

THE USING OF “IJIN” AS THE POLITENESS STRATEGIES ON PHATIC COMMUNION IN STIMART AMNI SEMARANG

Aprillina

Abstract

This study was conducted to know the using of “ijin” as the politeness strategies on phatic communion in stimart amni semarang in case for the students in the maritime field. This study mainly discuss about the politeness theory which is applied on phatic communion in STIMART AMNI students. The interview has been selected as the instruments to study what kinds of phatic communion in students of STIMART AMNI Semarang in deal with the using of “ijin” and to what extend the using of “ijin” of the STIMART AMNI Semarang’s students in deal with its response. It involves student’s activities in their interaction. There are some principles that should be followed so that the utterances become polite. Those are : asking permission, showing politeness, and make somebodyelse feel comfortable, and be friendly which based on regular verbal rule. Students in the lower level might use “ijin” as a strategy of showing positive politeness. The students in higher levels do not use the same expression to show their response of positive politeness in order to discover the best implementation of the communication aims.

Keywords: Pragmatic theory, politeness, Phatic communion

Language in Pragmatics.

Language is a means of communication to convey ideas, opinions, knowledge, etc. using a system of sounds symbol. By conveying the ideas in language, people need to interact with others in a society. Language and society are so intertwined that it is impossible to understand one without the other. All human societies are shaped by language, and language itself is shaped by society. Every social institution is maintained by language. Law, religion, government, education, the family, all are carried on with language.

Most of the people interaction with others involves speaking. They speak differently according their background. The social characteristic of one person can be

determined from his speech, his place of origin, education, social group, and even occupation. Sometimes, they speak differently according to the actual circumstances that they find themselves in a particular time. It is emphasized on the sociolinguistic that we speak differently in different social contexts, and they are concerned with identifying the social functions of language and the way it is used to convey social meaning. However, the social meaning itself concern with the pragmatic whereas Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics which studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning.

For being able to understand the meaning of an utterance, one cannot ignore the context surrounding since it is very important in interpretation of a sentence. If the context surrounding is ignored, there might appear different interpretation from what is intended.

The importance of context in language can be seen from the opinion of Levinson who says, “Pragmatics is the study of the ability of language user to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate” (Levinson, 1983). Further, Leech (1983) states that context deals with the relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance. Context is a background knowledge, which is showed by the speaker and the hearer in understanding their utterances.

This research will only focus on the politeness that happens in the utterances under certain situations. The word ‘politeness’ is derived from the adjective ‘’ which means ‘having or showing good manner’. Pragmatics encompasses speech act theory, conversational implicature, talk in interaction and other approaches to language behavior in philosophy, sociology, and linguistics. It studies how the transmission of meaning depends not only on the linguistic knowledge (e.g. grammar, lexicon etc.) of the speaker and listener, but also on the context of the utterance, knowledge about the status of those involved, the inferred intent of the speaker, and so on. In this respect, pragmatics explains how language users are able to overcome apparent ambiguity, since meaning relies on the manner, place, time etc. of an utterance. The ability to understand another speaker's intended meaning is called *pragmatic competence*. So

an utterance describing pragmatic function is described as metapragmatic. Pragmatic awareness is regarded as one of the most challenging aspects of language learning, and comes only through experience. There has been a great deal of interest in politeness that is included as a sub discipline of pragmatics.

Levinson stated that there are some politeness strategies as the realization of the language into an expression. The expression is formed into verbal communication in speaking (Levinson, 1987:101). As mentioned above that people interaction involves speaking in different characteristic based on social group, occupation, place of origin etc. Thus, there are politeness strategies that can be applied as the realization of speaking. would like to propose a solution to overcome the problems faced by English learners when they communicate with others by relating the using of “ijin” as the politeness strategies and English phatic communion in STIMART AMNI Semarang. Lakkof (1990) examines politeness based on 3 principles that should be followed so that the utterances become polite.the three principles are : don’t impose, give option, and make somebody else feel comfortable, and be friendly (Lakoff as cited by Eelen, 2001:3), eg, the first principle, do not impose or do not show greediness – “Ijin tanya pak? is more polite than “ Tanya pak” Second principle, give choice to interlocuters – “Ijin, bukunya yang mana pak!” is more polite than “buku yang mana pak!” Third principle, as if the speaker and the interlocuter are in the same level, e.g:“ijin mendahului mas” Is more polite than “ saya duluan ya mas?”

