THE USE OF CRITICIZING STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH AND JAVANESE LANGUAGES BY JAVANESE EFL LEARNERS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

SARI RACHMAWATI

S200140008

MAGISTER OF LANGUAGE STUDY

MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF SURAKARTA2015

A. Introduction

In communication, sometimes people give negative evaluation as a criticism to others in several kinds of conditions. In order to convey their critiques, the speakers will try to find the best words in a best way so the listeners would not feel threaten. Here, the use of politeness strategy is regarded as the best way in order to fulfill the purpose in criticizing.

The study on criticism is worth to be done as the act of criticizing is one of the act that highly potential to threaten the face of the hearers. Various strategies are expected and recommended to be used by the speakers in order to alleviate the threats.

A criticism can be realized by either direct or indirect strategies. Following Blum-Kulka (1987), the directness level of a criticism in the present study was determined by the degree of illocutionary transparency, and thus the amount of effort needed to interpret the illocutionary point of this criticism. That is, it assumes that ''the more indirect the mode of realization, the higher will be the interpretive demands'' (Blum-Kulka, 1987: 133).

The strategies used by speakers in criticism are varied, and they have strong relationship with the politeness strategies involved. So, how far the speakers vary their ways in criticism is going to be connected with their politeness strategies. This phenomenon is not only happen in English conversation, but also in other languages including in Javanese language. Even, Javanese language has more levels in politeness strategies in communication.

The English speakers tend to convey criticism only in two ways, whether it directly or indirectly. They will perform this directly means that they say what they think about something directly without any hesitancy. Or they can use indirect utterances such in the form of questions in order to soften their criticism so that the hearers would not feel irritated.

Whereas, the condition above is different if compare to Javanese culture; where criticism is regarded as a very sensitive form of communication. They will try to avoid this kind of communication, although the real condition is the contrary. If it is urgent, they will find the politest way in conveying their criticism and indirectly. The background extended above motivated this research to deeply dig into the use of criticizing strategies used by speakers in criticizing others, especially those for Javanese EFL learners compare to the criticizing strategies carried out by native

speakers of Javanese. Besides, the study also concerns with the use of politeness strategies used in English uttered by Javanese EFL learners and the politeness strategies applied in Javanese by native Javanese speakers. From the investigation, the results will be compared, whether they have the same politeness strategies or not. In overall, this research is focused on the investigation of the use of criticism strategies and politeness strategies used in criticizing performed by Javanese EFL learners and native Javanese speakers and the comparison of them.

B. Theoretical Review

a. Criticism (The Acts of Criticizing)

Riekkinen (2009:18) confirms that criticism is an act that may cause Face-Threatening Act (FTA) because it expresses negative evaluation to the hearer. When a speaker employs criticism, he may threat the positive self-image of the addressee. For that reason, a speaker cannot criticize directly to anyone because he must consider some basic rules of criticizing.

Next discussion is about the crucial rules when a speaker criticizes hearer. The first point is the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Tsui (1994:147) states that a speaker may not criticize others unless they know each other well. It implies a statement that a speaker may extend his criticism baldly if he has an intimate relationship with the hearer. This will be different when a speaker criticizes someone who has social distance with him. He may be more indirect since he considers about the distant relationship between him and the hearer.

The second point is about the relative power of the speaker over the hearer. A speaker who has greater power tends to criticize the hearer directly. On the contrary, people having lower of power tend to use indirectness with people who have greater authority (Thomas, 1995:124).

