

The Speech Act of Criticizing among Speakers of Javanese

Asim Gunarwan
University of Indonesia

1. Introduction

This paper reports on the results of a preliminary “ethnopragmatic” study conducted with a view towards finding out how the speech act of criticizing is realized (in terms of directness and indirectness) among native speakers of Javanese and, by extension, what strategies are used by them in socially differentiated speech events. Additionally, the study aims at seeking a clue as to what the quality of Javanese spoken by present-day Javanese is like.

The rationale for choosing the speech act of criticizing for this research study was that it is one of those speech acts which have a high potential of threatening the face (of the hearer). Since face saving is considered an art in itself among Javanese people, it would be interesting to see (1) how they express this highly threatening speech act, and (2) whether the realization of this act co-varies with age, education, sex and East vs Central Javanese grouping. There are two other reasons for choosing the Javanese speech community as the object of the research study. First, this speech community is renowned for indirection in their linguistic behavior, especially when it comes to communicating about unfavorable things. Second, Javanese are generally also known, at least by other ethnic groups in Indonesia, to have a penchant for avoiding excessiveness as evident, for example, from a common saying *Ngono ya ngono, nanging mbok aja ngono* (‘It may be correct to do that, but one should not have resorted to such an excessive act’), which they often cite when commenting on an act performed in immoderation.

On the basis of the foregoing reasons it is only natural to expect that Javanese criticisms are, in all probability, mostly indirect. Yet, it would still be of some interest to find out to what extent this is true and whether the strategies for expressing criticisms

correspond to Brown and Levinson's (1978) five strategies. It would also be of some relevance to find out, as alluded to above, whether there are signs of change in the degree of indirection of criticisms along the age dimension, perhaps as a result or a reflection of the shift in social values.

2. Background

The Javanese language is one of more than 400 languages in Indonesia. It is the mother tongue of about 70,000,000 people mostly living in Central Java, the Special Territory of Yogyakarta and East Java. There are also Javanese communities in the northwestern part of West Java, in North Sumatra and Lampung as well as in other Indonesian provinces where Javanese people have been resettled from the densely populated island of Java. Outside Indonesia, there are Javanese communities in New Caledonia, in the South Pacific, and in Suriname, in northern South America.

Javanese belongs to the western Austronesian language family, whose members include Indonesian (Malay), Batak, Minangkabau, Balinese, Sundanese and Madurese, to cite just a few, and many languages in the Philippines, including Tagalog. Javanese differs from many of the other members of the Austronesian language family, as it does from many other languages in the world, in that it has well-standardized speech levels, the use of which are dictated by an aggregate of factors such as the status of the hearer or addressee (including that of the person(s) talked about), the social distance between the speaker and the hearer and, to a certain extent, the degree of formality of the speech event. Some grammarians distinguish up to twelve speech levels. Poedjasoedarma *et al* (1979:13), on the other hand, distinguish only nine levels, an elaboration of the commonly used three levels, namely, *ngoko* (low), *madya* (mid) and *krama* (high).

The Javanese language has been the communication medium in a highly structured, civilized society for quite a long time, as can be inferred for example from C. Geertz (1960:7), who says that Java "has been civilized longer than England." Written literature has existed and has been continuously maintained since the tenth century (Poedjasoedarma 1979:1) and there are

indications that language “standardization” has been effective. However, since the commissioning of Malay (which was renamed Bahasa Indonesia in the Indonesian Youth Pledge in 1928) as the state language of the Republic of Indonesia, Javanese has lost its attraction. It has been losing ground to the effect that it is not infrequent nowadays to hear older Javanese complaining about the poor quality of Javanese used by the younger generations.

3. Some Javanese Values

According to H. Geertz (1961), quoted by Magnis-Suseno (1984:38), there are two basic rules that are most determinant in shaping the patterns of social intercourse in the Javanese community. The two basic rules, which Magnis-Suseno calls principles, are the principle of *kerukunan* (harmony) and that of *hormat* (respect). The former refers to the duty of each and every member of the community to endeavor to maintain social harmony, and the latter refers to the responsibility of all community members to show respect to others on every occasion in accordance with their status and standing in the community.