Stimart AMNI Semarang is one of maritime training institution that belongs to the member of the international maritime organization. STIMART AMNI has been approved by the general of Sea Transportation No. PH.34/2/20/DJPL.06 based on Regulation of STCW 95. It prepares the students to be officers on board ships. This institution uses some military systems in its education such as guiding, dressing, and commanding. They have to follow several activities in order to know their new environment well. The activities are in formed on the interaction with the senior (students of the higher level) and with the lecturers. The language that the students often produced, for instance on the situation when they want to come into the class on

the beginning of lecture they often say, “ijin masuk” or another situation in when they want to asking some question during the lecture, they might say “ijin bertanya”. Based on the reason, this paper underlined to study what kinds of phatic communion in students of STIMART AMNI Semarang in deal with the using of “ijin” and to what extend the using of “ijin” of the STIMART AMNI Semarang’s students in deal with its response.

The previous study of the phatic communion has been studied by Malinowski’s theory (1923) about language as a mode of action, Malinoski proposed a concept of phatic communion , that a type of speech in which ties of union are created by a mere exchange of words.(1923:315).

The concept of phatic communion then developed by Jakobson (1960) that is one of the six language functions , namely emotive, currative, referential, *phatic*, metalingual, and puitic. According to Jakobson (1960) Phatic communion is language function that stresses on the contact that happens between message sender and the message receiver. The term *contact* then referred by Rchards et al (1992) with the definition of social contact in phatic communion, communication that is not meant to find or to send information, but communication that has social function to maintain social contact

The theory of politeness

Politeness is something developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction (Lakoff, 1975).

Politeness is defined as the language usage associated with smooth communication (the speaker’s choice of expressions), which is realized through the speaker’s use of intentional strategies to allow his message to be received favorably by the addresses (Ide, 1989). Politeness relates to the notion of ‘face’: positive and negative face.

a. Positive face is the want of every member of a society that his want be desirable to at least some others.

b. Negative face is defined as the want of every competent adult member that his action be unimpeded by others (Brown and Levinson, 1978).

Studies from Brown & Levinson (1978, 1987) and Scollon and Scollonn (1995) have aroused increased attention in the study of politeness. The face theory proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) serves as the most influential theory on politeness. It plays a leading role in the study of speech acts (Ji, 2000;Hobbs, 2003). Brown & Levinson's face theory contains three basic notions: face, face threatening acts (FTAs) and politeness strategies. They argue that everyone in the society has two kinds of face wants, i.e

1. One is negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preservers, rights to non-distraction -- i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
2. The other is the positive face: the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.

Every utterance is potentially a face threatening act (FTA), either to the negative face or to the positive face. Therefore, people need to employ politeness strategies to redress the FTA. Three factors need consideration when calculating the weightiness of the FTA: power status, social distance and the imposition. Brown and Levinson (1987) introduce five super strategies for politeness in relation to FTA's: bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record.

The politeness systems theory advocated by Scollon and Scollon (1995) is also noteworthy in this field. They observe three politeness systems: the deference politeness system, the solidarity politeness system and the hierarchical politeness system. The distinction of the three systems is mainly based on whether there exists power difference and on the social distance between the interlocutors. The deference politeness system is one in which participants are considered to be equals or near equals but treat each other at a distance (e.g. students of the higher level) In a solidarity politeness system, the speakers may feel neither power difference nor social distance between them (e.g. students – lecture). The hierarchical politeness system

may be widely recognized among companies, government and educational organizations, in which the speakers resort to different politeness strategies: the "higher" use involvement politeness strategies and the "lower" use independence politeness strategies.