Classification of Criticism

As assumed by Blum Kulka (1987:133) that "the more indirect the mode of realization, the higher will be the interpretive demands"; means that the level of directness of criticism is determined by the degree of illocutionary transparency. Following Nguyen's investigation (2008), the acts of criticism are explained in the following taxonomy:

Table 2.1 Taxonomy of Criticism According to Nguyen (2008)

Type	Characteristics	Examples
1. Direct criticism:	Explicitly pointing out the problem with H's choice/ actions/ work/ products, etc.	
a. Negative evaluation	Usually expressed via evaluative adjectives with negative meaning or evaluative adjective with positive meaning plus negation.	*"I think ah it's <u>not a good way</u> to support to one's idea (L),* *"Umm, that's <u>not really a good</u> sentence" (NS).*
b. Disapproval	Describing S's attitude towards H's choice, etc.	*"<u>I don't like</u> the way you write that (L).*
c. Expression of disagreement	Usually realized by means of negation word ''No'' or performatives "I don't agree" or	*"<u>I don't quite agree</u> with you with some points (.) about the conclusion"(L),*

		"I disagree" (with or without modal) or via arguments against H.	*"I don't really agree with you (as strongly as) you put it here"* (NS).
d.	Statement of the problem	Stating errors or problems found with H's choice, etc.	*"And there are some incorrect words, for example ''nowadays'' (L),* "You *had a few spelling mistakes"* (NS).
e.	Statement of difficulty	Usually expressed by means of such structures as ''I find it difficult to understand…" "It's difficult to understand…"	*"I can't understand" (L),* "I *find it difficult to understand your idea" (L).*
f.	Consequences	Warning about negative consequences or negative effects of H's choice, etc. for H himself or herself or for the public.	*"Someone who don't— doesn't agree with you (.) would straight away read that and turn off"* (NS).
2.	Indirect criticism:	Implying the problems with H's choice/ actions/ work/ products, etc. by correcting H, indicating rules and standard, giving advice, suggesting or even requesting and demanding changes to H's work/ choice, and by means of different kinds of hints to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice.	
a.	Correction	Including all utterances which have the purpose of fixing errors by asserting specific alternatives to H's choice, etc	*"safer" not "safe", comparison" (L),* "And you put "their" *I think th-e-r-e"* (NS)
b.	Indicating standard	Usually stated as a collective obligation rather than an obligation for H personally or as a rule which S thinks is commonly agreed upon and applied to all.	*"Theoretically, a conclusion needs to be some sort of a summary" (L).*
c.	Demand for change	Usually expressed via such structures as "you have to", "you must", "it is obligatory that" or "you are required" or "you need", "it is necessary"	*"You must pay attention to grammar" (L), "You have to talk about your opinion in your summary'' (L).*
d.	Request for change	Usually expressed via such structures as ''will you . . . ?'', "can you…?", "would you…?" or imperatives (with or without politeness markers), or want-statement.	*"I still want you to consider some points" (L),"What I would have liked to have seen is like a definite theme from the start like you're just TA:LKING about it" (NS).*
e.	Advice about change	Usually expressed via the performative "I advise you…", or structures with "should" with or	*"You should change it a little bit." (L).*

	without modality.	
f. Suggestion for change	Usually expressed via the performative ''I suggest that…'' or such structures as "you can", "you could", "it would be better if" or "why don't you" etc.	*"I think if you make a full stop in here the ah (.) this sentence is clear is clear" (L),"It could have been better to put a comma (.) so ah ((laugh))" (NS).*
g. Expression of uncertainty	Utterances expressing S's uncertainty to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice, etc.	*"Are there several paragraphs ah not sure about the paragraphs" (NS).*
h. Asking/ presupposing	Rhetorical questions to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice, etc.	*"Did you read your writing again after you finish it?" (L).*
i. Other hints	Including other kinds of hints that did not belong to (h) and (i). May include sarcasm.	*"I prefer a writing style which are not too personal" (L).*

b. Politeness

Politeness theory is the theory that accounts for the redressing of the affronts to face posed by face-threatening acts to addressees. First formulated in 1978 by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, politeness theory has since expanded academia's perception of politeness. Politeness is the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003:6). Another definition is "a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure everyone feels affirmed in a social interaction". Being polite therefore consists of attempting to save face for another.

There are four types of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987, 68-71), including bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record-indirect strategy. In bald on record strategy, the speaker says what he wants to say without any politeness. In other words, the speaker does not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. It is used mostly for the speaker who has intimate relationship with the hearer.