There is a different way of looking at the two principles, however. Based on my Javanese intuition, it would not be inappropriate to regard the principle of respect (or *kurmat* in Javanese) as being a corollary of the principle of harmony, the argument being that showing no respect can be interpreted as disrupting an equilibrium that is the social harmony. Subject to verification, I posit that there is a cardinal principle which governs all patterns of Javanese social conducts and that this cardinal principle (i.e. the principle of harmony) translates into a number of maxims, four of which are the maxims of *kurmat* (respect), *andhap-asor* (modesty), *empan-papan* (place consciousness) and *tepa-sliira* (empathy).

The word *rukun* in the posited cardinal principle means ‘harmonious’ or ‘good and peaceful’ and is used to refer to a situation or instance in which there is no conflict. Additionally, many instances can be cited to show that Javanese people adhere, or at least try to adhere, to the principle of *rukun* (harmony). Small children at play are advised to be *rukun*, not to quarrel (among Javanese, children are considered *durung Jawa* (‘not yet

Javanese') and are therefore often reminded to be *rukun*). Sermons after a Javanese wedding almost always mention the importance of living in a *rukun* way for husbands and wives. Often a saying '*Rukun agawe santosa, crah agawe bubrah*' ('Harmony will lead to strength, conflicts will lead to havoc') is cited and a wish '*Dadia kaken inen-inen, rukun kaya mimi lan mituna*' ('May both of you become a great grandfather and a great grandmother, remaining *rukun* like a pair of *mimi* and *mituna* fish') is said.

That people are encouraged to always adhere to this principle seems to be evident from the frequent use of the word *rukun* to refer to an organization, perhaps in the hope that the members will work harmoniously. Thus, there is an organization for farmers called *rukun tani*, for women *rukun wanita*, and for families living in the same neighborhood *rukun tetangga*. People are frequently reminded of the pay-offs of being *rukun*, as implied for instance in the saying above. The pay-off can be very simple and materialistic, as mentioned in the rhyme line often sung in the performances of East Javanese folk theater '*Eman-eman, janji rukun gak kurang pangan*' ('Dearest one, as long as we are *rukun*, there will be no lack of food').

As alluded to above, the first maxim, the maxim of *kurmat* (respect), means that one should show respect to others. In terms of linguistic behavior, this maxim means 'use language in such a way that the hearer knows that you respect him as he deserves'. The submaxims would include: (1) do not use language to the effect that the hearer's face would be threatened and (2) choose a speech level (and use honorifics when necessary) in accordance with the hearer's status and standing.

The phrase *andhap-asor* in the second maxim proposed above comes from the word *andhap* ('low') and *asor* ('lowly'). Thus, this maxim can be paraphrased to read something like 'behave as humbly or as modestly as possible'. In terms of linguistic behavior, it translates into 'use language in such a way that the hearer knows that you are modest (for modesty is a good virtue)'. The submaxims would include: (1) maximize praise of others and minimize praise of oneself (or, conversely, maximize dispraise of oneself and minimize dispraise of others) (cf. Leech 1983), and (2) avoid using honorifics for oneself. As with the

maxim of respect, the violation of this maxim can disrupt harmony: not to be modest is 'to get on one's high horse' and this may lead to self-praise which in turn can cause others to feel irritated or angry, thus disrupting social harmony.

The word *empan* in the phrase *empan-papan* in the third proposed maxim, the maxim of place consciousness, is derived from the second constituent of the phrase, i.e. *papan*. This word means 'place' or 'position' and thus *empan-papan* means 'be aware of your place or position (in the social constellation where you are a member)'. From the viewpoint of the traditional Javanese belief, a person's place in the universe is predetermined and fixed. As long as one is in his assigned place, the equilibrium is maintained. If one changes places, chances are that he will bump into someone else and, again, harmony may be upset.

On a smaller scale, this maxim can also be interpreted to mean 'know where you are (in relation to existent settings)'. A form of behavior may be appropriate in one situation, but it may not be so in another. An utterance, by the same token, may be appropriate and acceptable in one setting, but may sound inappropriate, and even rude, in another.