Within the framework set by Brown & Levinson, many researchers carry out experiments in their specific culture to test the validity of politeness theory and try to make comparisons across gender and nationality (Hobbs, 2003).

Comparing with Herbert theory (1986) in conduct the study Pomerantz's taxonomy by analyzing American English speakers' compliment responses, here the writer applied Herbert table in order to know the utterance and response happened in a certain situation in STIMART AMNI Semarang as follow :

(Table 1)

Response Type	Example
I. To break silence	
Ijin pak, nunggu siapa?	Tidak nunggu siapa-siapa
II. To start conversation	
Ijin menghadap pak,....	O ya silahkan duduk
III. To express solidarity	
Ijin pak...saya bawakan bukunya	o ya..terima kasih
IV To show friendly agreement	
Ijin senior...apa kabarnya	baik...terima kasih
V. To show friendship	

	Ijin mas...kok keliatan senang hari ini, hayoo ada apa	(smile)
VI. To give honors		
	Ijin makan sen...	ya...
VII. To show politeness		
	Ijin masuk pak....	silahkan

Table 1. adapted from Herbert's Taxonomy of Compliment responses (Herbert 1986, p. 79)

Situation on Phatic communion

Halliday stated the way in which the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation. (Halliday (1978 :32). Certain situation (e.g formal meeting in the classroom) or type of language use (e.g interaction between students- teacher versus interaction between student-student in higher level), as well as certain relationship, require more formal language use. This formality may manifest itself in language by the choice of formal lexis and form of address, the avoidance of interruption, etc.

In formal situation, the politeness is also realized in an expression called honor expression. This is an expression that we probably see in our daily life. For example, while a student is passing by my house he might be say "permisi" or "ijin pak". The expression of honor becomes a part of conversation which is essential in STIMART AMNI Semarang environment. This kind of expression is just to establish a social relation between the speaker and his interlocutor. From the above samples, we can find that the lips service expression may emerge a sense of hospitality and caring of other people. There is no special function in the communication. This expression is used to maintain social contact between the speaker and the interlocuter.

The expression of “ijin” in STIMART AMNI Semarang environment is belong to the explicit regulation, although it does not put in the formal regulation. It can be seen from some of the activities which is made in law if the speaker, here the students in a lower level, whom did not say “ijin” to the interlocutor in this case are the students in a higher level. Since it is become a common utterance in STIMART AMNI Semarang, here the writer is interest to study the using of this utterance, in this case is “ijin” within the certain situation

The other cases is also exist in English language , although they are different but have the same purpose. For instance, “Hello”. , “How are you?”, or “Nice day, isn’t it?” are used by the English native speakers to maintain social contact happens. Just the way in Javanese language “Bade tindak pundi?” or “Where are you going?” which does not really ask where the interlocutor is really going to. If the question is a real question the English native speaker’s response is “It’s none of your business”. The fenomena above is called Phatic communion . Phatic communion is communication that is not addressed to find or send information , but communication that has social function to maintain social contact (Richard s et al. , 1992:214) in Dr Juminto, 2008:3).

Discussion

The subject of the study was the Students on the lower level of STIMART AMNI Semarang who interact with their seniors (students in a higher level), and the students in higher level to the lectures, and both the students in higher and lower level to their lectures. This study used transcript of conversation between the students and the senior, lectures. The materials in this study consisted of 7 situations. In this study, the procedure of the study was done using open interview then the result of the interview was analysed using a table containing the functions of phatic communion as proposed by Jakobson (1960). They were functions of phatic communion, namely

1. to break the silence
2. to start a conversation

- 3. to express solidarity
- 4. To show friendly agreement
- 5. to express friendship
- 6. to express honor,
- 7. to express politeness.

Interpreting

To see the language used in situation 1 to 7 as the result of the open interview by the students (x) and the lecture (y), there were as follows:

1. to break the silence

It means to break quietness. One of the students want to break the silence, he spoke to the lecture who sit near him

X : Ijin Pak, Apa Bapak sedang nunggu seseorang? (excuse me sir, are you waiting for someone?)

