

Violations of Language in Learning Process at Toraja Christian University of Indonesia

Resnita Dewi¹, Simon Rukuk²

¹ Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja, Indonesia; resnita@ukitoraja.ac.id

² Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja, Indonesia; simonruruk@ukitoraja.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Violation;
Language;
Learningprocess;
UKI Toraja

Article history:

Received 2022-01-18

Revised 2022-03-22

Accepted 2022-06-22

ABSTRACT

Lecturers and students as academics are required to be polite not only in behaving, but also in language. But in reality, often we find lecturers and students who do not show such courtesy, especially in the language or often called violations of language courtesy. This research aims to reveal violations of language courtesy committed by the academic community of Toraja Christian University of Indonesia (UKI Toraja), specifically in the learning process. Through this research, it is expected that various forms of violations of language courtesy can be expressed. Research on the violation of language courtesy is a type of qualitative descriptive research. This research was conducted at UKI Toraja specifically in the Indonesian Language education and Satra study program. The data in this study is the use of language used by lecturers and students of UKI Toraja in the learning process, both orally and in writing. Data is collected with documentation, record, and record techniques. The data was further analyzed using sociopragmatic approaches, which are approaches used to express the meaning of language externally. The results showed violations of language courtesy in the learning process at UKI Toraja were expressed through violations of wisdom maxims, violations of generosity, violations of reward maxims, violations of match maxims, and violations of simplicity maxims.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Resnita Dewi

Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja, Indonesia; resnita@ukitoraja.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Lecturers and students as academics are required to be polite not only in behaving, but also in language. But in reality, often we find lecturers and students who do not show such courtesy, especially in language or what is often called a violation of politeness principle. This resulted in the birth of gab in the way of language lecturers and students. Lecturers and students should show good manners in language, but in reality there are lecturers and students who do not apply so.

Not infrequently in everyday life, we find lecturers or students who do not communicate or speak politely so as to cause violations (Kusno, 2015a; Kusno, 2015b). It cannot be denied, even almost all lecturers often complain about the way students communicate that is disrespectful. But not a few lecturers who often say rude to students, causing offense to each other. This can be avoided if the entire academic community of Toraja Christian University of Indonesia (UKI Toraja) realizes the need to communicate well. Therefore, this study was conducted to show violations of language in communication during the learning process at UKI Toraja.

This research aims to uncover violations of politeness principle courtesy that are often carried out in the learning process at UKI Toraja. With the disclosure of the violation, it is expected that the entire academic community of UKI Toraja is aware and learns to be polite in communicating (Masfufah, 2013; Halid, 2017; Mahdian, 2015). This study was studied using a pragmatic point of view. Dewi (2019) explained that pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistics that studies the meaning of speech that is associated with factors that are outside the language. Externally it means being associated with the context of the speech. Humans as social beings cannot be separated from the language aspect, which is evident in everyday communication. Therefore, the politeness of language in everyday communication becomes very necessary to be studied (Gunawan, 2013; Ahmad, 2016). The word courtesy itself intersects with the words 'decency', 'respect', 'good manners', or 'appropriate behavior'. Cahyani et al (2019) argue that language is related to the language itself with various aspects of social structure related to ethics and manners. Therefore, true politeness is not only related to language, but also to nonverbal behavior.

The application and violation of politeness principle manners in daily communication is based on the implementation of politeness. Maksim is a rule of language in lingual interactions; the rules governing his actions, his use of language, and his interpretations of the actions and speeches of his opponents (Fathurohman, 2013; Dawn, 2018; Lestari, 2018). Leach in Dewi (2019) divides the principle of politeness over six maxims. The six maxims are tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, sympathy maxim.

2. METHODS

This research is qualitative research. This research is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written or oral words from people and observable behaviors (Moleong, 2007; Sukidin, 2007; Wisdom: 2005). Qualitative research is able to produce research results in the form of in-depth information about speech, writing, or behavior that can be observed in a certain scope viewed from a comprehensive point of view.

This research was conducted at UKI Toraja specifically in the Indonesian Language education and Satra study program. Therefore, the data in this study is the use of language used by the academic community of UKI Toraja in the Indonesian Language education and Satra study program, both orally and in writing. The data in this study is in the form of phrases, clauses, and sentences.

Data is collected with documentation, record, and record techniques. (Mahsun, 2007; Arikunto: 2010). Observation technique is to make direct observations of objects to find out about the situation, the existence of objects, context and meaning when collecting data. The recording technique is not recorded to record all language use by lecturers and students. The recording technique is used to record the use of the language of lecturers and students.