When it comes to the use of language, thus, this maxim may read as 'use language in accordance with your place in the social ladder of the community and in accordance with the current situation'. The submaxims would be: (1) choose a speech level in accordance with your social status in relation to the hearer's and (2) structure your utterance and select your words by first considering factors such as who the addressee is, what your relationship with him is like, where the interaction takes place, what the interaction is for,'

The phrase *tepa-slira* in the fourth proposed maxim, the maxim of empathy, consists of the word *tepa*, which is a variant of the word *tepak* ('hit the mark'), and *slira* ('body' or, in this context, 'one's own body'). Thus, this maxim can be paraphrased to read 'don't do unto others as you don't want others to do unto you'. When it comes to the use of language, this maxim may be read as 'don't use inappropriate language (in terms of structure and lexicon) to others as you don't want others to use inappropriate language to you'. The submaxims would be: (1) use

appropriate language as you want other people to use appropriate language to you and (2) don't use inappropriate language as you don't want other people to use inappropriate language to you'.

A question may arise at this juncture, namely whether all Javanese people always observe all of those maxims (assuming the four maxims are indeed correct) in real communications. The answer is obvious: no. Just as people more often than not violate Gricean maxims, we cannot expect all Javanese to abide by all of the four maxims above all the time. Perhaps only the Javanese Model Person, by analogy of Brown and Levinson's (1978) Model Person, adheres to all of the maxims perfectly. Hence, it would be interesting to find out how (and why) Javanese violate the maxims.

4. The Study

4.1 Theoretical Framework

The realization of speech acts can be seen as the application of social rules (cf. Leech 1983) or as the result of choosing strategies in communication (cf. Brown and Levinson 1978). In this paper, the realization of speech acts, including the speech act of criticizing, is seen as the result of selecting strategies in consideration of social maxims.

The social maxims are the ones posited above and the strategies are posited after Brown and Levinson (1978), who hypothesize that certain acts are in some way face-threatening to either the speaker or the hearer. According to Brown and Levinson, speakers "calculate" the level of the threat of a speech act by considering the social distance between the parties concerned, the degree of power that one party may have over the other, and the absolute ranking of impositions in a particular culture. On the basis of the result of the "calculation", speakers then choose a strategy for performing the act. Very threatening acts may not be performed at all, and minimally threatening acts may be done in a direct or explicit manner or, to borrow Brown and Levinson's term, "bald on record". In between, speakers can select, depending on the degree of the threat involved, any one of three possible strategies, namely on record with positive

politeness, on record with negative politeness, and off record -- in descending order.

For the strategy of on record plus positive politeness redress, Brown and Levinson list 15 possible ways of performing acts (1978:102). These include: attending to H (the hearer), (i.e. his interests, wants, needs, goods); exaggerating approval, sympathy with H; intensifying interest to H; seeking agreement; avoiding disagreement; asserting common ground; joking; and giving reasons. For the strategy of on record plus negative politeness, Brown and Levinson list 10 possible ways of doing the acts (1978:131). These include: being conventionally indirect; using questions and/or hedges; being pessimistic; giving deference; apologizing; and going on record as incurring a debt.

4.2 Data Collection

Data for this study were collected using a survey questionnaire developed on the basis of my intuition as a Javanese native speaker and on the results of interviews with nine Javanese experts, most of whom were faculty members of the Javanese Department, University of Indonesia. In this questionnaire respondents were first asked to provide information on their personal data anonymously, including which dialect of Javanese they speak, namely whether East Javanese (Surabaya, Malang and vicinities), Central Javanese (Yogyakarta, Surakarta, Semarang, Madiun, etc and vicinities) or Banyumasan Javanese (the [a] dialect). Respondents were then asked to provide a criticism against a hypothetical interlocutor in each of the eight hypothetical situations differentiated on the basis of three pairs of variables, namely (1) \pm power, (2) \pm solidarity and (3) \pm formality (of the setting). For each situation, respondents were asked to imagine that somebody had said something wrong and that, as a result, the respondents had the urge to criticize him. They were also given the option not to express the intended criticism in consideration of protecting the addressee's face. Finally, respondents were asked to rate the degrees of appropriateness of five strategies of criticizing (using a five-point rating scale).