For negative politeness strategy, Brown and Levinson (1987: 101) stated that positive politeness is designed to meet the face needs by performing an action like complimenting or showing concern for another person. Negative politeness is designed to protect to other person when face needs are threatened. Whereas, the off-record strategy or the indirect strategy is used when a speaker wants to does an FTA but he wants to avoid the responsibility in doing it Brown and Levinson, 1987:211).

c. Politeness and Criticism

Brown and Levinson (1987) assert that some speech acts intrinsically threaten positive and negative face of speakers and hearers or face-threatening acts (FTA). For example, disagreement and criticism threaten hearers' positive face, while requests threaten hearers' negative face.

d. Javanese Values in Language

In Javanese language, there are some principles and complex relationships in the use of language that also called as language levels (Errington, 1988). The "levels" are illustrated primarily in sets of lexical alternant (see table 2.3), although their differences are actually not only lexical.

Table 2.3 Javanese "Language Levels" or "Speech Styles"

(Errington 1988:90–1)

KRAMA:	1. menapa	nandalem	mundhut	sekul	semanten
	2. menapa	panjenengan	mendhet	sekul	semanten
MADYA:	3. napa	sampéyan	mendhet	sekul	semonten
	4. napa	sampéyan	njupuk	sega	semonten
NGOKO:	5. apa	sliramu	mundhut	sega	semono
	6. apa	kowé	njupuk	sega	semono
Gloss:	Question marker	you	take	rice	that much
Translation	Did you take that much rice?				

Although the Javanese "language levels" are often described as differing mainly in lexicon (sets of lexical alternants) and in some special affixes, Errington (1984:9) has pointed out that they also differ in prosody and morphophonemics, although these aspects have been little studied.

C. Research Method

Research method consists of the type of the research, object of the research, subject of the research, data and data source, technique of collecting data, data validity, and technique of analyzing data.

1. Research Type

The research approach used in this study is descriptive comparative research. Isaac (1971:46) explains that the purpose of descriptive research is to describe the facts and the characteristics of interested area of population in a systematical, factual, and accurate procedure. In addition, descriptive research is the data base that purely descriptively accumulated. Thus, it is not essential explain relationships, test hypothesis, make predictions, or get at meanings and implications.

2. Research Object

The object of the study in this research is the criticizing strategy in English and Javanese language used by Javanese EFL learners.

3. Research Subject

For the concern of the present study, several Javanese EFL students studying at IAIN Salatiga and Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta will be randomly selected. The selection of the subjects was done on the basis of the following criteria: a) they are Javanese EFL students in the third or fourth year of graduate study, and the students in the postgraduate program b) they have studied English subject at least 6 years; and c) they agreed to be chosen as subjects of the study. Whereas, for native Javanese speakers, the criteria are a) they are Javanese and b) their average age is between 23-40 years old. The total respondents that

would be taken in doing the research are 60 respondents, which consist of 30 respondents from Javanese EFL learners and 30 respondents from native speakers of Javanese.

4. Data and Data Source

The data are the criticizing strategies and the politeness strategies on criticizing used by the Javanese EFL learners and native speakers of Javanese. The data sources are taken from the utterances of the speakers as the respondents. As the source of data, utterances uttered by the speakers in their ways of criticizing will be examined by the writer from the form of discourse completion task.

5. Technique of Collecting Data

The technique of collecting data used in this research is Discourse Completion Task (DCT). This is the technique where the researchers used as an instrument to elicit the data in interlanguage pragmatic studies. The writer took DCT as the method of data collection as it assumed as the most prevalent tool used in pragmatic studies, although there is still a great deal of controversy in it (Leech, 2014:252).

DCT is not separated from Blum-Kulka's influential research program called CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project) that focused on the acts of requests and apologies. The members of certain cultural communities and the different languages speakers are compared on how they handled the same task of speech act production. The task used in this research was further known as DCT.

Following Blum-Kulka's theory, the forms of DCT has been developed by several researchers, such as MDCT or multiple-choice discourse completion tasks as explained by Brown (2001).

