

Face Threatening Act of Different Ethnic Speakers in Communicative Events of School Context

Novra Melisa P. Hutabarat

ABSTRACT

This research dealt with Face Threatening Act by the different ethnic speakers in communicative event of school context. The aims of this study were (1) to describe the face threatening acts are commonly performed by the different ethnic speakers in communicative events of school context. (2) to describe the face threatening acts are commonly performed by the different ethnic speakers in communicative events of school context. (3) to describe the reasons why the way it does. The source of data of this study were utterances of Bataknese and Javanese speakers. The data were collected through documentary technique and the instrument was the documentary sheet. The technique of data analysis was descriptive. The findings of this study revealed that: (1) There were 2 types of face threatening act, they are negative face and positive face. The most types of face threatening acts are performed by the different ethnic speakers is Positive Face within 46 times from 81 utterances consist of sentences were *disagreement, contradiction, agreement, and apology* in their conversations. (2) The ways of face threatening act was based on the interactions of the teachers, employees, and students in a certain conversations in school environment. The dominant type of FTA in negative face were expression of *thanks, acceptance of compliments, and acceptance of thanks, offers and compliments*. And the dominant type in positive face was *apologize*. It is indicated in the need for mutual relationships, to be accepted as members of the same purpose who has freedom of actions and unencumbered on solidarity and level of equality despite between Bataknese and Javanese have their own way to talk to their partners in this research. (3) Between the teachers, employees and the students, there are reasons of using Face Threatening Act: *request, suggestion, warning, disagreement and apology*. These reasons explain why the FTA does. All the reasons mostly influenced of face threatening act were the context of the situations (relationship between the different ethnic speaker).

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted 23 September 2021
Revised 23 September 2021
Accepted 03 Oktober 2021

KEYWORDS

Face threatening act, different ethnics speakers, communicative events of school context, negative face, positive face

CITATION (APA 6th Edition)

Hutabarat, Novra Melisa P. (2021). *Face Threatening Act of Different Ethnic Speakers in Communicative Events of School Context*. *Pedagogika: Jurnal Ilmu-ilmu Kependidikan*. Volume 1 (1), page. 17-21

*CORRESPONDANCE AUTHOR

hutabaratmelisa23@gmail.com

Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Communication is one of the most important matters for living things, especially for human. We have to communicate in order to help us fulfill our needs, because we cannot get what we want if we do not say it. Every human who lives in this world is created as a social creature. He or she always needs other people in his or her society to fulfill the social needs. In order to meet the social needs as a social creature, people have to be able to communicate or interact with the society. To communicate people needs tools of communication in which language is one of them. The use of language can be found in a conversation. Thus, conversation is a real form of language uses. It is an exchange of words, sentences and many other expressions that happen when two or more people are involved in talking about a certain thing in a certain situation. Making a conversation people does not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, but they also perform an act through those utterances. In other word, the acts are characterized in term how they are related to each other rather than the kind of function they are independently used to perform.

As a mean of communication and a part of culture, language has an important role in human's life. Therefore, it reflects speaker's behaviour. That is also why language is able to build human relationship. But every speech which is spoken by speakers or hearers is not exactly alike. Those differences, generally, are influenced by education, age, personality, sex, and

setting. These factors are sometime affected how close relationship or the interaction between speaker and hearer is. The personality, for instance, as a matter of fact that describes our character being related with the emotional states. Or sometimes we are conditioned by setting either formal or informal so we should decide how to behave in order to appropriate with its situation. Of course, the differences above influence people in using language whether it is regarded as polite language or not. It should be realized by everyone in forming good conversation because the use of language can reflect the behavior or the attitude.

Communication breakdown entails lack of effective and efficient communication; however, various measures are linguistically put in place to avert such situations. In daily interaction, people often do conversations with their gesture movement, and the way they talk with each other. It showed by their face when they perceive something from their face. Face is something that is emotionally invested and that it can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in an interaction. Goffman (1967) argues that face is a mask that changes depending on the audience and social interaction because in any society, whenever the physical possibility of spoken interaction arises, it seems that a system of practices, conventions and procedural rules comes into play which functions as a means of guiding and organizing the flow of messages. This is something that can happen in such situation that the researcher adopts for the current study.