4.3 Respondents

420 copies of the survey questionnaire were distributed to Javanese native speakers (with an education level of at least high school) in Jakarta, Semarang, Surabaya, Malang and Solo. Possibly because of the “difficulty” of completing the questionnaire, only 165 copies were returned. Of these, 23 were sorted out for defects in completing the questionnaire. Thus, the respondents of this study comprise 31 speakers of East Javanese dialect and 111 speakers of Central Javanese dialect. The respondents who speak Banyumasan Javanese are not included in this study because they are not part of the object of this present study. Of the 142 respondents, 63 are female and 79 male. In terms of education level, 35 completed high school, 34 hold an academy diploma, 54 hold S₁ degree (first university degree) and 19 hold Master’s or PhD degree. In terms of age, the breakdown of the respondents is as follows:

<= 20	:	14
21 - 30	:	48
31 - 40	:	50
41 - 50	:	14
>= 51	:	16

4.4 Data Analysis

A total of over 1,000 “speech acts” was obtained from the respondents. These were analyzed in terms of structure, lexicon, spelling and speech level, the purpose being to seek a clue, as mentioned earlier, as to what the “quality” of respondents’ Javanese is like. In addition, for each hypothetical speech event, the utterances were categorized in terms of directness and indirectness in order to find out the possible strategies used by Javanese. As for the quantitative data obtained from respondents’ rating the five strategies, these were subjected to statistical analyses to see if differences between and among respondent groups are significant. Specifically, ANOVA and Duncan’s Multiple Range Test were used.

5. Results

5.1 Language Forms

All in all, over 1000 sentences (speech acts”) were elicited from the survey. About 50 of them turned out to be in Indonesian instead of in Javanese, suggesting that there are Javanese who feel that Indonesian is a better medium for criticizing, or else that they feel more at home with Indonesian, the national language, than with their mother tongue.

The recurrent spelling mistake made by the majority of the respondents is the use of the letter *o* to represent the vowel [ɔ]. Possibly this is because, nowadays, the vowel [ɔ] in most Javanese names is spelled using *o* (such as *Suharto*, *Handoyo*, *Sarmo*), a common error originating from the Dutch way of spelling Javanese names. Another recurrent error is the use of a comma after verbs such as *kinten* (‘think’), *percaya* (‘believe’), *ngrumaosi* (‘feel’), as well as in sentences where a period or a semicolon should be used instead. These punctuation mistakes can be seen as a reflection of the same mistakes people make when writing in Indonesian, as can be exemplified in the Indonesian newspaper genre.

Many syntactical mistakes were also found, the common ones including the use of *bilih* or *yen* (‘that’) after phrases such as (in English) ‘As you see, ...’ or ‘As we know, ...’, in which no relative *that* must ever be used. This mistake seems to be caused by the probability that the respondents erroneously also use *bahwa* (‘that’ in Indonesian) in such a construction when they speak Indonesian.

The corpus is also replete with lexical errors. Many of them are a case of the violation of co-occurrence rules as exemplified by *ingkang panjenengan *sanjangaken* (‘what you [honorific] said’), in which *sanjangaken* should not co-occur with *panjenengan* because of the difference in the speech level to which each belongs. Similarly, *kulo *kagungan pamanggih* (‘I have an idea’) is also wrong because the verb *kagungan* (a high form using a honorific) should not be used to refer to oneself, as it would otherwise violate the maxim of modesty.

There are several other kinds of lexical errors, but what is fairly recurrent is the use of Indonesian words in otherwise Javanese

sentences. One example is the following (Indonesian words underlined).

- (1) *Maaf, saderengipun, bilih pendapat sampeyan puniko kirang pas lan margi terlalu panjang lan kirang gampil dipun mengerti.*

‘Excuse me first. Your opinion is not quite correct and because you use long-winding sentences, it is rather difficult to understand.’

A comparison between sample sentences provided by East Javanese respondents, on the one hand, and those provided by Central Javanese respondents, on the other, reveals that instances of Indonesian-Javanese code-mixing like the example above are more frequent among the former than among the latter. Maybe this is an indication that many East Javanese feel less secure using Javanese than Central Javanese do. If this is indeed the case, and if the linguistic insecurity continues to prevail, it can be hypothesized that language shift will occur earlier among East Javanese dialect speakers than among their Central Javanese counterparts. It remains to be seen. What is real from this study is that the wrong use of speech level is also more frequent among East Javanese than among Central Javanese. Also, the use of casual style is mostly found with East Javanese respondents. Long sentences in formal style are mostly provided by Central Javanese respondents.

