

# Maxim Violation of Politeness Speech Act of Participants of KBJ 6<sup>th</sup> in Javanese Politeness Frame

Suyami\*, Djatmika, Sumarlam, Dwi Purnanto

Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

{suyamibpsnt.jogja@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>}

**Abstract.** This paper discusses violations of the maxims of politeness in speech acts involving the 6th KBJ in the frame of Javanese politeness. This article is extracted from the results of a study entitled "Violation of the Maxim of Politeness in the Actions of Involvement of the 6th KBJ (Javanese Language Congress), which bases its analysis on Brown and Levinson's maxims of politeness, on 'saving face'. The object of study is in the form of speech acts involving the 6th KBJ which contain violations of the maxims of politeness. This research raises the problem, how is the violation of the maxims of politeness in the speech acts involved in the 6th KBJ analyzed based on Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness when viewed from the frame of Javanese politeness. The data was collected by recording, listening, taking notes, covering 135 speech act contexts. From the overall context of these speech acts, there are 10 contexts of speech acts that contain violations of Brown and Levinson's maxims of politeness, namely violating positive politeness maxims (threatening positive faces) and violating negative politeness maxims (threatening negative faces). The violation of the maxims of politeness violates the Javanese politeness system, in terms of *subasita*, including *nuju prana* (pleasing to the heart), *momot mengku* (tolerance), *ngiyani* (agreeing), *ngemong rasa* (maintaining feelings), *empan papan/ngono ya ngono ning aja ngono*, and included in prohibited actions, namely *ngremehke* (belittling), insulting (insulting), *nungkak krama* (disregarding politeness), *degsura* (standing up boldly), *kumaki* (arrogant), *sengak* (unpleasant to hear), *ngeyek* (humiliating) and *nyalahke* (blame), *jumawa*, *langar*, and *ngina* (insult).

**Keywords:** speech acts; the 6th KBJ involved; the maxims of politeness, Brown and Levinson; maxims of Javanese politeness; offense.

## 1 Introduction

Politeness is a basic instrument in the conduct of human life in order to maintain harmony and peace. According to Leech, politeness is described as an attempt to make the possibility of impolite beliefs and opinions as small as possible [1], [2]. In line with Leech's opinion, Nadar [3] argues that language politeness is used by speakers in order to minimize or reduce the degree of displeasure or hurt feelings by speech partners as a result of utterances expressed by speakers.

John Gumperz in the preface to the book of Politeness, Brown and Levinson [4] states that politeness, as defined by its authors, is the basis of the provision of social order, and a

prerequisite for human cooperation, so that whatever theory provides an understanding of phenomena this at the same time penetrates the foundation of human social life, where the phenomenon of politeness is essentially reflected in language.

In Javanese culture, the level of politeness in speech acts is generally manifested in the application of unggah-ungguh language, in accordance with the order of the Javanese grammar levels. A speech act is considered polite if the speaker is able to use the Javanese unggah-ungguh order appropriately. But besides the level of speech, politeness is also indicated by how a speaker keeps the face of the speech partner in a conversation or interaction. Speakers who guard the face of the speech partner even though he speaks Ngoko will still be called polite than speakers who do not guard the face of the speech partner even though he speaks Krama Inggil to him. Javanese politeness in addition to manifesting rules in language is also reflected in data on rules of attitude and behavior, which are known as subasita or speech attitudes and trapsila or gestures.

This research raises the topic "Violation of the Maxim of Courtesy of the 6th KBJ Involvement in Javanese Politeness Frames". KBJ (Javanese Language Congress) is a meeting place for stakeholders and practitioners of the Javanese language, which discusses dynamics of the existence of the Javanese language in the present and the possibility of its existence in the future. KBJ VI is an event for stakeholders related to the existence of the Javanese language, which is scheduled regularly every five years, in rotation by the Regional Government of Central Java, East Java and DI Y. The 6th KBJ was held in Yogyakarta in 2016. The event was held for four days, from the 8th to the 12th of October 2016.

KBJ activities are carried out by selected people who are competent in the world of Javanese language and Javanese culture. As well-known language, the Javanese language is not only a means of communication, but also able to describe the situation of the level of intimacy and politeness of the actors in their speech. Javanese is a language that is loaded with etiquette values of politeness. However, in the 6th KBJ activities, there were indications of violations of the maxims of decency in speech acts of those involved.

The problem formulations in this study are: 1) What are the maxims of politeness violated in the speech acts of the 6th KBJ participants? 2) How is the violation of the maxims of politeness in speech acts involving the 6th KBJ when viewed from the Javanese politeness frame?

