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Abstract

The objectives of this descriptive qualitative study were to find out the strategies which is used by the members of meeting in expressing their idea in the meeting. The data were collected by recording the utterances spoken by the members of the meeting of MTs Negeri 1 Deli Serdang on April 14, 2018. Then, they were transcribed the data, and identified all utterances which express role of linguistic. In analyzing the data, it categorized by referring to the discursive struggle values theory and deals with the explanation of the linguistic politeness which is classified in five categories; minimizing the conflict and confrontation, minimizing imposition, asserting reciprocity, claiming common ground, and bringing forwards accurate arguments and data (Minda, 2013:64). The findings of the study showed that the role of linguistic politeness can be occurred in the school meeting at MTs Negeri 1 Deli Serdang in which it showed discursive struggle that there are politeness value occurred in the setting, such as minimizing imposition, asserting reciprocity, claiming common ground, and bringing forward accurate arguments and Data.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The role of chairpersons in co-operative meetings includes tasks such as leading discussions and facilitating decision-making by controlling turns and topics. As Hanak, I (1998) stated that there are two agricultural co-operatives occurred in the roles and verbal contributions of chairwomen in rural Zanzibar. In the first co-operative, the chairwoman controls the meeting through the allocation of turns and topics, as well as the use of her position and its privileges to persuade others of her opinion by using of passive voice, subjunctive forms, hedges, the choice of pronouns and address forms. In the second co-operative presents in the meeting interferes, practically taking over the task of chairing the meeting by expressing several characteristics of a powerless speech style.

In addition, Murni, S. M (2013: 59) stated that there are some phenomenon occurred in the process of democratizing Indonesia especially in showing discursive struggle values such as minimizing conflict and confrontation, minimizing imposition, asserting reciprocity, claiming common ground, and bringing forward accurate arguments and data.

This study explores the role of linguistics occurred in the processing of school meeting. It will focus on the discursive struggle over the value of terms occur in school meeting for purposing find out the strategies which is used by the members of meeting in expressing their idea in the meeting.

2. METHODOLOGY

The data were collected by recording the utterances spoken by the members of the meeting of MTs Negeri 1 Deli Serdang on April 14, 2018. Then, the writer transcribed the data, and identified all utterances which express role of linguistic. In analyzing the data, it categorized by referring to the discursive struggle values theory and deals with the explanation of the linguistic politeness which is classified in five categories; minimizing the conflict and confrontation, minimizing imposition, asserting reciprocity, claiming common ground, and bringing forwards accurate arguments and data (Minda, 2013:64).

3. THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

a. ‘The discursive’

‘Discursive’ refers to the post-2000 critical turn in politeness studies, which perhaps began with Eelen’s (2001) groundbreaking monograph—though certain aspects of the critical thinking were present in the field since much earlier but they received considerably less attention (see e.g. Watts,
The label ‘discursive’ is a kind of ‘ragbag’, which includes various insightful conceptualizations of linguistic politeness that often have not much in common. Nevertheless, throughout this work I refer to discursive theorizations as a ‘field’, though some might find this definition inadequate since discursive ideas are rather diverse, because discursive research shares some related basic concepts (see also Christie, 2009), which differentiate it from other approaches to politeness.

The discursive approach is an interaction-based one, that is, it analyses politeness occurring in longer chunks of authentic discourse. This is in contrast with previous Brown and Levinsonian (henceforth B & L) research, which was predominantly based on brief examples. Within longer discourse fragments, discursive researchers aim to put focus not only on the speaker’s production of certain utterances but also on the hearer’s evaluation of them. As Eelen notes, “in everyday practice (im)politeness occurs not so much when the speaker produces behaviour but rather when the hearer evaluates that behaviour” (Eelen, 2001: 109). Furthermore, the discursive ‘trend’ makes a difference between the interactants and the researcher’s interpretations of politeness, labeling the former as ‘first-order’ and the latter as ‘second-order’ politeness – though there is no agreement in the field as to whether this difference can be implemented as a methodology or not (cf. Mills, 2003 vs. Watts, 2003). Theoretically, discursive scholars argue that researchers are inherently influenced by their own experience and stereotypes when analysing politeness. Thus, in order to avoid subjectivity at the level of analysis and the exclusion of certain views about politeness, researchers need to focus on the lay interpretation of politeness, by exploring the hearer’s evaluation (along with that of the speaker) in longer fragments of discourse, and reach theoretical second-order conclusions by means of analysis of data.