All things considered, one inference that can be drawn from the corpus of data is that the quality of Javanese used by the respondents leaves much to be desired. Thus, the worry of many older Javanese that younger people’s mastery of Javanese is decreasing in quality seems to be justified: it is empirically substantiated.

As mentioned earlier, in the questionnaire respondents were given the option “not to perform the act” of criticizing, following Brown and Levinson (1978), who posit that strategies for performing a highly face-threatening act include the strategy of not doing the act. Perhaps because the eight situations given were not real, the number of instances of this strategy being

selected is small. In a comparison of the over 1,000 instances of the other four strategies being selected, there were only 61 instances of the not-performing-the-act strategy being chosen. Care should be taken, however, not to interpret this finding to imply that present-day Javanese are more vocal. More evidence should be sought.

There were a small number of instances in which the bald-on-record strategy was chosen, mostly in Situation A (+P-S+F). This small number seems to reflect the tendency of Javanese people to use indirect speech acts when talking about unfavorable things like criticizing, especially when a situation is marked with +P, -S and +F. Still, it is rather surprising to find that about 30 sentences in this situation were in the *ngoko* (low) speech level, as exemplified by the following (spelling mistakes corrected).

- (2) *Padha-padha wong Jawa, aja ngono, Rek. Ngelek-elekna wong Jawa ae.*

‘All of us are Javanese people, so don’t say/do that, Buddy. It only makes Javanese people look bad.’

The use of *Rek*, *-na* and *ae* shows that the respondent who “volunteered” to provide that sentence is East Javanese. But it should be noted that many of the *ngoko* criticisms elicited for Situation A were expressed by East Javanese respondents. Whether this is an indication that implies that East Javanese are “more democratic” than Central Javanese remains to be seen. Another possible interpretation, subject to verification, is that East Javanese do not adhere to the various Javanese maxims of conduct as faithfully as Central Javanese. A more blunt interpretation may be that many East Javanese do not know when or how to use the high or *krama* speech level. But, again, this interpretation should not be taken seriously, considering that there were only 31 East Javanese respondents in this study.

The tally of the speech act tokens shows that the most often selected strategy is the strategy of on record plus negative politeness. Most of the sentences used begin with an apology such as *nyuwun sewu* (‘I beg one thousand pardons’) and *nyuwun pangapunten* (‘I beg an apology’). Other ways of realizing this

strategy are by using (1) questions and (2) hedges, as respectively exemplified by the following examples.

- (3) *Punapa ingkang panjenengan ngendikakaken punika leres?*
 'Is what you said correct?'
- (4) *Ketingalipun, kula kinten, menika radi kirang pas.*
 'It seems, I think, it is rather not quite right.'

No example of the use of a conventionally indirect speech act was found and neither was an example of an expression of pessimism found. The use of words to show deference is exemplified by the use of honorifics, and examples are plentiful.

The next common strategy selected by respondents is the strategy of on record plus positive politeness. Ways of realizing this strategy are: (1) seeking agreement, (2) using in-group identification markers and (3) giving reasons, each exemplified by the following:

- (5) *Aku sarujuk, nanging...*
 'I agree, but...'
- (6) *Iki karo kanca dhewe, mula...*
 'This is between my own friend and me, so...'
- (7) *Menawi dipun galih malih sae, jalaran cecek kaliyan nalar.*
 'It would be better to rethink about it, because [the result] would be more logical.'

No other examples of positive politeness, such as exaggerating, joking, avoiding disagreement or asserting common ground, were found in the corpus.

For people renowned for preference of vague expressions of intent, the number of instances of the strategy of off record being selected is small (about 100, less than 10%). This may have been due to the artificiality of the eight situations provided in the

survey. Still, the examples found in the corpus show that when it comes to hinting or giving association clues, Javanese people are clever. One good example was given by one respondent who “criticized” someone, ostensibly during a picnic, for standing while eating (which is considered improper according to “correct” Javanese etiquette).

- (8) *Kene lho, kene lho. Kebeneran aku duwe klasa.
Lungguh kene ae, penak.*
‘Here, here. I happen to have a mat. Sit here; it’s comfortable.’

