyance by placing S underpowered by H. To show this strategy, S is able to add the word “just”. For example:

(15) B : OK... OK... *just* a moment please! [B opens the door] But I think you don’t need to shout like that.

[Transcription 12 line 5]

In this case, S and H were friends. H asked S to open the door. Although S was angry with H’s act that shouted at her, she kept the distance from H and placed herself underpowered by H.

Giving Deference

This is another way not to coerce. Giving deference means placing H as superior. In students’ daily conversations, there were three utterances reflected this strategy. Two of them are:

(16) J : *Mbak Susi, may I borrow your pen please?* [Transcription 10 line 1]

In this utterance, S had lower status than H. In Javanese language, the word “mbak” used to address older sister. Here, S showed that she placed H as superior by saying that word. Although S requested her older sister, H would not be imposed by S’s act.

Communicating S's wants to not Impinge on H

In this way, S is aware of H's existence and takes H into account. In the data, the students used this strategy twelve times which were divided into three sub strategies: apologizing, impersonalizing S and H, and stating the FTA as a general rule.

Apologizing

Apologizing strategy might be familiar strategy of politeness. In this strategy S takes account of H's condition by apologizing before he disturbs H. for example:

(17)A : Umm... **sorry**, but I haven't one. Would you please lend me a dictionary? [Transcription 3 line 6]

In this utterance, S and H were close friends. S did not have dictionary, so she wanted to borrow her friend's dictionary. First, H asked S to look up the difficult word in the dictionary. Then, S said "sorry" because she did not have a dictionary. Finally, S asked H to lend her a dictionary. The word "sorry" indicated that actually S did not have a desire to disturb H, but she had to find the difficult word she found, so she borrow H's dictionary.

Stating the FTA as a General Rule

In this strategy, S communicates his wants as a general rule. The students used this strategy six times. Two of them are:

(18)P1: ***The parents should use every moment to communicate with their children.***
[Transcription 24 line 28]

This case happened in formal discussion. S imagined herself and the audience as parents. S wanted to

give advice about parent's rule. She stated that all parents should use every moment to communicate with their children. This is actually tips for parents whose children were addicted by drugs, but she stated her wants as parents in general.

Redressing Other Wants of the H's

In this last strategy, S redresses FTAs by explicitly claiming indebtness of H by means of certain expression. The students used this strategy once. That is:

Going on Record or Incurring a Debt or as not Indebting the H

(19) P₂ : ***If you have enough money, you can build it by yourself.***

[Transcription 24 line 155]

Citation (58) described how S showed indebtness to redress H's negative face. S made her request look like a statement. S tried to take indebtness of H's ability that if she had enough money she could build rehabilitation to help drugs addict.

In negative politeness, when the students talked to someone, they had to take care of their H's autonomy. This strategy is considered as the second most used strategy by the students.

OFF-RECORD

Sometimes what S says with its meaning is different. When S tries to reduce FTAs, he also can do it indirectly. Two ways of doing off-record strategy is by *inviting conversational implicature* and *being vague or ambiguous*. But I just found inviting conversational implicature in

students' daily conversation. Some of the examples are:

Inviting Conversational Implicature

In this strategy, S must give some hints and clues to H and hope that H picks up them and thereby interprets what S really means (intends) to say. I found ten utterances reflected this strategy. They were divided into three sub strategies: giving hints six utterances, giving association clues three utterances, and overstate one utterance.

Giving Hints

When talking to someone, sometimes S does not speak directly and H has to search interpretation of S's words. Related to this case, the students used this strategy six times. Some of them are:

- (20) C : Sorry, I forgot to bring my dictionary. ***How about Linda?***

[Transcription 3 line 7]

In this utterance, S and H were close friends. S did not really want to ask about Linda's condition. S used this utterance with the intention behind it was S asked H to borrow Linda's dictionary. S gave hints to H by questioning.

Giving Association Clues

In this strategy, S gives related clues to H, so H can find interpretation of S's intention. For example:

- (21) B : No... no... no... ***I need this book today.***

[Transcription 5 line 18]

This utterance happened in casual conversation between close friends.