This study focuses on the phenomenon of face threatening act. Face threatening act is considered as a linguistic product of contact, determined in various ways by the social circumstances in which it occurs. Face threatening act is now considered to be a natural product of interaction. Face-threatening act is act which in some way threaten the 'face' or self-esteem of another person (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Some people think that all communicative acts are potentially threatening. In fact, the potential does exist to threaten 'face' with every act of communication. Whether the act is actually a threat depends not so much on the intent of the speaker but on the perception of the hearer. Face threatening Act includes act other than spoken or written. Very often we can threaten others' face by a look, an expression or some other non-verbal communication. Staring at someone is often perceived as a FTA for no other reason than it can be so unnerving. The starrer's motivation is always questioned. The person who is being stared at must wonder, what is wrong. A child (or adult) at times can be more expressive and rather than hide a FTA, might express him or herself openly.

Talking about face threatening act, there are some types of face threatening act. Brown and Levinson (1987) distinguished two types of face threatening act. They are Negative Face Threatening Act and Positive Face Threatening Act. Negative face is threatened when an individual does not avoid or intend to avoid the obstruction of their interlocutor's freedom of action. It can cause damage to either the speaker or the hearer, and makes one of the interlocutors submit their will to the other. Freedom of choice and action are impeded when negative face is threatened. Positive face is threatened when the speaker or hearer does not care about their interlocutor's feelings, wants, or does not want what the other wants. Positive face threatening acts can also cause damage to the speaker or the hearer. When an individual is forced to be separated from others so that their well-being is treated less importantly, positive face is threatened.

The overall people around this world have ethnicity each other and they use language for their communication and interaction, especially in Indonesia. In Indonesia most of members of society have their own ethnicity. Ethnicity is a named human population with myths of common ancestry, shared historical memories, one or more elements of common culture (e.g. religion, customs, language), a frequent link with a homeland and a sense of solidarity among at least some of its members' (Hutchinson and Smith, 1996 in Cristi Karner, 2007). Ethnic is a work containing the basic study of the processing and analysis of the culture of a tribe or ethnic group. In this study the researcher is discussing about the interaction in the ethnic group that can occur for different ethnic speakers between Batakese and Javanese in school context. Batakese and Javanese are two of many dialects in Indonesia that have very particular characteristics in the way they communicate that many linguists are interested in studying those dialects. Muryantina (2011) said that, Batakese and Javanese are usually seen as two opposite cultures based on the way they interact with other people. Batak people are always seen as rude because they speak out loud in an aggressive manner. While Javanese people are always seen as indecisive because they speak softly and politely.

In this study people make interaction and take place in SMK Negeri 10 Medan. In every interaction, there are kinds of face threatening act in communicative events that appear between teachers, employees, and students. Communicative events are events which comprise communication, communication function as identity.

According to Saville-Troike (2002) state that the communicative event is the basic unit descriptive purposes. A single event is defined by a unified set of components throughout, beginning with the same participants in general topic, generally using the same language variety, maintaining tone or key and the same rules for interaction. An event terminates whenever there is a change in the major participants, their role relationship, or the focus of attention. If there is no change in major participants and setting, the boundary between events is often marked by period of silence and perhaps a change in body position.

In this case, the Batakese and Javanese do the face threatening act and the interactions took place in environments of school. The researcher aims are to give an overview of face threatening act, and to tell the readers what face threatening act is actually and how important to manage a FTA in our daily life based on Brown and Levinson's theory. The example of phenomenon face threatening act in communicative events is describe below:

TT₁ : On di son baen surat na! (*here put the letter!*)

TT₂ : Mauliate! (*thanks*)

MT : Ini udah ada sampe 3.000.000 uang jula-julanya
(*the total of the money is 3.000.000*)

TT₂ : Bah baen ma. (*alright.*)

Jangan dipegang-pegang lagi uangnya, salah nanti lagi perhitungannya, aku lagi nanti yang repot!