5.2 Ratings of Strategies

The computation of mean scores for each of the five strategies (for *all* respondents) yields figures presented in Table 1. As can be seen, the mean scores for each of Strategies 2, 3 and 4 in all situations do not differ significantly, each score being in the neighborhood of its respective overall mean score. For Strategy 1 (bald on record) and Strategy 5 (act not performed), however, mean scores vary significantly. In Situation A (i.e. +P-S+F) the mean score of Strategy 1 is 1.92 (the lowest), while in Situation H (i.e. -P+S-F) the mean score of the same strategy is 4.03 (the highest). What these two figures seem to indicate is that for respondents in general, performing an act of criticizing bald on record is considered least appropriate if the hearer (H) is more senior, the speaker (S) - hearer (H) relationship is not intimate and the setting is formal; conversely, it is considered most appropriate if H is less senior (or equal), the S-H relationship is intimate and the setting casual.

Table 1. Mean scores of respondents' ratings of five strategies of criticizing in all eight situations

Situation	Mean Scores				
	<i>Bald on Record</i> (1)	<i>On Record + Positive Politeness</i> (2)	<i>On Record + Negative Politeness</i> (3)	<i>Off Record</i> (4)	<i>Act not Performed</i> (5)
1. A (+P-S+F)	1.92	3.27	3.86	2.76	3.07
2. B (+P+S+F)	2.47	3.85	3.75	2.67	2.08
3. C (-P-S+F)	2.73	3.66	3.63	2.78	2.00
4. D (-P+S+F)	3.51	3.58	3.45	2.70	1.62
5. E (+P-S-F)	2.39	3.55	3.69	2.74	2.50
6. F (+P+S-F)	3.09	3.52	3.70	2.73	1.86
7. G (-P-S-F)	3.08	3.36	3.56	2.78	2.15
8. H (-P+S-F)	4.03	3.30	3.14	2.60	1.75
Overall	2.91	3.51	3.60	2.72	2.14

For Strategy 5 (act not performed) the figure for Situation A is 3.07 (the highest) and that for Situation H is 1.75 (the lowest). This can be interpreted as implying that for respondents in general, not performing the act is considered most appropriate if H is more senior, the S-H relationship is not intimate, and the setting is formal; conversely, it is considered least appropriate if H is less senior (or equal), the S-H relationship is intimate and the setting casual.

Since Situation A is the exact opposite of Situation H (either one being characterized as $\pm P$, $\pm S$ and $\pm F$), the two pairs of figures above seem to further indicate that face saving is taken into account when Japanese criticize and that, in general, Japanese still observe the maxims of respect, place consciousness and empathy. The same figures do not indicate whether or not the maxim of modesty is observed, however, because those figures do not (and cannot) show the speech levels used.

What is interesting to note in Table 1 above is the hierarchy of strategy appropriateness. On the basis of the overall mean scores, the rank order of the five strategies is:

- (1) On record + negative politeness (3.60, most appropriate)

- (2) On record + positive politeness (3.51)
- (3) Bald on record (2.91)
- (4) Off record (2.72)
- (5) Act not performed (2.14, least appropriate)

That the two strategies using politeness are high on the hierarchy seems to underscore that Javanese still very much observe the maxims of respect and modesty. What is more interesting, however, is that contrary to the widely held view that Javanese usually shun criticizing, there is an indication that they *do* criticize -- more often than expected. This can be inferred from the finding that the strategy of not performing the act of criticizing is *not* rated as the most appropriate.

By the same token, what is also more interesting to note is that for Javanese people, who are traditionally renowned for frequently using indirection in language, the bald-on-record strategy has been found to rank third, not fifth or fourth. Perhaps this can be interpreted as indicating that one traditional Javanese value is shifting: present-day Javanese are more frank, more straightforward.