The objectives of this study are: 1) Presenting the types of politeness maxims violated in the speech acts involved in the 6th KBJ; 2) Presenting a description of violations of the maxims of decency in speech acts of the 6th KBJ in the frame of Javanese politeness.

## **2 Research Methods**

The violations of the maxims of politeness in the speech acts involving the 6th KBJ were analysed based on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory of "face saving". Brown and Levinson [4] state that in the principle of politeness, speaking is not the origin of the sound, but it is necessary to choose a strategy, especially in order to protect the face of the speech partner, avoid speech actions that can threaten the face, or embarrass the speech partner so that the speech partner feels losing face [5]

According to Brown and Levinson [4]"Face", associated with the presence of shame or humiliation, or "loss of face". Brown and Levinson defined a "face" as the public self-image that everyone wants. In that case Brown and Levinson distinguish faces in two aspects, namely

"positive faces" and "negative faces". Positive faces are the consistently positive self-images or 'personalities', (especially including the desire for this self-image to be appreciated and approved) that is claimed by interactants. Negative advance is a basic claim to territory, personal preserves, the right to non-interference, namely freedom of action and freedom from imposition [6]. Actions that threaten the desire for a positive face are violating the maxims of positive politeness. Actions which threaten the desire of a negative face are violating the maxims of negative politeness.

The purpose of politeness is to maintain harmonious social relationships[7] ,[8] . Cruse states that for the sake of politeness, in speaking we need to choose the expression that is least likely to cause speech partners to lose face [8]. The concept of 'face' which is associated with shame or humiliation, or 'loss of face', is in line with the concept of 'shame' in Javanese culture, which is referred to as 'rai' (face). Javanese culture, people who are in a state of shame are called ora duwe rai (do not have a face).

People who have no shame are called ora idhep isin (shameless), "rai gedheg" ('face' of woven bamboo ') or "rai gedheg" (face of wall). This means that the person is likened to an inanimate object that has no feelings. As for an act that can cause embarrassment, in Javanese culture it is called nampek rai (slapping the face). in Brown and Levinson's principle of politeness which is called 'face threatening act' (FTA). In fact, if the act which makes the shame feels extreme and outrageous, in Javanese terms it is called 'ngraupi tai' (smearing face with feces). Many studies have been conducted regarding politeness [2], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13].

### 3 Results and Discussion

Sources of data in this study are fragments of speech acts involving the 6th KBJ which are indicated to contain violations of the maxims of politeness. Data collection was carried out using a record system, listen, record[13]. The data collection technique was first to record all official speech acts of the 6th KBJ involved. Official speech acts are speech acts carried out in the trial process including speech acts of the event host (MC), speech acts of the moderator, speech acts of preaching, as well as speech acts of the responders or questioners.

Furthermore, the results of the recording are listened to by re-listening to identify speech acts that contain violations of the maxims of politeness. All speech acts indicated to contain elements of violations of the maxims of politeness are recorded for further use as research data. As for speech acts that are not indicated to contain violations of the maxims of politeness, they are ignored, ignored in the research, but are still considered as an interrelated context.

**Table 1.** Face Threatening Act of Speech Partner

| Types of threats             | Actions   | Speaker Expression   | Speaker attitudes   |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| A. positive face threatening | 1. Actions that show the speaker has a negative evaluation of several aspects of the speech partner's positive face | a. Expressions of disapproval, criticism, insult or ridicule, complaints and reprimands, accusations, insults. | The speaker indicates that he or she dislikes/desires one or more of the desires, actions, personal characteristics, items, beliefs or values of the conversation partner |
|                              |   | b. Contradiction or disagreement, challenge  | The speaker indicates that he thinks the speech partner is wrong or misguided or makes no sense about a problem,  |