Furthermore, the data analyzed miles and huberman, data analysis includes three main steps, namely: 1) data reduction, 2) presentation of data, 3) withdrawal of conclusions. These three steps are done continuously from the beginning. The three main things according to Milles and Huberman can be described as follows:

2.1. Data collection

This stage is done to collect data at the research site, both orally and in writing. This data collection is done by observation, recording, and recording techniques.

2.2. Data Reduction

Data reduction is a stage for the analysis and organization of data through writing a summary, separating important data related to research problems with irrelevant data. Related to irrelevant data, researchers will still reanalyze if later researchers still need these data in data processing before drawing final conclusions.

2.3. Presentation of Data

Presentation of data is a stage to present data descriptively in accordance with the purpose / expectations of each data can not be separated from the background.

2.4. Withdrawal of Conclusions

The withdrawal of conclusions is a complete configuration activity. In accordance with the objectives to be achieved from the background as above, analysis and conclusion withdrawal are carried out. In this study, researchers corrected the results of the study and after the data was appropriate it could then be drawn conclusions from each item.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Violation of politeness principle in everyday communication is a phenomenon that we often encounter. Not infrequently, this violation becomes one of the causes of not establishing good communication between speakers and laying. Therefore, both speakers and laying people need to understand the politeness of language. Application and violation of politeness principle occurs due to the non-compliance of a person to the maxim in communicating. Maxsim is a rule of language in lingual interactions; the rules governing his actions, his use of language, and his interpretations of the actions and speeches of his opponents (Fathurohman, 2013; Dawn, 2018; Lestari, 2018).

The application of politeness principle in each culture is clearly different. However, the application of the language impression has the same main goal of creating effective communication, avoiding misunderstandings, and not offending others. Leech (1993) formulated the criteria of courtesy consisting of six maxims, namely (1) tact/wisdom maxim, (2) generosity maxim (3) maxim of acceptance, (4) maxim of simplicity, (5) Match maxims, and (6) maxim of sympathy. Maximal wisdom requires each speech participant to minimize the loss of others or maximize profits for others. Generosity requires each speech participant to maximize respect for others, and minimize disrespect for others. Maximal acceptance requires each speech participant to maximize losses for themselves, and minimize self-gain. The maxim of simplicity requires each speech participant to maximize disrespect for oneself, and minimize respect for oneself. Match maxims require speech participants to maximize the compatibility between them, and minimize incompatibility between them. Maximalization requires each speech participant to maximize sympathy, and minimize antipathy to speech opponents.

Violation of the use of the principle of courtesy by the academic community of UKI Toraja, seen through the violation of the maxims. These are outlined one by one below.

3.1. Violation of tact maxim

The violation of tact maxim of communicating at the maxim of wisdom appears to be a form of communication that seeks to minimize the benefit to others and maximize the loss to others. Instead, speakers maximize self-gains and minimize losses for themselves. Such forms of communication that occur in the communication of the Academic community of UKI Toraja, are seen in the following data.

- Student : Siang Bu. Jadi komi kah masuk hari ini?
 Lecturer : Mata kuliah apa? Kelas Apa?
 Student : Soalnya banyak mi temanki pulang Bu'!

The data above shows a violation of the principle of politeness communicating at the maxim of wisdom. This appears in the saying 'Siang Bu. Jadi komi kah masuk hari ini?' and Soalnya banyak mi temanki pulang Bu'!. Both questions submitted by the student imply an order or imperative to the counterparty in this case the lecturer. The speech caused the lecturer to have no choice but to obey the orders of his students by directly answering his first question Siang Bu. Jadi komi kah masuk hari ini?" The question makes the layer in this case feel pressed with the statement used because it implies the question must be answered as soon as possible. In pragmatic studies, such statements violate the principle of maxim that should make an offer that results in others not feeling aggrieved. Pragmatically, the above student speech is categorized as detrimental to lecturers in communicating. The demands of students to immediately get the answers they want, make lecturers feel unappreciated. The feeling of disdung is caused by the existence of social factors that are intertwined between speakers and laying. The social factors are age and profession. Lecturers who are older than students hope that students can be wiser in contacting lecturers and not equalize when communicating with fellow students.

Student: Malam Pak. Maaf Pak, bisa kah kami konsul Pak. Kami dari Makale dan sudah di depan rumah Bapak?

Lecturer: ???????

