



Politeness Strategy in the Usage of Language Among Young People

Indah Karina Sianturi

Universitas Lancang Kuning

[*itsindahkarina@gmail.com*](mailto:itsindahkarina@gmail.com)

NoviaSariahtaSilalahi

UniversitasLancangKuning

[*Noviasariahta05@gmail.com*](mailto:Noviasariahta05@gmail.com)

AvivahAdindaPutri

UniversitasLancangKuning

[*Avivahputri11@gmail.com*](mailto:Avivahputri11@gmail.com)

MathildaSumbayak

UniversitasLancangKuning

[*mathildasumbayak@gmail.com*](mailto:mathildasumbayak@gmail.com)

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to study the Politeness Strategy by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson that is used by young people to communicate with community members and other peers. This is a fact that can be claimed that young people are easily provoked because of a lack of politeness when solving or facing problems that often might be considered foul and taboo like death, illness, different bodily functions and gender problems. Although such complaints are unprecedented in the way young people use their language, this research began to examine older people by obtaining various Politeness Strategies that allow young children to communicate with various groups of people. The study notes that the language used by young people who have politeness in speaking depends on the level during communication.

Keywords : Young people, language, politeness, communication, theory

INTRODUCTION

The language that has the main function is as a communication tool. Therefore language is a communication tool that must always be understood the principle of cooperation to avoid misunderstanding or interference in communication. In social relations and social relations everyone has a polite conversation and the speaker will choose the way to communicate accordingly. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that to do anything people do, for example, verbal, offer something, fulfill something and criticize it is not done with language and openly equipped with easy and perfect made of politeness. Politeness requires individuals to affirm the positive face that others present without compromising or otherwise attempting to undermine the negative face presented (Cai and Wilson, 2000; Arundale, 2005, p. 47). A librarian might affirm the positive by such actions as indicating respect for those attributes which an individual feels are most central to positive face, such as asking a self-identified expert for assistance in identifying a topic's jargon when formulating a search string. Avoiding any compromise to the negative face could include acknowledging that certain actions constitute an imposition autonomy, such as apologizing for keeping someone waiting.

A number of pedagogical agent investigations have since been conducted, seeking to understand the persona effect in more detail, and replicate it in a range of learning

domains (Johnson et al., 2000; Moreno et al., 2001). The results of these studies have been mixed. For example, a study by Andre et al. (1998) showed that animated agents reduce the perceived difficulty of the material being learned, and a study by Bickmore (2003) showed that subjects liked an animated agent that responded socially to them, but neither study reported significant learning gains. Moreover, several studies (Moreno and Mayer, 2000, 2004; Graesser et al., 2003; Mayer et al., 2003; Mayer et al., 2004; Atkinson et al., 2005) indicated that the agent's voice was the significant contributor to learning outcomes, not the animated persona. Thus, the persona effect is at best unreliable, and may in fact be a misnomer if the animated persona is not the primary cause of the learning outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

This qualitative study uses discourse analysis (Burck, 2005; Cheek, 2004; Frohman, 1994; Mautner, 2005) to examine the syntactic and content markers of formality levels employed by both the user and the librarian in reference chat sessions in an effort to understand the nature of the relationship over the course of the exchange. It was assumed that in discussion sections of research articles a writer makes the highest level of claims, and the act of presenting one's findings threatens negative and positive face. The pragmatic framework offered by Brown and Levinson (1987) served as a reference to study the presence of face-redressive politeness strategies in the corpus.

Buliba et al (2006:88) observed that there is serious relationship between language, society and culture because since time in memorial language in many cultures has shown that even though certain words have not been banned; their usage is valid only in certain forums and by certain class of people. In essence, communities in many areas embrace use of language that advocate for positive moral order. Other forms of taboo language try to prohibit or to delete certain aspects in language. In view of the above, it is clear to cite that youth on their Hudson (1995) investigated the relationship that is there between language and society where he discovered that there are varying strategies that are employed by different groups of people according to their classes while communicating. He cited that; that will change in accordance to peoples' social status change. He retaliated that workers in a given place will always have their different way of communicating from another groups. Whilst quoting Fromkin and Rodman (1988), Njeri (2007:20) observed that society formulate words when they are in a process of growing and later consensus is reached on regarding category of polite words which are termed as obscene – obscene words are finally tagged, and they are never used anyhow. The aforesaid scholar go further to observe that, all words are made of man, but society's context will always turn to be the deciding factor on where the said word is to be used. They continued to say that language obscenity or appropriateness has its place in the ear of the listener or the entire society observation. The data were analyzed through transcribing, codifying, classifying, analyzing and discussing. In transcribing process, the researchers listened carefully to the recording; then conversations are transcribed into written form. In codifying, the words, phrases, and clauses and sentences which are used by students in conversations were coded. Codes are based on the categories of positive politeness. In classifying section, the researchers classified the data into categories of positive politeness. In analyzing, the researchers analyzed the data based on categories of positive politeness. In discussing part, the researchers discussed the result as the findings of the research.

ANALYSIS AND RESULT

Positive politeness strategies: Showing solidarity and involvement with the reader Positive politeness devices show solidarity with peer researchers and the scientific community as a whole. Solidarity is found when writers claim common ground, i.e. the providing of basic information on the research topic. The writer can identify one's work with that of the whole field by assuming

everyone shares either the idea behind one's claim or the experience behind what might be taken as criticism (1 and 2).