b. Classifying the Discursive Struggle

There are five categories in classifying the discursive struggle. These categories are taken from many researchers like:

1) Minimizing the Conflict and Confrontation

As Lakoff (1990: 34) and Zimmermann in Held (2005: 132) suggest that linguistics politeness is a system of interpersonal relation which is designed to facilitate an interaction by minimizing potential conflict and confrontation.

2) Minimizing Impostion

As Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that minimizing imposition is one of negative politeness strategies. And Fraser and Nolen (1981: 93-109) shows conversation between the speaker and the hearer and suggest as face-saving-act. In this case, the hearer does it for himself; i.e. by criticizing and protesting inaccurate evaluation imposed on him by the speaker.

3) Asserting Reciprocity

As Brown and Levinson (1987: 101-128) suggested as saving the hearer’s positive face is asserting reciprocity in which there are cooperation between speaker and hearer is claimed by giving evidence of reciprocal rights or obligations obtained between speaker and hearer.

4) Claiming Common Ground

5) Bringing Forwards Accurate Arguments and Data

As Watts (2000) writes that analyzing and interpreting linguistic politeness or polite behavior in a community of practice requires prior studies and formulation on what is accessed as politic behavior in that particular community. Politic behavior comprises all expression of linguistic politeness which is socially stricted. In addition, the politic behavior is formulaic. Polite behavior comprises all linguistic politeness which are strategically chosen by individuals. Polite behavior is semi-formulaic which means the use goes beyond the stricted norm. According to Watts, this is the kind of linguistic politeness to study.

c. Findings

After transcribing the data, this study found out the discursive struggle occurred in processing of school meeting in MTs Negeri 1 Deli Serdang. It can be seen below:

1) Minimizing Impostion

In meeting, there are some utterances which showed the minimizing impostion, it can be seen below:


b) Mariani: Pak, kami akan melaksanakan kewajiban kami sebagai guru, tapi tolong jangan tahan hak-hak kami.

KTU : saya tidak pernah menahan hak-hak Bapak/Ibuk guru
Mariani: Itu sama dengan Bapak menahan uang makan kami.


From the conversation above, we can see that the speaker (Mariani) imposes her idea by using the negating after hearing KTU’s utterances. So, we can conclude that the hearer refuses to accept the minimizing imposition that the speaker tried to claim common ground, like:

KTU: Cobalah itu kurang buk, Pak, bagaimana dengan saya, setiap hari Jum’at saya selalu berkhutbah jum’at. Apakah tidak ada toleransi untuk saya, karena gak mungkin sampai 6 jam saya beradadisekolah sementara terkadang saya berkhutbah jauh, ke medan, ke perbaungan. Saya mohon toleransinya untuk saya pak dihari Jum’at.

From the examples above, we can concluded that there are some utterances which is showed the minimizing imposition occurred in the meeting, and it also showed that the role of linguistic politeness especially in discursive struggle is polite in that setting.

2) Asserting reciprocity

The next category is asserting reciprocity. It also can be seen in this case, like:


   Tapi, saya rasa biar saya yang menjadi pengawasnya dulu, kita buat ini semacam training sampai menunggu tahun ajaran baru. Ditahun ajaran baru, baru kita landkingan peraturan ini. Jadi, masa sekarang kita buat masa trainingnya.

   Sumarni: Kenapa harus Bapak yang jadi pengawasnya?

   KTU: Karna selama ini tidak ada yang mengurus itu semua, dan saya berhak mencoba di masa training kita ini.