The data above shows a violation of the principle of politeness communicating at the tact maxim. This appears in the saying 'We are from Makale and already in front of the Father's house'. The statement made the layer in this case feel pressed by the statement used because it implies the question should be answered as soon as possible. In pragmatic studies, such statements violate the principle of wisdom that should make an offer that results in others not feeling aggrieved. Pragmatically, the above student speech is categorized as detrimental to lecturers in communicating. The demands of students to immediately get the answers they want, make lecturers feel unappreciated. The feeling of disrespect is caused by the existence of social factors that are intertwined between speakers and laying. The social factors are age and profession. Lecturers who are older than students hope that students can be wiser in contacting lecturers and not equalize when communicating with fellow students.

3.2. Violation of generosity maxim

The violation of generosity maxim can be seen in one's efforts to minimize one's self-harm and magnify one's own advantages. Violation of the generosity maxim, seen in the following data.

Student : Siang Bu. Untuk pengganti pertemuan minggu lalu, apakah bisa dimulai sekarang Bu (09.40)? Karena dosen kami ada yang tidak masuk

Lecturer : Saya ada kelas lain. Sesuai kesepakatan minggu lalu (13.00)

The maximal violation of generosity in the data above appears in the speech Siang Bu. Untuk pengganti pertemuan minggu lalu, apakah bisa dimulai sekarang Bu (09.40)? Karena dosen kami ada yang tidak masuk'. The speech provides an offer that is not free to lecturers from his students. On the contrary, the speech seemed to be a student's coercion against lecturers so that the use of clear time markers such as 09.40, did not reflect the principle of student generosity towards their lecturers, because previously there was no agreement between lecturers and students.

3.3. Violation of approbation maxim

Violations of approbation maxim occur because the speaker tries to minimize praise for others and magnify criticism for others. In the context of student communication discourse towards lecturers, violations of the award principle can be seen in the following data.

Student : Siang Bu. Di mana komi bu? Kapan saya bisa konsul Bu. Saya sudah ACC di Pak ---- Bu!

- Lecturer : Siang juga.
 Student : Jadi bisa mo' mendaftarkan ujian Bu?
 Lecturer : Bisakah burung terbang kalau sayapnya cuma satu?

The speech between the student and the lecturer showed a violation of the award. In the speech, the Lecturer 2 felt less appreciated by his guidance students. This is apparent in the saying 'Bisakah burung terbang kalau sayapnya cuma satu? The speech is a form of frustration of a lecturer because of the lack of respect from students. Student statements that offended the lecturer and resulted in an unpleasant reaction from the lecturer appeared on the speech 'Siang Bu. Di mana komi bu? Kapan saya bisa konsul Bu. Saya sudah ACC di Pak ---Bu'. The speech makes the 2nd guidance lecturer can feel unsatisfactory because the student concerned seems to think that the main thesis consultation lies in the 1st supervisor instead of the 2nd mentor. The consequence of this assumption is that students hope that they no longer need to consult in tutor 2 if it is ACC in mentor 1.

3.4. Violation of Modesty Maxim

Violations of modesty maxim are characterized by attempts to minimize self-criticism and magnify praise for oneself. Indicators of the occurrence of violations of simplicity, among others, show self-worth, boasting, and showing off the advantages to others. The breach of cooperation can be seen in the following data.

- Lecturer: Selamat malam. Mengingatkan kembali bahwa tugas terakhir dikumpulkan malam ini pukul 23.59 melalui portal ecampuz. Mohon saling mengingatkan. Terima kasih
 Student: Sudahmi saya Bu. Saya yang pertama. Mahasiswa teladan!

The speech shows that students who are impressed always show their own advantages. This can be seen in the saying 'Sudahmi saya Bu. Saya yang pertama. Mahasiswa teladan'. 'Mahasiswa teladan' Exemplary student speech is a speech that wants to show their own strengths, brag, and show off their advantages to others. In that case, a student boasted through the speech of an exemplary student because he had become the first student to collect his assignment through the ecampuz portal.

3.5. Violation of agreement maxim

Violations of agreement maxim are characterized by attempts to make others have to agree with the opinions we make but the person does not agree with them. Violations of the principle of compatibility are also characterized through doubt of the opinions or judgments of others as well as providing responses that may offend others. Violations of this principle can be seen in the following speech.

- Student: Bu, kembar hapemi sama Bu Anas Le?
 Lecturer: Kurang tahumi.

The context of the above communication is that the student tries to justify his statement to the lecturer. The statement he wants to match is the similarity of the phone opponents of his speech with other lecturers. This is seen in the speech of Bu, kembar hapemi sama Bu Anas le? But the answer to the speech indicates a violation of the match. This appears to be in the speech of the Kurang tahumi (I do not know).