| Types of threats             | Actions   | Speaker Expression   | Speaker attitudes   |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                              |   |  | which is associated with disapproval.   |
|                              | 2. Actions that show the speaker doesn't care about the partner's positive face | a. Expressions of violence out of control, emotions  | The speaker shows an attitude that makes the speech partner feel afraid or ashamed  |
|                              |   | b. Disrespect, mentioning taboo topics including those that do not fit the context                               | The speaker shows disrespect for the values of the speech partner and is not afraid of his fear;                          |
|                              |   | c. Bring bad news about the speech partner, or good news (brag) about the speaker                                | The speaker causes trouble to the speech partner and / or does not care about the feelings of the speech partner;         |
|                              |   | d. Bringing up dangerous emotional or divisive topics, for example politics, race, religion, women's liberation, | Speakers act thereby increasing the likelihood of actions that threaten the face of the speech partner                    |
|                              |   | e. The attitude of not cooperating that is striking in an activity,  | The speaker deliberately interferes with the speech partner's conversation or shows an indifference to the speech partner |
|                              |   | f. Use of address and identification terms that are different from the initial meeting,                          | Speakers knowingly or unintentionally misidentify speech partners in an offensive or embarrassing way.                    |
| B. Negative face threatening | 1. Actions intended to hinder freedom for speech partners                       | a. Putting pressure on (or refraining from doing) actions, such as orders and requests,                          | The speaker shows the desire for the speech partner to do or not do something   |
|                              |   | b. giving advises or persuasion  | The speaker shows that he thinks the speech partner must take an action   |
|                              |   | c. giving warning  | The speaker shows that the speech partner must remember to do something   |
|                              |   | d. giving threats, warning, courage  | The speaker indicated that he would give sanctions to the speech partner, unless he did something                         |
|                              | 2. Actions that intend to give or refuse something that could                   | a. giving offer  | The speaker offers to take several actions for the speech partner so that it creates the                                  |

| Types of threats                           | Actions   | Speaker Expression   | Speaker attitudes  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | cause the speech partner to become indebted   |  | possibility of the speech partner being indebted to the speaker;                       |
|  |   | b. giving promise  | The speaker promises to take action for the benefit of the speech partner.             |
|  | 3. Actions underlying some of the speaker's wishes that give the speech partner a reason to take action to protect the object of the speaker's wishes | a. Giving compliments, expressions of envy or admiration           | The speaker shows the attitude of liking or wanting something from the speech partner; |
|  |   | b Gives expression of strong negative emotions to speech partners, | Speakers show hatred, anger, lust for speech partners.                                 |
| C. Threatening positive and negative faces | Complaints, interruptions, threats, strong emotional expressions or requests for personal information   |  |  |

The results of recorded official speech acts involving the 6th KBJ recorded 135 contexts. Among the non-speeches, there were 10 contexts of speech acts indicated to contain elements of violation of the maxims of politeness, namely context 7, context 11, context 19, context 46, context 47, context 49, context 50, context 51, context 52, and context 53. The analysis of violations of the maxims of decency in speech acts involving the 6th KBJ is based on Brown and Levinson's politeness principle regarding face-threatening actions (FTA/Face Threatening Act). The types of actions that can threaten the positive and negative faces of speech partners are summarized in the following table.

### 3.1 Result of the 6th KBJ Study of Violation of the Maximum Courtesy of Involved Speech Actions

The results of the analysis show that from the 10 contexts of speech acts involving the 6th KBJ, there were 44 cases of fragments of speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness. Context 7 contains 4 cases. Context 11 contains 13 cases. Context 19 contains 17 cases. Context 46 contains 2 cases. Context 47 contains 1 case. Context 49 contains 1 case. Context 50 contains 3 cases. Context 51 contains 1 case. Context 52 contains 1 case. Context 53 contains 1 case.

#### Context 7

Context 7, with a speaker with the initials N. from Yogyakarta, committed 4 cases of cutting off speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness, namely cases 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4. Case 7.1 is an expression of criticism and reprimand which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness. Case 7.2 is an expression of a request which is an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner thus violating the maxims of negative politeness.

Case 7.3 was an intention to threaten or an act of courage which was an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so as to violate the maxims of negative diligence. Case 7.4 is an expression of contradiction or disagreement which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner thus violating the maxims of positive politeness.

### **Context 11**

Context 11, with the speaker with the initials G. from Semarang, did 13 cases of fragments of speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness, namely cases 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 11.7, 11.8, 11.9, 11.10, 11.11, 11.12, 11.13. Cases 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, and 11.12 are in the form of ridicule which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness. Case 11.6 is in the form of denial which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness.

Case 11.7 is an expression of advice which is an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of negative politeness. Case 11.8 is in the form of promises and ridicule which is an act of threatening the positive face as well as the negative face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive and negative politeness. Case 11.9 is in the form of expressions of criticism and disagreement which constitute an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness. The context 11.10 is in the form of expressions of orders and promises which are acts of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness. Case 11.11 is an expression of an order which is an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of negative politeness. Case 11.13 is an expression of confession which is an act of threatening the speaker's positive face.