Y : Oh.... Nggak nunggu siapa- siapa , saya lagi pengen merokok di sini (No, I am not. I want to smoke here)

X : Ijin...saya ganggu ya pak? (Am I disturbing you?).

Y : Ah tidak... (No worries...)

2. to start a conversation

It means to begin a conversation the student greeted then introduced himself to the teacher.

X : Ijin Pak, Saya taruna Agus, semester dua nautika, nrp 094730060, ijin menghadap. (Excuse me sir , I am Agus, the second semester of nautical department student, register number 094730060, I need to meet you).

Y : Ya.... Duduk (Yes....take a seat)

X : Terimakasih pak, ijin. (thank you sir)

3. Express solidarity

It means mutual agreement and support: harmony of interests and responsibilities between the Students and the lectures to offer to bring lecture's stuff.

X : Ijin pak, saya bawakan bukunya pak. (excuse me sir, can I help u to bring your book?)

Y : Oh, ya..ini. terima kasih ya(Oh yes, please.here you are, thank you).

X : Sama-sama pak.(you are welcome sir).

4. **to show friendly agreement:** a situation in which there is friendly agreement or accord. This conversation in this situation showed the harmony between students and their seniors greet each other. They live in harmony

X : Ijin sen, apa kabarnya? (Excuse me, how are you)

Y : Baik, kamu gimana? (Fine, Thank you)

5. to express friendship

It means a relationship between two or more people who are friends. From the conversation we know that the students in a lower level had a close relationship with his senior.

X : Ijin, Mas Vino kelihatan senang, (Excuse me, mas vino seems to be happy)

Y : Ah biasa aja? (No, I am fine)

X : Lagi jatuh cinta ya? Hayo....(Do u fall in love).

Y : ya...gitu deh..(It could be...)

6. to express honor

It means **respect:** great respect and admiration in this situation the students' expression was to respect to the senior in situation that he want to having a lunch in canteen whereas the senior is in the canteen, too.

X : Ijin makan sen (Let's eat)

Y : ya... (go a head)

7. to express politeness

It means well-mannered : showing or possessing good manner or common courtesy.

To show her politeness.

X : Ijin masuk.. (May I come in?)

Y : masuk (come in)

Findings

This study is taken by conducting the observation on Stimart Amni Semarang students. By interviewing the students from the higher, lower level students and the lectures, the writer found some of the utterance of “ijin” based on the certain situation and it is followed by the certain responses. Although it is found variety situation of the using “ ijin” utterances, here the writer put 7 function or situation as the finding of this study.

Based on the previous discussions, this study identified 7 functions above. one that should be taken into consideration was that for example the expression of politeness a part of Stimart AMNI feature that is used military system, especially in using some interactions in a certain expression, in this case the using of “ijin” in STIMART AMNI Semarang students. This is an expression that we might see in the daily activities in STIMART AMNI Semarang. For example, while a student is passing by my house he might be say “permisi” or “ijin pak” though, in fact, they do not actually want to ask permission in any activities. This could not just be applied in English conversation because it will destroy the communication. If this is applied in an English conversation the response might be strange since for western people do not like to be having specific rules in practicing politeness strategies. They were some functions of phatic communion, namely :

1. to break the silence
2. to start a conversation
- 3.to express solidarity
4. express friendly agreement

5. To express friendship
6. to express honor
7. to express politeness.

In this case, the student in a lower level must use the expression of “ijin” as the utterance on the certain situation in addition to show the politeness strategies in Stimart AMNI environment which based on the verbal institution rule. Since the politeness in Stimart Amni Semarang is one of the verbal regulations, so the utterance, in this case the expression of “ijin” must be used as the speech interaction among the speakers and interlocutors. It is interesting in knowing that if the speakers (the lower level students to the higher level students, or both of them with the lecture) didn’t use for utterance of “ijin” they will get such kind of punishment from the physical official department.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