From the conversation above, we can see that KTU asserted his belief that he has the right to determine when he were speaking in which he showed that himself has right to correct get the decision.

3) Claiming Common Ground

For claiming the common ground, it also can be found in the meeting, like:

a) KTU: Saya rasa ini sudah banyak leluasa kepada Bapak/Ibu guru, tidak ada konsekuensi jika guru tidak datang, jika guru hanya datang pas jam mengajaranya saja, sudah selsai jam mengajar langsung pulang………

Based on the conversation showed above, we can see that the speaker tried to claim common ground to get the fact. In this case, he tried to show the other fact which occurred in our society to claim his truth.

4) Bringing Forwards Accurate Arguments and Data

For the final category is bringing the forwards accurate arguments and data also can be found in the meeting, we can see from their utterances below:

b) Bu emi: Saya rasa, supaya tidak terlalu berat, mungkin lebih baik seperti keputusan semalam saja Pak, berada di sekolah 10 menit sebelum masuk dan boleh pulang jika sudah 3 jam berada di sekolah.

c) Bu ema: Maa Pak, tadi rapat katakan 7 jam? Saya rasa mulai dari jam 07.15-01.00 belum mencapai 7 jam. Mungkin diralat pak menjadi 6 jam. Perhitungan bapak salah.

KTU: oya maaf, salah ngitung saya. Kita ralat menjadi 6 jam.

Bagaimana Bapak/Ibu? Setuju?

Bu Sutiah: Pak, bagaimana 5 jam saja kita ambil, Diantara 2 keputusan semalam, semalam 4 jam dan tadi 6 jam.

Bagaimana 5 jam saja kita tetapkan?

Kepala Sekolah: Kalau memang kita ingin 5 jam 1 hari, ya bisa kita diskusikan apakah yang lainnya setuju dengan pendapat bu Sutiah atau tidak, dengan catatan bagi guru PNS yang tidak mengikuti peraturan jam KBM 5 jam dalam 1 hari, maka uang makan tidak akan keluar untuk hari itu.

Bu Mariani: Saya setuju Pak.

Based on the utterances above, we can see that the participant of the meeting (Ema) tried to give her ideas or arguments in solving the problems which is discussed in the meeting.

In addition, there is a participant who has disagreement to the other ideas and she expressed her disagreement like:

d) Sumarni: Kenapa harus Bapak yang jadi pengawasnya?

KTU: Karna selama ini tidak ada yang mengurus itu semua, dan saya berhak mencoba di masa training kita ini.

Sumarni: Saya rasa saran dari Bu Ema tadi telah cocok dibuat, mungkin dapat membantu kita, kita buat guru piketnya sebagai pengawas kehadiran. Dan saya juga ingin menanyakan apakah ada konsekuensi jika dalam 1 hari guru tidak menjalankan jam yang telah ditetapkan?

Based on the context above, in showing her agreement (Sumarni), she also tried to give her ideas by giving the reason why she disagreed with KTU’s statement.

4. CONCLUSION

After finding the result, it can be concluded that the role of linguistic politeness can be occurred in the school meeting at MTs Negeri 1 Deli Serdang in which it showed discursive struggle that there are politeness value occurred in the setting, such as minimizing imposition, asserting reciprocity, claiming common ground, and bringing forward accurate arguments and Data.

5. DISCUSSION

After finding out the result this study, there is a finding which is contrarily with Minda’s journal. Minda’s found out that in the DPR-RI’s meeting especially in the processing of democratizing Indonesia, there were five categories of role politeness linguistics, discursive struggle, are minimizing the conflict and confrontation, minimizing imposition, asserting reciprocity, claiming common ground, and bringing forwards accurate arguments and data. While in this study, the writer did not found out all of the categories like Minda’s. The minimizing the conflict and confrontation is not found out in the school meeting in MTs Negeri 1 Deli Serdang. There are only four categories occurred in that meeting.
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