### **Context 19**

Context 19 with the speaker with the initials E. from Tegal, conducted 17 cases of cutting off speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness, namely cases 19.1, 19.2, 19.3, 19.4, 19.5, 19.6, 19.7, 19.8, 19.9, 19.10, 19.11, 19.12, 19.13, 19.14, 19.15, 19.16, 19.17. Case 19.1 is an expression of orders, requests and threats which constitute an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner thus violating the maxims of negative politeness. Cases 19.2, 19.3, 19.4, 19.6, 19.7, 19.11, 19.12, 19.14, 19.15 are in the form of expressions of criticism and disagreement which are acts of threatening the positive faces of speech partners so that they violate the maxims of positive politeness. Case 19.5 is an expression of orders and requests which constitute an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so as to violate the maxims of negative politeness.

Case 19.8 is an expression of orders and threats which constitute an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so as to violate the maxims of negative politeness. Cases 19.9 and 19.17 are in the form of ridicule which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness. Case 19.10 is an expression of a prohibition order which is an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so as to violate the maxims of negative politeness. Case 19.13 is an expression of disrespect which mentions taboo topics and does not fit the context, which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner thereby violating the maxims of positive politeness. Case 19.16 is an expression of disrespect which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner thus violating the maxims of positive politeness.

### **Context 46**

Context 46, with the speaker with the initials S. from Surabaya, committed 2 cases of cutting off speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness, namely cases 46.1 and 46.2. Case 46.1 is an expression of disagreement which is an act of threatening a positive face so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness. Case 46.2 is an expression of acknowledgment of shortcomings and weaknesses which constitute an act of threatening the speaker's positive face.

#### **Context 47**

Context 47 with a speaker with the initials Y. from Yogyakarta, committed 1 case of a piece of speech act that violated the maxims of politeness, namely case 47.1. Case 47.1 is an expression of ridicule which is a realization of the off-record politeness strategy, in order to give speech partners, the opportunity to determine their attitude regarding their inappropriate actions because they ignore the rules of politeness in presenting their papers using the Javanese language of the *ngoko* variety.

#### **Context 49**

Context 49 with a speaker with the initials A. from Semarang committed 1 case of a piece of speech act violating the maxims of politeness, namely case 49.1. Case 49.1 is an expression of disagreement which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner thus violating the maxims of positive politeness.

#### **Context 50**

Context 50 with the speaker with the initials S. from Pati, did 3 cases of cutting off speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness, namely cases 50.1, 50.2, 50.3. Case 50.1 is in the form of criticism and satire which is an act of positively threatening speech partners so as to violate the maxims of positive politeness. In addition, case 50.1 also contains a satire expression which is the realization of off record politeness strategy with metaphorical expression. Case 50.2 is an expression of criticism and disapproval which is an act of threatening the positive face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of positive politeness. Case 50.3 is in the form of expressions of criticism and suggestions which constitute actions that threaten the positive faces and negative faces of the speech partners so that they violate the maxims of positive politeness and negative politeness.

#### **Context 51**

Context 51 with speakers with the initials Ys. from Surakarta committed 1 case of severing speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness, namely case 51.1. Case 51.1 is in the form of critical expressions and suggestions which are actions that threaten the positive faces and negative faces of the speech partners so that they violate the maxims of positive politeness and negative politeness.

#### **Context 52**

Context 52 with the speaker with the initials M. from Blora, did 1 case of a piece of speech act that violated the maxims of politeness, namely the case 52.1. Case 52.1 is an expression of advice or advice which is an act of threatening the negative face of the speech partner so that it violates the maxims of negative politeness.

#### **Context 53**

Context 53 with speakers with the initials Sw. from Yogyakarta committed 1 case of severing speech acts that violated the maxims of politeness, namely case 53.1. Case 53.1 is an

expression of a satire question which is the realization of an off-record politeness strategy in the form of a rhetorical question. The summary of the results of the study of violations of the maxims of decency in speech acts involving the 6th KBJ is presented in table 2.2 as follows.

### **3.2. The Result of the Study on Violation of the Maximum Courtesy of the 6th KBJ Involvement in Javanese Politeness Frames.**

In the concept of Javanese politeness, the teaching of politeness is framed in terms of *trapsila* (how to place/carry oneself), *subasita* (how to socialize), and *manners* (rules of acting or behaving) [14], [15]. *Trapsila* includes body movements and postures. *Subasita* includes attitude and speech. The manners for the application of language *unggah-ungguh*. The results of the analysis of the violations of the maxims of politeness in the speech acts involved in the 6<sup>th</sup> KBJ, in the case of Javanese politeness, it is known that among the 44 cases of violations of the maxims of politeness in speech acts committed by the 6 KBJ actors violating 16 kinds of Javanese politeness maxims.