From the discussion above, it is clear that the communication needs appropriate strategies in order to achieve its goal. Communication with intent to convey a message needs an involvement from cooperative principles which have to be complied either by the speaker or his interlocutor:

1. There are some principles that should be followed so that the utterances become polite. They are as follows:
 - a. asking permission
 - b. showing politeness
 - c. make somebody else feel comfortable
 - d. and be friendly which based on regular verbal rule.
2. Students in the lower level might use “ijin” as a strategy of showing positive politeness. The students in higher levels do not use the same expression to show their response of positive politeness.

Suggestion.

Observing of this case, there are some suggestions that might be as the result of this study as follows

1. It needs of special attention for the new member of STIMART AMNI Semarang participants to practice “ ijin” as one of the expressions to convey a message.
2. Besides contextual knowledge, English learners should also enrich cultural knowledge such as phatic communion because lack of cultural knowledge would brings problems in communication.

References

- Hessa, Al Fallasi 2007; Just Say “Thank You”: A Study of Compliment Responses :
The Internet Asian Linguistic Journal. <http://www.asian-linguistic-journal.com>
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. *How to teach writing*: England. Longman
- Hornby, A S.2000. *Oxford. Advanced learner’s dictionary*: New York. Oxford University Press.
- Cedar. P. (2006). *Thai and American Responses to Compliments in English*. *The Linguistics Journal*, June, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 6-28. http://www.linguistics-journal.com/2006_pc.php
- Guodong, L. & Jing, H. (2005). *A contrastive study on disagreement strategies for politeness between American English & Mandarin Chinese*. *Asian EFL Journal*(7), 1. Retrieved May 5th , 2006, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/march_05_lghj.php
- Herbert, K. (1986). Say “thank you” or something. *American Speech*, 61(1), 76-88. Retrieved April 13, 2006 from the JSTOR database
- Brown, R., & Levinson, S. (1978). *Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*. New York: Garland Press.

- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Politeness. Some universals in Language used*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, P. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*. (pp. 56-289). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, P. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press
- Setyowati, Dyah. 2003. Siap as a multifunctional word to react at AMNI SEMARANG. *Jurnal Sains dan teknologi maritime volume I/2 Januari 2003. Akademi Maritim Nasional Indonesia (AMNI) Semarang*
- Chen, R. (1993). Responding to compliments: A contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*,(20),49-75.
- El Samaty, M. (2005). Helping foreign language learners become pragmatically competent. *Proceedings of the 10th TESOL Arabia Conference*, 9, 341-351.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fatahi, A. (2004). The effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL-EJ*(8),2. Retrieved May 5th, 2006, from <http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESE-EJ/ej30/a2.html>
- Cedar. P. (2006). Thai and American Responses to Compliments in English. *The Linguistics Journal*, June, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 6-28. http://www.linguistics-journal.com/June2006_pc.php
- Ghawi, M. (1993). Pragmatic transfer in Arabic learners of English. *El Two Talk*, 1(1),39-52.

- Guodong, L. & Jing, H. (2005). A contrastive study on disagreement strategies for politeness between American English & Mandarin Chinese. *Asian EFL Journal*(7), 1. Retrieved May 5th, 2006, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/march_05_lghj.php
- Herbert, K. (1986). Say “thank you” or something. *American Speech*, 61(1), 76-88. Retrieved April 13, 2006 from the JSTOR database.
- Liu, S. (2003). Studies on negative pragmatic transfer in international pragmatics. *Guangxi Normal University Journal*. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://www.gxnu.edu.cn/Personal/szliu/negative%20pragmatic%20transfer.doc>
- Rizk, S. (2003). Why say “NO!” when you refuse? *TESOL Arabia 2002 Conference Proceedings*,7,401-431.
- Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence in Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal*,(8), 131-155.
- Urano, K. (1998). Negative pragmatic transfer in compliment responses by Japanese learners of English. Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~urano/research/esl660.html>