

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

A. Related Literary Review

The related literary review consists of three areas; they are previous study and theoretical review.

1. Previous Study

There are several research that have been conducted in the area of criticism; the first one is from Anjarsari (2011) that studied the politeness strategy of criticizing on a movie entitled 'The Ugly Truth'. This research was conducted in 2011 entitled "*Politeness Strategies of Criticizing: A Study on a Movie the Ugly Truth (Pragmatic Study)*". The subject of the research is the characters of the movie. It investigated three points; they are the politeness strategy to extend criticism, the politeness strategy to respond criticism, and the factors which influence the choice of the strategy. This research is qualitative descriptive, and the researcher found 17 criticism utterances in the movie that used as the data. The study found that there are three strategies employed by the characters to extend criticism: bald on record as the most used strategy, positive politeness strategy, and negative politeness strategy. Whereas, the politeness strategies used in responding criticism are bald on record, positive politeness, and off record strategies. The third finding of the research is about the factors which influence the speakers to the choice of the strategy.

Those like legitimate power, the expert power, and the close relationship between the participants are the factors that influence the choice of strategy to deliver criticism. In responding criticism, the influencing factors are almost the same, but it differs in the situational context (Anjarsari, 2011).

Yanti (2008) observed the criticizing act in Minang, Indonesia, entitled “*Speech Act of Criticizing Used by Women and Men of Minangnese in Indonesian Language*”. This is a sociopragmatic study which studied how the speech act of criticizing is realized (in terms of directness and indirectness) among native speakers of Minangnese (in this case men and women). From the data collected, the writer found that women speak differently from men. The differences can be seen in terms of forms of words or vocabulary, and grammar. In this research, the writer just limited the study on the communication strategies used by women and men in criticizing where those speech acts which high potential of threatening face of the hearer. The result shows that there are varieties and various communication strategies used by them in order to consider the four maxims of Minangnese principles that are postulated in this study. A number of sub strategies used by men and women in four communication strategies such as notice, use in-group identity markers, seek agreement, give reasons, be conventionally indirect, question, hedge, be pessimistic, be ironic, presuppose, use rhetorical questions, etc (Yanti, 2008).

The next research comes from Nguyen (2008) in Vietnam. The title

of the research is “*Criticizing in an L2: Pragmatic Strategies Used by Vietnamese EFL Learners*”. This paper reports a study of the pragmatic strategies used by Vietnamese learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) when criticizing in English with a view to shedding light on the pragmatic properties of this under-researched act. Interlanguage data were collected from 36 adult learners via a peer-feedback task, a written questionnaire, and a retrospective interview. First and second language baseline data were collected from two respective groups of 12 Vietnamese NSs and 12 NSs of Australian English, via the same peer-feedback task and questionnaire. Results showed that the English language learners criticized in significantly different ways from the Australian NSs in terms of their preference for realization strategies, their choice of semantic formulae, and their choice and frequency of use of mitigating devices. A number of interplaying factors might explain these differences: learners’ limited L2 linguistic competence and lack of fluency, which seemed to load their processing capability under communicative pressure, their lack of L2 pragmatic knowledge, and the influence of L1 pragmatics (Nguyen, 2008).

The other study was also conducted by Hoa in 2007, which entitled “*Criticizing Behaviors by the Vietnamese and the American: Topics, Social Factors and Frequency*”. This paper report a cross-cultural study on criticizing behaviors by the Vietnamese and American people focusing on three aspects: the topics of critics, factors affecting criticizing behavior,

and the frequency of criticism. Responses to questionnaire items by 102 Vietnamese and 102 Americans reveal both similarities and differences between the two groups of people in all the three investigated aspects. From the investigation in the frequency of criticizing by the Vietnamese and the American reveals the fact that Americans criticize considerably less than the Vietnamese on all topics, to people of all types of relationships to them. In addition, the frequency Americans criticize does not vary much with people of different relationships with them, whereas for the Vietnamese groups the difference is significant. Although both groups tend to criticize close friends and family members more often, the rank order of frequency by the two groups differ. Relatively, the Vietnamese tend to criticize their spouse more often, while the Americans do so more to their siblings. Also, Americans criticize their grandparents (ranked 11th by the Americans and 7th by the Vietnamese) much less than the Vietnamese (Hoa, 2007).