6. Technique of Analyzing Data

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview and understanding them and to the researcher to present what he has discovered to others (Bogdan and Bikllen 1998: 157). The steps of analysis are as follow:

 a. Data Collection

   In collecting the data, the writer collected them by questioning the Javanese EFL learners and native Javanese in the form of DCT. After the data was collected, they were compiled into a complete table of data. These data results also served in the attachment of the research.

 b. Identification

   In this section, the writer identified the respondents' answers that will be examined from the results of data collection. The task is to determine the object of the research; those are the politeness strategy used in criticizing.

 c. Data reduction

   In data reduction, the researcher reduced data that do not fulfill the research targets.

 d. Classification

   The writer classified the data into several groups based on the language is used (English or Javanese) and from the background of the respondents, whether

they are graduate students or postgraduates. And the last, the researcher put the data that are collected in a separated list.

e. Data Analysis

Data analysis is the core of these processes in analyzing the data. The writer analyzed the politeness strategies used by the respondents both in English and Javanese language and classified them. This process is the deepening process of the classification of the research process.

f. Drawing conclusions and Verification

Finally, the writer concludes the research finding. This stage is the final part of conclusions and suggestions.

D. Result

On process

E. Conclusion

On process

REFERENCES

Anjarsari, S. (2011). *Politeness Strategies of Criticizing: A Study on A Movie The Ugly Truth (Pragmatics Study)*. Surakarta: digilib.uns.ac.id.

Austin J.L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ardiyani, Septiana. (2014). *Interlanguage of Criticism by Indonesian Learners of English*. Surakarta: digilib.uns.ac.id.

Bach, Kent. 1994. *Meaning and Communication.* Retrieved from www.sfsu.edu on November 2015 at 5 PM.

Bogdan, R. C & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and. Methods* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education Group.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. (1987). ''Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or Different?" *Journal of Pragmatics*11, 131–146.

Brown, J.D. (2001). Pragmatics tests: Different purposes, different tests. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching,* 301–325. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Choyimah, Nurul. (2014). Disagreeing Strategies in University Classroom Discussions among Indonesian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Linguistics,*132-152.

Faqih, G. (2013). *Comparative Study on Politeness Strategy between Javanese and English Address System Found in Panyebar Semangat "Wahyu Mustika Aji" and Hello Magazine "Final Evidence": A Sociolinguistic Perspective.* Purworejo: Unpublished.

Hoa, H. T. (2007). Criticizing Behaviors by the Vietnamese and the American: Topics, Social Factors and Frequency. *VNU Journal of Science*, 141-154.

Isaac, Stephen, and Michael, William B. (1971). *Handbook in Research and Evaluation.* California: Edits Publishers.

Johnson, Nat. (2007). *A Consideration of Assessment Validity In Relation To Classroom Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Assessment.

Karyasuta, I Wayan Gede. (2015). *Positive Politeness Strategies of Criticism in a Movie entitled "Fury"*. Denpasar: Unpublished.

Kulka, B. (2000). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Mc Milan*, 196-213.

Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited.

Leech, Geoffrey N. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mills, Sara. (2003). *Gender and Politeness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nguyen, T. T. (2008). Criticizing in an L2: Pragmatic Strategies Used by Vietnamese EFL Learners. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 41-66.

Parker, Frank. 1999. *Linguistics for Non-Linguistics.* London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Riekkinen, Niina. (2009). *Softening Criticism: The Use of Lexical Hedges in Academic Spoken Interaction.* Helsinki: Unpublished.

Searle, John R. (1971), *The Philosophy of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics.* London and New York: Longman.

Victorina, Elvira. (2014). *Teachers' Politeness Strategy in Criticizing Classroom Presentation*. Salatiga: Unpublished.

Wijayanto, A. (2013). The Emergence of the Javanese Sopan and Santun (Politeness) on the Refusal Strategies Used by Javanese Learners of English. *The Internet Journal Language, Culture and Society*, 34-47.

Yanti, Y. (2008). *Speech Act of Criticizing Used by Women and Men.* Padang: Unpublished.

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.