(1) Meshing friction in gear pairs has been defined in earlier works as a force along the off line-of-action direction that two paired teeth exert against each other while they match. As this force takes place once a pair of teeth comes together, it generates a periodic waveform friction with the frequency with which the two teeth match. For that reason it has been always considered position-dependent friction. (Robotics)

(2) It is well known that the α -curve of a laser diode is a nonlinear exponential function. (Telecommunications)

In (3) a speculative claim is introduced. By treating the assumption as frequent, the writer considers the reader as potentially capable of making this claim, minimising her/his original contribution to the field:

(4) Since intradomain multicast routing is often available, a frequent assumption is that the AGCS is only used between sites, not within a site. A representative in each site locally multicasts the traffic received. Doing so increases global scalability since all the local members are hidden behind their representative. (Telecommunications) Writers show their solidarity with the members of the community by displaying personal attitude to research results. The human side of researchers emerges when emphasising aspects related to the interpretation of unexpected research results. Through the asking of rhetorical questions, the writer involves the reader in the discourse guiding him to particular interpretations. The writer's claim is presented as a question but no response is expected, in fact writers answer the question immediately. How can seemingly less trusting attitudes about the Internet be related to greater rather than less Internet use? One possibility is that less trusting attitudes are better construed as more informed attitudes about the Internet, and more informed attitudes predict greater

CONCLUSION

The results of the data presented in the previous parts; clearly stated that the address terms of positive politeness in conversation are divided into two categories; greeting, thanking, praising, apology, congratulating, intimacy, and obedience belong to the first category, "without imposition" and question, request, suggestion, rejection, chastisement, and disagreement are put in the second category, "with imposition". The data in the first category shows that greetings make 27.27% of the total address terms in the conversation. Then it is followed by thanking with the percentage is 22%. The apology makes 15%; the intimacy and praising are 10%. The congratulation address is 9% and the lowest is obedience which is 7.14% of the total address terms. In the second category; the question is the highest percentage of the total address terms which is 40%. It is followed by the request with the percentage is 22%, and then disagreement is 14 %. The suggestion makes 11% and the rejection makes 8%. The chastisement is the lowest percentage which is 5% of the total address terms. It is hoped for the next researcher to conduct further research about positive politeness in another media such as on the television show, face book, news paper, song lyrics, public figure speech, etc.

Most of the discussion presented in this paper was made from a theoretical point of view and was—to borrow a term from Locher and Watts (2008, p.5)—the product of a 'second-order' conceptualization. Nevertheless, first order concepts (i.e., judgments about behavior) were also employed in this paper; the first-order concepts (e.g., polite, impolite, foolishness, and so on) employed in the paper informed the line of argumentation I adopted for my discussion. Needless to say, language is not always produced in spoken form. People also make use of language to write text. My study concluded that writing is different from speech in politeness terms. My interview corpus revealed that, when asked to label writing, interviewees did not use the polite/impolite dichotomy. Rather, they preferred to evaluate writing as a deed and therefore labeled writing the way they labeled self's non-verbal behavior. This is quite interesting in that deed is considered dominant in writing although language is the main element of writing. In other words, although language is the

key agent that brings written performance into existence, it is considered as the recess element in writing. As such, people do not use the same labels they use for speakers to express their evaluations of writers when they produced the same language. It seems as if people see written performance as a product of some deed, not a product of language or speech. Nevertheless, people distinguished between writing produced for communication (e.g., Emails, Mails, etc.) and writing produced for entertainment (e.g., poems, novels, etc.). While they confidently used labels for the evaluation of writers who had produced communicative pieces of written text, they were not confident in their labeling of authors who had produced entertaining texts. This is a quite interesting phenomenon and requires further research not only in particular but also in other languages.

REFERENCES

- Baron, N. (2002), "Who sets e-mail style? Prescriptivism, coping strategies, and democratizing communication access", *The Information Society*, Vol. 18, pp. 403-13.
- Berger, C. (2002), "Meta-analysis in context: a proto-theory of interpersonal communication", in Allen, M., Preiss, R., Gayle, B. and Burrell, N. (Eds), *In Interpersonal Communication Research: Advances through Meta-Analysis*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 13-41.
- Berger, C. (2005), "Interpersonal communication: theoretical perspectives, future prospects", *Journal of Communication*, September, pp. 415-47.
- Bradac, J. and Giles, H. (2005), "Language and social psychology: conceptual niceties, complexities, curiosities, monstrosities, and how it all works", in Fitch, K. and Sanders, R. (Eds), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 201-30.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987), *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press: New York
- Chaer, Abdul & Agustina, Leonie. 1955. *Sociolinguistic*: Perkenalan Awal. Rineka Cipta: Jakarta
- Fromkin, V. Rodman, R (1988) *Introduction to Language*. Holt: Rinehart and Winston.
- Fromkin, V. Rodman, R. and Hymes, N. (2003) *An Introduction to Language*. (7th Ed) Boston: Wardsworth Thompson Corporation.
- Hamuddin, B. (2012). A Comparative Study of Politeness Strategies in Economic Journals (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
- Hofmann, R (1993) *Realms of Meaning, an introduction to semantics*. London: Longman.
- Hudson (1995). *Language and Society*. London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Igboanusi, H. (2001) *Language Attitude and Language Conflicts in West Africa*. Ibadan: Enicrowfit Publishers.
- Leech, G. (1983) *Principles Of Pragmatics*. Singapore: Longman Publishers.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1993. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press: New York
- Mbaya, M (2002) *Linguistic Taboo In African Marriage Context: A Study Of The Oromo Laguu*. Nordic Journal of African Studies 11(2): 224-235 Senegal: University of Gaston Berger.
- Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge University Press: New York
- Thomas, Jenny. 1996. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman Group Ltd.: New York
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1986. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Basil Blackwell Ltd.: New York
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press: New York
- Yule, George. 1996. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press New York