Do Not Do FTA

The last politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson is do not do FTA/keep quiet. In this strategy S chooses to remain silent and does not want to do anything to avoid FTAs. The students used this strategy five times. They are:

- (22) A : Turn off the light!
B : ***[silent]***

[Transcription 13 line 1-2]

This utterance happened between close friends. A asked B to turn off the light. B just kept silent because she did not want to do anything to avoid FTA.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research I did, there are some conclusions I got. The Senior High School Daarul Huda in the academic year of 2007/2008 used Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy in 166 utterances which were divided into five ways. They were sixty five utterances of bald on record strategy, forty utterances of positive politeness strategy, forty six utterances of negative politeness strategy, ten utterances of off-record strategy and five utterances of do not do FTA strategy.

Bald on record strategy was the strategy that was mostly used. It is because the strategy provides no effort to redress someone's face, so it was the easiest strategy used. However, the students should also consider their hearer when they talked to someone, whether they talked to their friends or their senior.

In positive politeness, the students asked H to do the same activity together with them. They were also optimistic that their friend will do their wants. This strategy made them getting closer to H easily.

In negative politeness, when the students talked to someone, they had to keep their H's autonomy. This strategy is considered as the second most used strategy by the students.

In off-record strategy, the students used hints and clues to H and let H interpret what they intended to do. This strategy might be unfamiliar to students. The weakness of this strategy is if H failed to interpret the right message of S's utterance, conflict could happen.

Do not do FTA/keep quiet strategy was considered as the most unfamiliar strategy for students. For human being, the desire of communication could not be stopped. If they did this strategy, they stopped their desire to communicate. Because of that reason, the students were rarely used this strategy.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, there are some suggestions for the readers. If their hearers are their senior, they are expected not to use bald on record strategy because it does not have any efforts to reduce conflict. Yet, if they use this strategy to their friends, it is alright.

Because of the commonest strategy found was bald on record strategy, the lecturers of English Department are expected to teach politeness more to the students because if the students use this strategy for a long time, they will become obsolete in conveying their

messages to their elder. They would have a bad habit to express their messages directly without considering politeness.

I suggest for other researchers in the future that they could make more complete research about politeness. The subject of the data could be taken from all levels of English Department students, so various ways of politeness strategy could be found. Besides that, the other researchers could use other politeness theories instead of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory because this theory is a perception in 1978. Within 30 years, it would be any changes, so they should consider these changes too.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1996. *Prosedur PssPenelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen C. 1978. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. 1989. *Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- David Crystal. (nd). *Speech Acts*. Online at <http://echoingmemories.wordpress.com/2007/06/20/>. [accessed 20/03/2007]
- Eggins, Suzanne and Slade, Diana. 1997. *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassel.
- Elizabeth, Mary. 2003. *Painless Speaking*. United States: Barron's.
- Finnochiaro, Mary. 1974. *English as a Second Language: from*

- Theory to Practice*. New York: Regents publishing Company, Inc.
- Grundy, Peter. 1995. *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Guandong, Liang and Jing, Han. (nd). *A Contrastive Study in Disagreement Strategies for Politeness between American and Mandarin Chinese*. Online at <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/march-05-lghj.php>. [accessed 20/03/2007]
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd Ed.). London: Longman.
- Hickey, Stephen C. 1998. *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Great Britain: Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1982. *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. Translated by Oka, M. D. D. 1993. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Moleong, Lexy J. 2004. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mujiyanto, Yan. 2007. *Petunjuk Penulisan Skripsi*. Semarang: Penerbit Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Ramelan. 1992. *Introduction to Linguistic Analysis*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.
- Richards, Jack C and Richard W. Schmidt. 1983. *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
- Rustono. 1999. *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: CV. IKIP Semarang Press.
- Saeed, John I. 1997. *Semantics*. USA: Blackwell Publisher Inc.
- Saleh, Mursid. 2005. *Handout Introduction to Linguistics Research*. Semarang: Bahasa Inggris UNNES.
- Searle, John R., Ferenc, Kieter. and Bierwisck, Manfred. (Eds). 1980. *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Holland: D. Riendel Publishing Company.

Jurnal TarbiyahMu
ISSN 2798-429X
Volume 1 Nomor 2
Juli 2023