- TT₁ : *(don't touch that money, it will get mess)*
: Olo! Cerewet hian ho, Cuma salah dikitnya tadi ku hitung, udah panjang protesmu!
(ok! You are very talkative, I only made little mistake and you get mad of it).
- MT : Eh mana catatan yang dicatat sama kak Enitia tadi gimana?
(where is the note that given by Enitia?).
- TT₂ : *(it has taken by her.)*
: Udah diambilnyalah!
- TT₁ : Itu yang uang 500000 ribu katanya dari yang belum kasih jula-jula kemarin dan udah ditulis balik kakak itu tadi jumlahnya!
(she said that 500.000 from them that did not add yet yesterday and it has written the total of that money by her.)
- TT₃ : Itu tambahkanlah dengan uang 3.000.000 tadi.
(please add it with 3.000.000.)
- MT : Kalo udah urusan duit memang pande kali lah kalian berdua, langsung lancar otaknya hitung menghitung duit.
(when you are talking about money, you are so smart, straightforward the brain can count that money fast.)
- TT₂ : Jangan lagi dipegang-pegang uang itu buk, bersalahan lagi nanti, udah pas tadi ku hitung jumlahnya!
(don't touch the money anymore, it will get mess, I have counted it).
- MT : Okelah! *(ok!).*

From the example above the power, the role of speaker and the nature of circumstances for the set of rights. They play role in determining what messages may be expected both in terms of form and content. It is based on the idea that any communicative act has both informational as well as interpersonal aspect an idea that is also expressed by Brown and Levinson (1987) but they also focus on impolite or rude aspects of social behavior. For a message to be perceived to be polite, impolite or merely appropriate depends on the judgments the interactants make at the level of relational work during an ongoing interaction in a particular setting. For that reason, the researcher decide to study face threatening act of different ethnic speakers in communicative events of school context and to know whether there are reasons behind their daily interactions.

DISCUSSION

This study reveals that there are 46 utterances consist of sentences Face Threatening Acts commonly performed by the different ethnics speakers from 81 conversations: disagreement, contradiction, agreement, and apology. It occured in teachers' interactions, in employees interactions and also in teacher to students interactions. By using positive face as explained many times that everyone wants to be respected. Knowing that his/her arguments will not match, in order to minimize the threatening acts towards his/her own face so, she/he stated that actually she/he only wants to specifically argue the point. The data had been condensed previously that permit to the process of drawing conclusion. In order to make the data clearer, the researcher displayed the data into the following tables:

Table 4.1 The Total Types of Face Threatening Act Performed by All Speakers

NO	Speakers	Types of FTA	
		Negative Face	Positive Face
1.	Teachers	21	10
2.	Employees	14	13
3.	Students	0	23
Total Number		35	46

In this research, for the first, the speakers often threaten hearers' positive face rather than negative face. As explained by Brown and Levinson (1987), Positive face is someone's desire to be respected, connected, and well thought of by others, while negative face is someone's desire to be free from imposition. It is happened because of competing arguments where each position wants to win the opinions or the judgments each other. By doing the act of *insults, contradictions, disagreements, or challenges* are considered that they can threaten their partners and also the students. The second is threatening hearers' negative face because by threatening other's negative face such as *insults, contradictions, disagreements, or challenges suggestions, advice, reminding, threats or warnings* are considered given less contribution to the different ethnic speakers (students) because it cannot show their arguments are stronger than their teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing the data, conclusions are drawn as the following:

1. There were 2 types of face threatening act, they were negative face and positive face. The most types of face threatening acts was performed by the different ethnic speakers was Positive Face within 46 times in their conversation. Then it is followed was negative face in 35 times. Face Threatening Acts commonly performed by the different ethnics speakers from 81 utterances consist of sentences were disagreement, contradiction, agreement, and apology.
2. There were two types in face threatening act and usage of face threating act by differents speakers were discussed as the following: The dominant type of FTA in negative face were expression of thanks, acceptance of compliments, and acceptance of thanks, offers and compliments. And the dominant type in positive face was apologize. It is indicated in the need for mutual relationships, to be accepted as members of the same purpose who has freedom of actions and unencumbered on solidarity and level of equality despite between Batakese and Javanese have their own way to talk to their partners in this research.
3. Between the teachers, employees and the students, there were reasons of using Face Threatening Act: request, suggestion, warning, disagreement and apology. These reasons explain why the FTA does. All the reasons mostly influenced of face threatening act were the context of the situations (relationship between the different ethnic speaker).