Next, a research entitled "*Interlanguage of Criticism by Indonesian Learners of English*" from Ardiyani (2014) from Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta. This research aims at finding the criticism strategy, hedging strategy, and politeness strategy used by Indonesian learners of English. The data are criticism utterances taken from Indonesian learners of English or English Foreign Language (EFL) students. In collecting the data the writer uses "Pilot Study" with following steps : (1) Grouping the subject, every group consists of

four students (2) Asks every subject (EFL) students to draw a picture, the picture is an animal (3) Every subject (EFL) students criticize their friends' work in pair. To analyze criticism utterances, the writer uses Nguyen formula. To describe the using of hedging strategy, the writer uses Martin theory. To describe the politeness system used in criticism utterances, the writer uses Politeness Strategy by Brown and Levinson. Having analyzed the data, the writer found that there are two ways of criticism: direct criticism and indirect criticism. In direct criticism (48%) the writer found six strategies: (1) negative evaluation (15%), (2) disapproval (19%), (3) expression of disagreement (7%), (4) identification of problem (50%), (5) statement of difficulties (6%), (6) consequences (3%). While in indirect criticism (52%) the writer found nine strategies: (1) correction (5%), (2) indicating standard (7%), (3) demand for change (17%), (4) request for change (12%), (5) advice about change (10%), (6) suggestion for change (17%), (7) expression of uncertainty (2%), (8) asking/presupposing (19%), (9) other hints/sarcasm (11%). The writer also found three types of hedging strategy used: (1) strategy of indetermination (54%), (2) strategy of camouflage (5%), (3) strategy of subjectivisation (41%). There are four politeness strategies used: (1) bald on-record strategy (36%), (2) positive politeness strategy (26%), (3) negative politeness (16%), (4) off record (22%) (Ardiyani, 2014).

Karyasuta also took a research entitled "*Positive Politeness*

Strategies of Criticism in a Movie Entitled FURY” (Karyasuta, 2015). This study is aimed at finding out the types of positive politeness strategies used when extending and responding criticism and also analyzing the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies by the characters of the movie. The analysis of this study concerns with the utterances of positive politeness strategies of criticism and the non-verbal expression of the characters. The data is obtained from movie “Fury” produced by David Ayer (2014). The process of collecting data was done through documentation method. The theories applied are the theory of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson and the theory of criticism proposed by Tsui. Documentation method was applied to obtain the data. The descriptive qualitative method is applied in the analysis. The finding shows that when extending criticism, the characters used notice, attend to H, exaggerate, intensify interest to H, use in-group identify markers, presuppose/raise/alert common ground, assert or presuppose S’s knowledge of and concern for H’s wants, be optimistic, include both S and H in the activity, give (or ask for) reasons, and give gifts to H. The positive politeness strategies to respond criticism are almost the same. The response towards criticism, which frequently given by the characters is negative response. The most prominent factor that influences the characters to use the strategy to respond the criticism is a priori or payoffs consideration (Karyasuta, 2015).

The other research probed by Victorina (2014) from Satya Wacana

Christian University. Her research entitled “*Teachers’ Politeness Strategy in Criticizing Classroom Presentation*”. This research investigates teachers’ politeness strategy in giving certain criticism and its reason to perform it by observing and interviewing six participants. The results were analyzed based on Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness strategy and Nguyen (2008) classification of criticism strategies. The result indicates that teachers mostly tend to state the problem when criticizing students’ performances and use bald on record politeness strategy. The main reason is because the teachers mostly focus on the form of criticism rather than students’ face or other reason. This result can be used to help the teachers and student-teachers develop their awareness to save their students’ face by choosing the most appropriate politeness strategy when criticizing students (Victorina, 2014).

A research in criticism also conducted by Riekkinen (2009) from University of Helsinki entitled “*Softening Criticism: The Use of Lexical Hedges in Academic Spoken Interaction*”. The objective of the study are (1) to see how the two groups use hedges when giving criticism in face-to-face situations, and (2) to see if there were any distinct features that characterized the way ELF-speakers used hedges as compared to the native speaker group. This is comparative qualitative study in which the researcher looked at doctoral thesis defenses of both native speakers and ELF-speakers. She analyzed the language used at these thesis defenses, focusing especially on the use of lexical hedges when giving criticism. The