That is a weak assumption, however, and there should be corroboration in order for it to have a chance of ringing true. Since a shift in a social value can usually be traced on an age gradation, the best way to look for some substantiation for the assumption is by subjecting respondents' ratings of the bald-on-record strategy in Situation A to ANOVA (to find out whether differences in scores along the age parameter are significant) and then the results of the ANOVA are subjected to Duncan's Multiple Range Test (to see what the real grouping is like and what the mean score of each group is). The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of the analysis of variance of and Duncan's multiple range test on the bald-on-record strategy ratings in Situation A (+P-S+F)

<i>Source</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>F Value</i>	<i>Pr > F</i>
Age	4	12.55448013	2.22	0.705
Error	125	176.67828910		
Corrected Total	129	189.23076923		
R-Square		C.V.	BOR Mean	
0.066334		61.82156	1.92307692	

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for variable BOR
 Alpha=0.05 df=125 MSE=1.413426

Number of Means	2	3	4	5
Critical Range	0.777	0.817	0.843	0.862

<i>Duncan's Grouping</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Age Group</i>
A	2.429	14	1 (≤ 20)
A			
B	2.152	46	2 (21-30)
B			
B	2.000	12	5 (≥ 51)
B			
B	1.859	44	3 (31-40)
B			
B	1.429	14	4 (41-50)

At Alpha=0.05 and df=125, the differences in mean scores across age groups are significant. What seems to substantiate the assumption above (i.e. that a Javanese value is undergoing a shift) is the result of the Duncan's Test. It was found that there are two groups of respondents, A and B, which have a really significant difference in mean scores (mean scores with the same letter -- A or B -- being not significantly different). However, the fact that mean scores (almost) consistently become smaller downwards along the ascending order of age groups (with only one aberration, i.e. the mean score associated with age variable 5), the figures should not be left uninterpreted. As we can see, the mean scores form an implicational scale (scalability=80%, there being one aberration in five cells): the mean score gradually increases

from 1.429 (associated with the 41-50 age bracket) to 2.429 (associated with the ≤ 20 age bracket), the difference being 1.000 (one scale, thus significant). Since the implicational scale involves respondents' ratings of the bald-on-record strategy, the implication is that the younger the Javanese person, the higher the frequency of using the bald-on-record strategy when criticizing a person more senior. A further implication is that, generally speaking, younger Javanese are more frank or straightforward than older Javanese, an indication of there being a shift in a sociocultural value.

The application of Duncan's Multiple Range Test on respondents' ratings of the bald-on-record strategy yields results which show that in six of the eight situations, the age group 1 mean scores differ significantly from the age group 4 mean scores. Table 3 shows the comparison of the bald-on-record strategy mean scores between both age groups in Situations A, B, C, E, F and G.

Table 3. Results of Duncan's multiple range test on age groups 1 and 4 respondents' ratings of the appropriateness of the bald-on-record strategy in 6 situations

Situation	Mean Scores	
	<i>Age Group 1</i> (≤ 20 years)	<i>Age Group 2</i> (41-50 years)
1. A (+P-S+F)	2.429	1.429
2. B (+P+S+F)	2.429	1.286
3. C (-P-S+F)	2.357	2.000
4. E (+P-S-F)	2.571	1.385
5. F (+P+S-F)	4.071	2.231
6. G (-P-S-F)	3.000	2.429

As can be seen, for the bald-on-record strategy the mean scores of respondents 20 years old or younger are consistently higher than the mean scores of respondents in the 41-50 years bracket. Since the difference between these two groups is approximately one generation, it may be interpreted as indicating that straightforwardness, more common for younger Javanese, changes significantly in a period of approximately one generation.

The analysis of variance of respondents' ratings of the five strategies as well as the application of Duncan's Multiple Range Test on the ratings yield results which show that strategies of criticizing do not co-vary with sex. With five strategies in eight situations, significant differences in mean scores are found only in four situations, namely with regard to Strategy 3 (on record plus negative politeness) in Situation A (+P-S+F) and Strategy 2 (on record plus positive politeness) in Situation C (-P-S+F).

The results of the same analysis and test applied to respondents' ratings plotted against the education level variable show that strategies of criticizing co-vary with education. As can be seen in Table 4, the only situation in which there is no significant difference in the mean score is Situation D (-P+S+F).