Violations of language in learning should be avoided. This is done to establish a positive relationship between lecturers and students. This positive relationship is indicated by the use of appropriate and consistent literacy.

To find out the manners of a person's language, there is a scale that can be used called the scale of manners. Chaer (2010) states that the scale of courtesy is a ranking that starts from the scale of the untuned to the most polite. Rahardi (2005: 66) states that leech's scale of courtesy is divided into five: 1) Cost benefit scale is characterized by the more speech is detrimental to the speaker, the more it will be considered polite speech. Conversely, the more speech benefits the speaker will be increasingly

considered unfathing (Rahardi, 2005: 67). 2) Optionality scale is characterized by speech that allows speakers or speech partners to make many and free choices, will be considered more polite speech.

Conversely, if the speech does not provide the possibility of choosing for the speaker and the speech partner, the speech is considered unannitible (Rahardi, 2005: 67). 3) Indirectness scale is characterized by the more speech it is direct will be considered the more unsan mannered speech. Conversely, the more indirect, the meaning of a speech, will be considered the more polite the speech (Rahardi, 2005: 67). 4) Authority scale is characterized by the further social distance between speakers and speech partners, speech used will tend to become more polite (Rahardi, 2005: 67). 5) Social distance scale is characterized by a ranking of social relationships between speakers and speech partners involved in a speech (Rahardi, 2005: 67).

Based on the six maxims of courtesy expressed by Leech (1993: 206), Chaer (2010: 56-57) characterizes the manners of a speech as follows. 1) Long speech shows good manners. 2) Indirect speech is more polite than direct speech. 3) Governing with news sentences or question sentences is more polite than the command sentence (imperative).

Zamzani, et al. (2010: 20) formulated some good speech characteristics based on the principle of Leech's politeness, namely as follows. 1) Speech that benefits others 2) Speech that minimizes benefits for yourself. 3) Speech that respects others 4) Self-deprecating speech 5) Speech that maximizes speech compatibility with others 6) Speech that maximizes sympathy for others In a speech also needed indicators to measure the politeness of a speech, especially diction.

Pranowo (2009: 104) advises speech to reflect politeness, using the words "please," "sorry," "thank you," "if it pleases," "he" , "father/mother" to greet the third person. Furthermore, Pranowo (2009: 110) outlines the things that need to be considered in order for communication to succeed, namely as follows. 1) situation 2) speech partners. 3) n message delivered. 4) Purpose. 5) How to deliver. 6) The norm applies. 7) Language. 8) The relevance of the speech. 9) The dignity or feelings of speech partners. 10) Avoid things that are not good for speech partners (confrontation with speech partners). 11) Avoid compliments for yourself. 12) Give benefits to speech partners. 13) Give praise to the speech partner. 14) Express sympathy for the speech partner. 15) Reveal the things that make speech partners happy. 16) Make an understanding with the speech partner.

4. CONCLUSION

The application and violation of language in everyday communication is based on the implementation of the principle of politeness. Maksim is a rule of language in lingual interactions; The rules governing his actions, his use of language, and his interpretations of the actions and speeches of his opponents. In the learning process at UKI Toraja, there is a violation of language manners. Such violations are expressed through violations of wisdom, violations of generosity, violations of maximal appreciation, violations of match maxims, violations of maximal simplicity.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Jamaluddin. (2016). "Ketidaksantunan Berekspresi dan Daya Pragmatik dalam Wacana Haters Politik dan Implementasinya sebagai Materi Ajar Bahasa Indonesia di SMA". Skripsi. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Agustina, S & Cahyono, B. Y. (2016). Politiness and Power Relation in EFL Classroom Interactions: A Study on Indonesian Learners and Lecturers. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 3. 2. Hal. 92-100
- Alfiati. (2015). Santun Berbahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal: An-Nuha*. Vol. 2. 1. Hal. 17- 34.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta
- Cahyani, Rokhman. (2019) Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa dalam Berinteraksi di Lingkungan Universitas Tidar: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia* 6 (1), 44-52