The maxims of Javanese politeness that are violated are; 1) *momot mengku* were violated in four cases, in codes 7.1, 19.1, 49.1, 50.2; 2) *nuju prana* was violated in one case, in code 7.2; 3) *Degsura* was violated in one case, in code 7.3; 4) *ngiyani* was violated in two cases, in codes 7.4, 11.7; 5) *Nylekit* was violated in four cases, in codes 11.1, 19.17, 47.1, 53.1; 6) *Kumaki* was violated in five cases, in codes 11.2, 11.4, 11.10, 11.13, 19.8; 7) Strictly violated in eight cases, in codes 11.3, 11.6, 11.9, 19.3, 19.10, 50.1, 50.2, 50.3; 8) Mistakes were violated in ten cases, in codes 11.5, 19.2, 19.4, 19.5.19.6, 19.7, 19.11, 19.12, 51.1, 52.1; 9) *Ngremehke* was violated in one case, in code 11.8; 10) cuddling feelings were violated in one case, in code 11.11; 11) *Ngenyek* was violated in two cases, 11.12, 19.9; 12) *Empan papan/ngono ya ngono ngono ning aja ngono* was violated in one case, in code 19.13; 13) *Jumawa* was violated in one case, in 19.14 case; 14) Lest manners were violated in three cases, in codes 19.15, 19.16, 46.1; 15) *Langar* was violated in three cases, in codes 49.1, 50.1, 50.3; 16) *Ngina* was violated in two cases, in codes 50.1, 50.1

## **4 Conclusion**

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that the order of politeness in acting in speech is universal. Speech acts which in Western theory, Brown and Levinson fall into the category of violating the maxims of politeness, which means they are speech acts that are not or less polite, when viewed in terms of Javanese politeness, they also include speech acts that violate Javanese politeness. Based on the analysis of the violations of the maxims of politeness in the speech acts involved in the 6th KBJ in the Javanese politeness frame, it is known that the Javanese politeness frame is more complicated and more detailed than the Western politeness theory (Brown and Levinson).

Brown and Levinson's politeness theory prioritizes attention to the act of threatening faces, both positive faces and negative faces. Meanwhile, in the Javanese politeness system, polite actions and unscrupulous acts are clearly differentiated from the concept of suggestions and prohibitions. The concept of suggestions and prohibitions as a basic guideline for ethical behaviour, namely by doing the recommended prayer and avoiding what is put on. The results of this study indicate that among the 6th KBJ actors, there are some who commit speech acts that violate Javanese politeness rules, namely not heeding recommendations or prohibitions.

The concepts of politeness suggestions that are violated are *momot mengku*, *nuju prana*, *ngiyani*, *ngemong rasa*, *empan papan*, and *ngono ya ngono ning aja ngono*. The concept of the



prohibition that is being violated is *degsura, nylekit, kumaki, sengak, nyalahke, ngremehke, ngenyek, jumawa, langar, nungkak krama, and ngina*.

## References

- [1] G. Leech, Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik. Jakarta: University Indonesia (UI-Press), 1993.
- [2] E. S. Sari, Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesantunan Berbahasa dalam Acara Dua Arah Kompas TV. Surabaya: Sastra Indonesia, Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, 2019.
- [3] F. X. Nadar, Pragmatik dan penelitian Pragmatik. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2013.
- [4] S. C. Brown. P. and Levinson, Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage. Great Britain: Redwood Burn Ltd., Trowbridge, Wiltshire., 1987.
- [5] Y. Huang, Pragmatics. Oxford: University Press, 2007.
- [6] Djatmika, Mengenal Pragmatik Yuk. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2016.
- [7] A. Cruse, Meaning in Language. Oxford: Oxfors University Press, 2000.
- [8] A. Gunarwan, Pragmatik, Teori dan Kajian Nusantara. Jakarta: . Universitas Atma Jaya, 2007.
- [9] M. Wajdi, "Code Choice And Politeness Systems In Javanese," vol. Makalah. M, 2011.
- [10] Sukarno, "The Reflection of the Javanese Cultural Concepts in the Politeness of Javanese," J. Kata, vol. Volume 12, 2010.
- [11] S. Wibawa, "Efforts To Maintain And Develop Javanese Language Politeness," vol. Makalah. P, 2005.
- [12] S. Poedjosoedarmo, Javanese Speech Levels. Published by: Southeast Asia Program Publications at Cornell University, 1969.
- [13] R. Santosa, Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan. Surakarta: UNS Press, 2017.
- [14] W. J. S. Poerwadarminta, Boesastra Djawa. Batavia: J.B. Wolters Uitgevers Maatschapiij, 1939.
- [15] S. Poedjosoedarmo, "'Language Propriety in Javanese'," J. Lang. Lit., vol. Vol. 17 No, 2017.