aims are to find out how many lexical hedges are used, which expressions are most frequently used, and how all the lexical hedges can be grouped into larger categories. Based on the findings she analyzed how the use of lexical hedges between the two speaker groups differs and possibly tries to establish any patterns that might characterize the language of ELF-speakers. The results of the study, first, the main findings were that the native English speakers used more lexical hedges per minute than the ELF-speakers. Native speakers used approximately 4.44 lexical hedges per minute whereas the ELF-speakers used 3.85 lexical hedges per minute, which is about 13 percent less. An even bigger difference was discovered between how many different lexical hedges were employed per minute. The exact amounts were 2.30 different lexical hedges per minute for the native speakers and 1.64 for the ELF-speakers. The ELF-speakers thus had nearly 30 percent less variation on their usage of lexical hedges. Second, there were differences between which lexical hedges were most frequently used. The native speakers used the following expressions most: *just* (12%); *would* (9.5%); and *I think* (7.5%). The most frequently used lexical hedges of the ELF speakers were *I think* (20%); *would* (9%); and *kind of* (7.5%). The percentages stand for the relative perceptual share a particular expression had from all the lexical hedges the speaker groups used (Riekkinen, 2009).

One more research presented by Choyimah (2014) from Islamic Institute of Tulungagung entitled “*Disagreeing Strategies in University*

Classroom Discussions among Indonesian EFL Learners". This study aims at finding out patterns of the relationship between students' strategies in disagreeing and their English proficiency using qualitative conversational analysis. Students joining Seminar on Linguistics course in the School of Culture Studies at Universitas Brawijaya (UB) Indonesia in the odd semester of 2010-2011 were the participants of this research. They were classified into four levels of language proficiency: pre-intermediate, intermediate, pre-advanced, and advanced according to their TOEFL scores. The data of this study were students' utterances containing the force of disagreement, their TOEFL scores, and their responses to interviews. The findings of this research suggest that students' strategies in disagreeing can be classified into two macro strategies: direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategy covers four micro strategies: refusal, denial, correction, and strong criticism. Indirect strategy was represented in four micro strategies: mild-criticism, internally-contrasting, reminding, and suggestion. Besides, the findings revealed that students having higher levels of English proficiency tended to use indirect strategies, but those at lower levels used direct ways in disagreeing (Choyimah, 2014).

From the research conducted above, it can be seen that there are several studies are focused on criticizing strategy. In some research, this strategy is also investigated from the side of the politeness strategy used in performing the act. The research that would be conducted by the writer

here also has correlation with politeness strategy in criticism, but she will focus on the comparison of the use of criticism strategies and politeness strategies used in English and Javanese language. So, it is expected from the study that the differences of using criticizing strategies and the politeness strategies used in performing them in English and Javanese language will be found.

2. Underlying Theory

In this section, the writer reviews the theories used in the study. It covers from the theories of speech acts, criticism (the act of criticizing), and politeness.

a. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a relatively new area of linguistics compare to the other language discipline. The definition of pragmatics is varied, proposed by several linguists in their periods. The former linguist who defined about pragmatics was Steven C. Levinson (1983), then Geoffrey Leech, followed by Jenny Thomas and finally George Yule.

There are two context-dependent aspects covered by the term of pragmatics; the language structure and the principles of language usage. So, the definition of pragmatics should cover both aspects, although it is difficult (Levinson, 1983:9).

It comes to a definition that “pragmatics is the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate” (Levinson, 1983:24). This definition

inferred from discussion and difficulties. It means that the context and principles of language usage should be bound in interpreting pragmatics, especially in the implementation in understanding speaker's pragmatics aspect.

Different with Levinson, Thomas explains that pragmatics is meaning in interaction (Thomas, 1995:22). There are several aspects should be fulfilled in interpreting speaker's meaning, including the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social and linguistic) and the meaning potential of an utterance. Basically this theory is almost the same with Levinson's, that pragmatics is the meaning of an utterance that not only lied on the words, but also the context in the interaction.

The further discussion is from Yule (1996:3), where he defines pragmatics as the study of what speakers mean, or 'speaker meaning', or the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or readers). He divided the definition of pragmatics in four detailed explanations:

1) Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning

It concerns with the study of speaker's meaning in his utterance and the interpretation by the hearer. This is more focused on the meaning of what the speaker intended rather than the meaning of the words or phrases might mean by themselves (Yule, 1996:3).

2) Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning

This is the study of what people mean in particular context and how the context influenced what is said (Yule, 1996:3). There is a consideration on how speakers organizing what they want to say with the circumstances (who, how, when, and where).

3) *Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than it is said*

In other words, pragmatics is the study of ‘invisible meaning’. It explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated (Yule, 1996:3).

4) *Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance*

People will not say anything to anyone whom they do not recognize well. Hence, closeness whether it is physical, social or conceptual, implies shared experience (Yule, 1996:3).