- Chaer, A. (2010). Kesantunan Berbahasa. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta
- Dewi, Resnita. (2019). Pragmatik: Antara Teori dan Praktik Berbahasa. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Deepublish.
- Fathurohman, Irfai. (2013) Wujud Kesantunan Berbahasa sebagai Profesionalisme Guru di Tingkat Sekolah Dasar Dalam Berkomunikasi melalui Media Short Message Service: Kajian Pragmatik, http://eprints.umk.ac.id/1278/2/MAKA_LAH_PGSD.pdf
- Fajar Hilmya Yusifa, R. Hendaryan. (2018) Penunjukan Kesantunan Berbahasa Indonesia Dalam Ragam Pergaulan Oleh Siswa. *Jurnal Literasi Volume 2 | Nomor 1 | April*
- Gunawan, Fahmi. (2018). Wujud Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa Terhadap Dosen Di Stain Kendari: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *Journal Arbitrer*.
- Halid, Elan. (2017). "Kesantunan Berbahasa Dalam Kegiatan Diskusi Mahasiswa Angkatan 2016 Program Studi DIII Keperawatan Solok Poltekkes Kemenkes Padang". *Jurnal Bahastra. Universitas Mahaputera Muhammad Yamin, Volume 37, Nomor 1, Maret 2017, Halaman 1-8.*
- Irni Cahyani and Sri Munalisa. (2020) PELANGGARAN PRINSIP KESANTUNAN BERBAHASA DALAM SINETRON "SIAPA TAKUT JATUH CINTA" *Stilistika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya ISSN 2527-4104 Vol.5 No.1, April 2020.*
- Kasper, Gabriele. (2011) "Locating Politeness in Interaction" dalam *Linguistik Indonesia Jurnal Ilmiah Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia. Terakreditasi SK Dirjen Dikti No. 64a/DIKTI/Kep/2010, THE 5 UAD, Yogyakarta TH URECOL PROCEEDING 18 February 2017 THE 5 TH URECOL PROCEEDING 571 ISBN 978-979-3812-42-7 Edisi Februari 2011, Tahun ke 29, Nomor 1, IISSN 0215-4846.*
- Kusno, A. (2015a). Pematuhan dan Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesopanan Serta Fungsinya dalam Wacana Terkait Usulan Dana Aspirasi DPR di Rubrik Politik Kompasiana. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Kesastraan Widyaparwa. 43 (1), 65-77.*
- Kusno, A. (2015b). Penggunaan Gaya Bahasa Ustaz Yusuf Mansyur: Deskripsi atas Tausiah yang Berjudul Kun Fayakun. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Bebasan, 3 (1), 1-16.*
- Lestari, B Indiatmoko. (2018). Pelanggaran Prinsip Percakapan Dan Parameter Pragmatik Dalam Wacana Stand Up Comedy Dodit Mulyanto. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia 5 (2), 148-162 20*
- Mahdian. (2015). Pelanggaran dan Pematuhan Prinsip Kerja Sama serta Implikaturnya dalam Novel Ronggeng Duku Paruk Karya Ahmad Tohari. Tesis tidak diterbitkan. Banjarmasin: Program Pascasarjana Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia ULM Banjarmasin
- Mahsun, (2007). Metode Penelitian Bahasa. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Perkasa
- Masfufah, Nurul. (2013). 'Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa di SMAN 1 Surakarta: Sebuah Kajian Sosiopragmatik'. Dalam Yudianti Herawati (Ed). *Benua Etam: Bunga Rampai Penelitian Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan. 99-122. Yogyakarta: Azzagrafika.*
- Moleong, J. Lexy. (2011). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi)*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nisa, F. (2016). "Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesantunan dalam Wacana Tutar Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok). *Jurnal Stilistika. No. 1, tahun 2016, Vol. 1. Banjarmasin: STKIP PGRI Banjarmasin*
- Novia Anggraini, Ngudining Rahayu, dan Bambang Djunaidi. (2019) Kesantunan Berbahasa Indonesia Dalam Pembelajaran Di Kelas X Man 1 Model Kota Bengkulu. *Jurnal Ilmiah Korpus, Volume III, Nomor I, April 2019*
- Nordquist, Richard. (2015) "Pragmatics (Language). Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms". Accessed on December 16, 2015 at 03.30 p.m. <http://grammar.about.com/od/pq/g/pragmaticsterm.htm>.
- Oktifiana, Kurniawati. (2012) Analisis Pemanfaatan Prinsip Kesantunan Berbahasa pada Kegiatan Diskusi Kelas Siswa Kelas XI SMA N 1 Sleman, 2012. <http://eprints.uny.ac.id/9437/>
- Pranowo. 2009. *Berbahasa Secara Santun*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

- Rahardi, Kunjana. 2005. *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Zamzani, dkk. 2010. *Pengembangan Alat Ukur Kesantunan Bahasa Indonesia dalam Interaksi Sosial Bersemuka dan Non Bersemuka*. Laporan Penelitian Hibah Bersaing (Tahun Kedua). Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.