REFERENCES

- Ajtony, Zsuzsanna. (2011). *Ethnic Stereotypes-Impediments or Enhances of Social Cognition*. Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica, pp. 134-155
- Amundrud, T. (2012). *Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) in Advanced Non-Native English Speaker (NNES) Emails: A Study of Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Department of English, Nara University of Education, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 183-190
- Anwar, A. M., Anam. S., & Wisangsoko. (2013). *The Analysis Of The Face Threatening Act Delivered By Asperger Syndrome In Adam Movie*. English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 89-95
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2010). *Kewarganegaraan, Suku Bangsa, Agama dan Bahasa Sehari-hari Penduduk Indonesia*. Jakarta
- Creswell, John. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, Mixed Method Approaches, (3rd ed)*. USA: Sage Publication, Inc
- Denzin, N. K. (2001) . *The Research Act in Sociology*. Chicago: Aldina
- Elfira, M. (2011) . *Inter-ethnic relations in Padang of West Sumatra*. Faculty of Humanities, University of Indonesia, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 293-304
- Eliza Suza, D. (2007). *Comparison of pain experiences between Javanese and Batak patients undergoing major surgery in Medan, Indonesia*. Prince of Songkla University, Thailand. pp. 247-258
- Gil, J. M. (2012). *Face-Threatening Speech Acts and Face-Invading Speech Acts: An Interpretation of Politeness Phenomena*. Faculty of Humanities, University of Mar del Plata, Argentina. Vol. 4, No. 2. pp. 400-410
- Huberman, M. & M.B., Saldana, Jhonny. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: a Method Source book*. USA: Sage
- Izadi, A. (2013). *Politeness in Spoken Review Genre: Viva Voce Context Department of English, Abadan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadan, Iran*. Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 1411-1429
- Karner, C. (2007). *Ethnicity and Everyday Life*. USA: Routledge
- Kedves, A. (2013). *Face threatening acts and politeness strategies in summer school application calls*. Josip Juraj Strossmayer University. pp. 431-444
- Martin, J.N., Nakayama, T.K. (2009). *Intercultural Communication in Contexts*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McGarty, C., Yzerbyt, V.Y., & Spears, R. (2004). *Stereotypes as Explanations: The Formation of Meaningful Beliefs about Social Groups*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murakami, Miki. (2011). *A Study of Compensation for Face-Threatening Acts in Service Encounters in Japan and the United States*. (Master's thesis, Portland State University). Retrieved from http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1380&context=open_access_etds
- Muryantina, Rima. (2011). *The Indecisive Vs. The Rude: Comparing Javanese and Toba Batak Cultural Speech Behaviours*. Jakarta: University of Indonesia
- Nasution, Anggi. F and Ariyanti, Lisetyo. 2013. *The Usage of Face Threatening Act in Princess Diaries 1 and Princess Diaries 2: The Royal Engagement Movies*. State University of Surabaya.
- Newton, Jonathan. (2004). *Face-threatening talk on the factor floor: Using authentic workplace interactions in language teaching*. Victoria University of Wellington. Vol. 19, No. 1
- Neuman, W. Lawrence. (2013). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, (7th ed.)*. USA: Pearson Education.
- Pauww, Scott. (2009). *One Land, One Nation, One Language: An Analysis of Indonesia's National Language Policy*. New York: University of Rochester
- Samovar, A. Larry., Porter, E. Richard & McDaniel, R. Edwin. (2010). *Communication Between Culture: 7th edition*. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Sato, Yoichi. (2010). *"Kuki Ga Yomenai": Situated Face-Threatening Act Within Japanese Social Interaction*. Waseda University. pp. 173-181
- Schneider, D. J. (2004). *The Psychology of Stereotyping*. Distinguished Contributions in Psychology (Edited by Kurt W. Fischer, E. Tory Higgins, Marcia Johnson, Walter Mischela) Guilford Series. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2000). *Intercultural Communication*, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Sembiring, S. (2004). *Alih Kode Penutur Bahasa Karo Kelurahan Sempakata Kecamatan Medan Selayang, Thesis*. Pascasarjana Universitas Sumatera Utara

- Sukmawan, Ramdan and Hestiana, Siska. 2015. *Face Threatening Act in Wayang Golek*. Muhammadiyah University of Sukabumi. Vol. 7, No. 5
- Tobing, Roswita. (2014). *Tingkat Tutar Dalam Budaya Jawa dan Batak: Analisis Sosio-Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: University of Yogyakarta.
- Yule, G. (1996) . *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press