Table 4. Significant and insignificant differences
in the mean scores of respondents' ratings
of five strategies plotted against the education variable

Strategy	Situation							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1. Bald on record	s	s	i	i	i	i	i	i
2. On record + positive politeness	s	i	s	i	s	i	i	i
3. On record + negative politeness	i	i	i	i	i	i	s	s
4. Off record	s	i	i	i	s	s	i	s
5. Act not performed	i	s	i	i	i	i	i	i

[s=significant; i=insignificant]

Since it is always interesting to find out about Javanese straightforwardness, respondents' ratings of the bald-on-record strategy in Situation A were subjected to ANOVA and Duncan's Multiple Range Test. Table 5 shows the results.

Table 5. Results of the analysis of variance of and Duncan's multiple range test on the bald-on-record strategy ratings in Situation A (+P-S+F)

<i>Source</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>F Value</i>	<i>Pr > F</i>
Education	3	7.33638420	1.89	0.1717
Error	128	181.89438503		
Corrected Total	129	189.23076923		

Duncan's Multiple Range Test for variable BOR
Alpha=0.1 df=126 MSE=1.443606

<i>Duncan's Grouping</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Age Group</i>
A	2.152	33	1 (high school)
A			
A	2.125	32	2 (academy)
A			
B	1.792	48	3 (BA)
B			
B	1.471	17	4 (MA/PhD)

As can be seen in the results of Duncan's Test, the mean scores form a perfect implicational scale (scalability=100%). The figure consistently becomes smaller as the level of education goes up, and the most significant difference is found between the mean score of education level 1 (high school) and the mean score of education level 4 (MA and PhD). The implication which can be drawn from the implicational scale above is that the higher the education level of a Javanese person, the lower the frequency of using the bald-on-record strategy in criticizing a person more senior.

Finally, with regard to East vs. Central Javanese grouping, the results of the use of ANOVA and Duncan's Multiple Range Test on respondents' ratings show that by and large there is no significant difference in the mean scores of five strategies in eight situations. Thus, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the two groups of Javanese in perceiving the appropriateness of the five strategies. The only situation in which there is a significant difference in the mean scores between these two groups of Javanese is Situation D (-P+S+F), namely as

regards Strategy 2 (on record plus positive politeness) and Strategy 3 (on record plus negative politeness) (see Table 6).

Table 6. Results of Duncan's multiple range test on East and Central Javanese respondents' ratings of the appropriateness of the use of the strategies of on record with redress in Situation D (-P+S+F)

Group	Mean Score	
	<i>Strategy 2</i>	<i>Strategy 3</i>
Central Javanese	3.721	3.548
East Javanese	3.036	3.100

The table shows that for both strategies the mean scores of Central Javanese are higher than those of East Javanese. The inference that can be drawn is that Central Javanese perceive the strategies of on record plus positive and negative politeness as being more appropriate than East Javanese. Whether or not this implies that Central Javanese are more polite than East Javanese remains to be seen.

6. Concluding Remarks

There is no denying that differences in the patterns of behavior, linguistic or otherwise, exist from person to person. However, this study deals with group, rather than individual, behavior and as such it has made use of the concept of system. In this study, persons with similar cultural identities are seen as constituting one cultural system, whose members share verbal (and nonverbal) behavior patterns, common principles and common maxims of conduct.

Four maxims or the Javanese principle of harmony are postulated in this study and part of the result shows that there is a difference in the degree of the observance of the maxims between East Javanese on one hand and Central Javanese on the other. However, the result of the statistical analysis shows that the difference is not significant. Thus, one hypothesis of this research study is refuted. In terms of the straightforwardness of criticisms, East Javanese do not differ significantly from Central Javanese.

Another result of this study also shows that the realization of the speech act of criticizing among Javanese speakers does not co-vary with sex. What has been discerned is that there is an indication that it co-varies with the level of education and, more importantly, with age. This latter finding points to the possibility that younger Javanese are more straightforward, at least as far as criticizing is concerned, than older Javanese.

References

- Brown, Penelope and S.C. Levinson. 1978. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. Esther N. Goody, ed. *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*, 56–324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1960. *The religion of Java*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Geertz, Mildred. 1961. *The Javanese family: A study of kinship and socialization*. New York: The Free Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Magnis-Suseno, Franz. 1984. *Etika Jawa: Sebuah analisa falsafi tentang kebijaksanaan hidup Jawa*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- Poedjasoedarma, S. *et al.* 1979. *Tingkat tutur bahasa Jawa*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa