

The Education of Politeness in the Court: Pragmatics Analysis

Inestie Printa Elisya¹ and Ike Revita²

¹Postgraduate Study of Linguistics, Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia

² English Department, Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia

Keywords: Crimes, Language, Politeness, The Court Session, Violation.

Abstract: Court is the place where legal trials take place and where the crimes are judged. In the court session, all of need is cooperation from all participants in order to make clear the case. The goal of this writing is to analyze the types of politeness violation and the factors that cause politeness violation in the court session “KOPI SIANIDA”. The data are all the linguistic aspects involved in the courtroom. The data are collected by observational method with note-taking, recording, taking picture. The analysis is done by referential method related to the concept proposed by Oktavianus and Revita (2013). Having analyzed the data, it is found that there are four types indicated as politeness violation. They are (1) politeness in expressing; (2) politeness in being emotional; (3) politeness in asking; and (4) politeness in refusal, etc. There are ten factors that caused the violation of politeness such as setting, participant, ends, act, setting and key, act and key, people involved in the speech, speech environment, speech topic and speech norm.

1 INTRODUCTION

Language essentially reflects a nation. As a fact, politeness nearly extinct due to human acts. The high amount of wrongly or miss interpreted meanings provoked debates to happen, whether in social media or in real life. There are many things associated with politeness that we must know. This is because, language would show the quality of a nation. The nation that uses language must show the eastern culture which is full of tolerance, peace and respectful towards each other. There are couple of cases (hate speech, hoax news, etc) or the usage of politeness that have been waved away, would affect some aspects of our lives, especially in education field.

Education is a process of teaching, training, and learning, to improve the knowledge and develop skills (Hornby, 2010 p.468). One of the most important is about politeness. Politeness can be found in our daily life when people have a conversation. It can be found in formal and informal conversation. One of the examples in formal conversation is the court session.

In speaking, we have the potential to apply threat to someone's face. So, people tend to use politeness strategy to prevent conflict. Unfortunately, some violations are still happening for some reasons. Politeness violation can be found in our daily life

when people have a conversation. It can be found in formal and informal conversation. When saying something, people do not always say what is true and what they have evidence for.

The speakers also do not always make their contribution as informative as it is required. Their contribution is not always relevant to the interaction and the way they are saying something. In other words, it can be said that sometimes, what the speaker says is unclear. This unclearness is often found in politics or for speaker's own benefit. If the speakers do all of those intentionally, it means that they violate the politeness.

According to Thomas (1995, p.150); Oktavianus (2008, p. 98), politeness can be seen as a sincere desire to do good to others. Sincere desire here means it can be a form of verbal language and non verbal language. Polite means we do not offend others. Polite in one community or sphere is not necessarily considered polite in other communities or sphere.

Linguistically, the politeness of an utterance could be marked by segmental and supra-segmental form. Segmental form consist of the words that the existence influences the politeness. These words could increase or decrease the level of meaning. The choice of words, utterances including diction reflect much to their politeness (Oktavianus and Revita, 2013, p. 61). There are four segmental aspects of

politeness. They are the use of word, the use of particles, use of greetings, and the use of hedges.

2 METHODS

A method is a kind of systematical work plan in order to make the research work become easier, so it can achieved its main purpose (Sudaryanto, 1993, p. 9). There are three steps in conducting this research. They are Method and technique of collecting data, the method and technique of analyzing data and the method and technique of presenting the result of analysis.

This is a descriptive research by using qualitative approach. In the process of gathering the data, the writer uses observational method with non-participant observational technique. According to Sudaryanto (1993), observational method is observing the language used in the research. The writer watches "live" on television and records it.

The writer watches the video several times and makes some notes.

The writer is interested in analyzing this session because it was an interesting topic and hot issue now. The session is a face-to face conversation which is full of politeness violation phenomena.

The second step is analyzing the data. The writer uses referential and translational identity method which is related to the types of politeness proposed by Oktavianus and Revita (2013). Referential method is used to figure out the reference of the data by describing the situational context of the data to determine the types, functions and factors in politeness violation.

Firstly, the writer described the text based on its context, and then identified the part of conversation that violates the politeness. After the data are transcribed, they are classified based on categories of politeness which is violated.

In presenting the result of the analysis, the writer applied both formal and informal method. The technique which is used in informal method is verbal statement where the analysis will be presented by using ordinary words or natural language. Then, the technique which is used in formal method is symbol or sign (Sudaryanto, 1993, p. 145).

In the court, all of the participants of that session have to keep quiet and obey the rules. In many sessions, all of the personals run their job in order to make the decision. The personnel are The Judges (MH), Public Prosecutors (JPU), Advocates or lawyers (PH), Clerks (PP), and defendant. But this

session was different. The session didn't run well. Most of participant there felt angry, sad, and hectic.

In this study, the writer analyses the politeness violation of all the participants in the court. The utterance will be classified into the politeness principle by Oktavianus and Revita. This research aims to describe the spoken used in hearing "KOPI SIANIDA" session which is shows politeness violation and the cause. The object of this study is the utterance from eye witness and expert. Those data are in the forms of video which contain the recording of the hearing "KOPI BERSIANIDA" live on television and records it.

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The court session is illustrated as a hot and very tensed situation. Each public prosecutor argued with the other side (advocates) by using strong arguments. This case happened because they (the participants) want to prove their arguments and they want the judges to believe them. In the court session "KOPI SIANIDA", some of the participants do not always observe politeness principle. Participants do violation for some reasons. It is also influenced by some contextual factors.

Datum 1

Description : *Setelah Lawyer 1 bertanya, dilanjutkan oleh lawyer ke 2*

'After lawyer 1 questioned the expert, it was then continued by lawyer 2'

PH : *Baik kepada ahli, kembali lagi, kalau saya melihat apa yang sudah berjalan.. kami minta "supaya" ahli dapat menjawab sesuai dengan yang jujur.*

'Alright, back to the expert, if I see from the previous sessions. we are asking the expert to answer the question honestly.'

This conversation involved lawyer 2 and expert (Psychologist). The expert was from JPU's side. This interaction occurred at 12th session. The conversation started after lawyer 1 finished his question. Lawyer 2 said "*Baik kepada ahli, kembali lagi, kalau saya melihat apa yang sudah berjalan.. kami minta supaya ahli dapat menjawab sesuai dengan yang jujur*".

The statement from the lawyer indirectly showed that lawyer 2 doubted the testimony or the statement of the expert before. The word “supaya” is conjunction for specific purpose. This conjunction tries to explain the purpose of someone’s act. According to Hoetomo (2005: 491) the word “supaya” means the consequence or the objective. Then, the lawyer asked the expert to be honest. It was including as politeness violation.

Lawyer asked to the expert to be honest because the lawyer doubted the expert’s statement. The politeness that was violated was politeness in requesting. According to Oktavianus and Revita (2013) a request was an expression that contained a meaning which later on will be the reason or part of the reasons for the hearer to act. In particular culture, a request can drop self-esteem. The lawyer asked with imperative sentence. The lawyer asked the expert to speak honestly. But, this actually dropped the expert’s pride. In the court, an expert was a person who came because of his/her knowledge considered to have given wrong information or dishonest.

Filing a request to hearer was essentially a threat to negative face of the hearer (Revita, 2008, p. 4). Negative face was a person’s desire that his/her action was not disturbed by others (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 129). In speech event which was meant as a request, a speaker must be careful in choosing the utterance because the choice of inappropriate form can make the hearer offended.

This resulted in the relationship between participants that were not harmonious, can lead to new conflict (Revita, 2008, p. 4); (Revita, 2009, p. 77). This was provided by the offended expert’s response by thanking to the lawyer who doubted her honesty. The expert also said that she had been sworn in and she was not lying.

There were two factors that influence the lawyer to violate politeness principle; participants and ends. According to Oktavianus and Revita (2013, p. 164) Participants here were related to some parties involved in conversation. In this case, as the speaker, the lawyer had the opportunity to lead the judges to doubt on expert’s statement /testimony (ends). Lawyer started with saying in the court sessions, the expert do not tell the truth in giving her testimony. The other factor was speech topic. The topic was about the expert’s testimony. The speaker had the opportunity to lead the judges in doubting the expert’s testimony. This topic had a high risk to the hearer. The lawyer asked the expert to speak honestly. But, this actually dropped the expert’s pride.

Datum 2

Description : *Majelis Hakim masih berusaha memberikan solusi kepada kedua saksi ahli.*

‘The Judges still mediated the two experts’

PH 1 : *Iya...karena dia membuat zooming-zooming membuat suatu teknik-teknik sendiri sehingga seakan-akan ada percepatan tangan-tangan ambil ini lo yang mulia, jadi itu yang mau kita analisis bahwa itu gak benar tidak sesuai dengan prosedur menurut ahli ini.*

‘Because he makes his own zooming and makes his own techniques. So there were as if a speed up of the that is what we want to analyze that is not true, not coherent with the procedure according to this expert...’.

The Judge gave a solution to the lawyer and JPU. He stated it by saying “*Apakah sekiranya ada flashdisk baru di copy kan dari jaksa bagaimana?*”. He suggested to copy the file (CCTV) from JPU. The Judge stated that because the lawyer’s expert did not have the copy of CCTV. The JPU’s expert got the file. So, the judge suggested it in order to make it equal. The judge told it so they can show their work with the same source. The JPU’s expert agreed with judge’s decision by saying “*Gpp...silahkan aja gak ada masalah*”.

But the lawyer did not agree by stating “*Yang mulia..karena yang mau kita analisa kan apa yang dilakukan ahli ini...*”. He stated that he wanted to analyze The JPU’s work. The Judge did not know that the lawyer wanted to analyze the JPU’s work. It can be seen from the judge’s statement by saying “*O..berati yang dikendaki...*”. Then, the lawyer explained by saying “*Iya...karena dia membuat zooming-zooming membuat suatu teknik-teknik sendiri sehingga seakan-akan ada percepatan tangan-tangan ambil ini lo yang mulia, jadi itu yang mau kita analisis bahwa itu gak benar tidak sesuai dengan prosedur menurut ahli ini....*”. The lawyer explained it in order to convey to the judges that JPU’s expert made his own technique. There were as if a speed up of the hand taking this too. So, they (lawyer and his expert) wanted to analyze that it was

not true, not coherent with the procedure according to this expert (Lawyer's expert). It was included as politeness violation. The lawyer accused the JPU's expert without checking it first. The politeness that was violated was politeness in requesting.

According to Oktavianus and Revita (2013) Politeness in requesting, was when people were asked to be more polite or mannered in requesting. The lawyer requested the expert's work but he did not ask it politely. After the judge heard the statement from lawyer, he answered it quickly by saying "Ya artinya kan begini..bahwa ahli yang diajukan oleh Jaksa Penuntut Umum itu menganalisa rekaman cctv berdasarkan perintah penyidik..ya kan..perintah penyidik....ya kan dia tidak mengzooming-zooming sendiri tapi kan menganalisa berdasarkan perintah penyidik.. ya sehingga apabila disetujui..seperti saya katakan flashdisk yang ada pada Penuntut Umum dicopy untuk dianalisa ahli yang dari Penasehat Hukum dengan hak zooming-zooming sehingga seimbang...". The judge stated it because he knew that the expert did it based on investigator's orders. So, he did not zoom on his own but he did his analysis based on investigator's orders.

The factor that influences the expert to violate politeness was Ends. He wanted to prove that the work of JPU's expert was not true. He stated it in order to get the JPU's expert work. The Judges did not understand the lawyer's want. So, the judges tried to mediate them by copying the real CCTV. The lawyer did not want it. The lawyers and their expert wanted the other file. They had their own purpose to get the JPU's expert (JPU) work. The other factor was participants. The lawyer stated it bravely because he knew from his lawyer. The lawyer explained it in order to convince the judge. They believed that the JPU's expert made his own technique.

4 CONCLUSIONS

At the end of the analysis, the writer concluded that not all of types of politeness were violated by some participants in the court session "KOPI SIANIDA". Those violations were politeness in requesting, refusal, asking, directing, expressing, and politeness in being emotional. In violating the politeness, some participants were influenced by some contextual factors.

Among the six types of politeness, politeness in expressive was the most frequently violated. It appeared in 21 utterances. The participants violated them by intentionally being insincere and untruth. The hearer can be misled by their utterance. Most

of participants violated this politeness to cover the truth, hide information and their secret. The speakers also violated this politeness to protect her/his self, protect someone else (their client; Jessica), to prove to Judges, to cover the truth, to hide the real feeling, and to hide real intention. Politeness in expressing was violated because the speaker did not give the hearer information that they need. It is also can be giving too much information or less information.

There were six factors that caused the violation of politeness. The dominant factor was end. The end factor happened because of the final goal, or what the speaker or hearer wanted to reach. The other factor was participants. Being older and educated actually did not guarantee the speaker to speak politely. The character of the speaker and final goal that influenced someone in speaking. Overall, there are ten factors that caused the violation of politeness such as setting, participant, ends, act, setting and key, act and key, people involved in the speech, speech environment, speech topic and speech norm.

In conclusion, this study shows that in court session "KOPI SIANIDA" some participants created the utterance contained politeness violation. The writer has seen that it is necessary for some side to make the hearer flare up and emotion. This way applied in order to the answer that they need come out. By violating those politeness, the problem of this session become long session, almost one year to finish this case. The judges proved that Jessica is the murder. The public prosecutors and Judges try to find the fact about Jessica's utterances.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Penelope & Stephen Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universal of Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoetomo. (2005). *Kamus Lengkap bahasa Indonesia*. Surabaya: Mitra Pelajar.
- Hornby, A.S. (2010). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oktavianus. (2008). "Rekonstruksi Nilai Budaya dari Peribahasa Minangkabau dan Pembudidayaan dalam upaya memperkokoh Filosofi Adat Basandi Syarak-Syarak Basandi Kitabullah (ABS-SBK)". Padang: Penelitian Fundamental Dikti.
- Revita, Oktavianus. (2013). *Kesantunan dalam bahasa Minangkabau*. Padang: Minangkabau Press
- Revita, Ike. (2009). "Faktor-Faktor Penanda Kesantunan dalam permintaan Berbahasa Minangkabau (Kajian Pragmatik)", *Jurnal Bahasa*, Bil 15, pp.74-92.
- Revita, Ike. (2008). 'Permintaan dan Penolakan dalam Bahasa Minangkabau: Tinjauan Sosiopragmatik. Disertasi. Yogyakarta: Universitas GadjahMada

- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: DutaWacana University Press.
- Thomas, Jenny. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