Furthermore, Yule (1996:7) also stated that pragmatics is the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. It means that pragmatics meaning is the other meanings in utterances in addition to literal meaning. Pragmatics is studying this kind of meaning; the intended meaning from the speaker to the hearer; and the variation in this study are wide.

There still many concepts under pragmatics, starting from deixis, speech acts, presupposition, politeness, inference, and many more. In this research, the theories used are focused on speech acts

and politeness, where the theory of criticism is explained under the theory of speech acts.

b. Speech Acts

Generally, speech acts can be defined as the acts of communication. Certain utterance produced by the speaker contains specific act, such as an act of promising, apologizing, or commanding. In the communication, the speaker expresses certain attitude that has the relation with the performance of a particular type of speech acts.

The success of speech acts in its rule as the act of communication occurred when the audience or the hearer is able to identify the expression of the speaker's attitude when he/she intend to communicate something. In short, speech acts succeed if the hearer comprehends the speaker's intention in communication by means of his/her acts performances.

However, it is also possible that the function of speech acts is to affect some institutional states of affairs which demand certain circumstances and positions such as the judge's utterances used in the court. Further it is called the felicity condition, i.e. the requirements needed in performing certain act of speech. The first is that there is a specific person that acts certain utterances, and the second that these utterances have to be spoken in specific context (Yule, 1996: 50).

c. **Realization of Speech Acts**

From the description of speech acts above, the works are continued to the next explanation about the types of speech acts. There are three kinds of classification system of speech acts in order to differentiate the utterances into their own characteristics. Those classification are based on the basis of the structure (direct and indirect speech acts), from the literal or nonliteral meanings, from the general function (Yule, 1996:53-54), and from the dimensions of the use of language (Austin, 1962: 109).

In this part, the writer will explain the types of speech acts based on the forces of the utterances (locution, perlocution, and illocution), based on their functions according to some philosophers, based on the relation between the syntactic form of the words and the communicative function (direct and indirect speech acts), and finally based on their non figurative meanings or commonly known as their literal an nonliteral meanings.

Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary Acts

Austin (1962:109) conveys the distinction of speech acts into three types, they are locutionary acts or locution, illocutionary acts or illocution, and the last is perlocutionary acts or perlocution. He defines those three kinds of acts as followed:

We first distinguished a group of things we do in saying something, which together we summed up by saying we

perform a *locutionary act*, which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to ‘meaning’ in the traditional sense. Second, we said that we also perform *illocutionary acts* such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, &c., i.e. utterances which have a certain (conventional) force. Thirdly, we may also perform *perlocutionary acts*: what we bring about or achieve *by* saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even say, surprising or misleading.

In the other words, locutionary act is the act of saying something, illocutionary act is the act in saying something, and perlocutionary act is the act by saying something (Austin, 1962: 109).

The further explanation in order to get the understanding, here are the examples of those three kinds of acts based on Austin:

“The weather is so hot today.”

Locution: the saying of the speaker, i.e. the words uttered by the speaker.

Illocution: it can be a request for the hearer to take a glass of water for the hearer. It is also possible to use that sentence in order to make a statement, or a request to turn on the air conditioner, to make an explanation, or the other communicative purposes that so called as the illocutionary force in general (Austin, 1962: 100-103).

Perlocution: it can be the hearer take a glass of water for the speaker, or turn on the air conditioner, or do not obey to the speaker’s say. It is the act of the speaker to get the hearer to do something (Austin, 1962: 100-103).

It is also assumed that the three types explained above are the part of speech acts, where locution defined as the communicative acts, illocution as the speakers' intention, and perlocution as the effect that the speech act has on the context of participants' world (Spencer:2004). In addition, those three types of acts can be defined as the levels of speech acts. However, generally the meaning and the functions are the same (Bach, 1994:1-3).

d. Classification of Speech Acts

There is a brief explanation of the types of speech acts based on its function or its uses by George Yule in his book entitled "Pragmatics". Those are declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives. This classification is the proposition introduced by Searle as what explained by Levinson (1983:239).

1) Declarations

Declarations are used to announce something clearly and have direct change to the world through certain utterances (Yule, 1996:53) and it especially used officially in the institutional state of affairs. For instance, "You're fired!" said by the Chief Executive Officer to his employer. "I name this ship Aurora", as uttered in the official announcement. It is shown that to perform such declarations, there are two requirements to be fulfilled; the speaker has to have institutional role and the utterances declared in specific context. Furthermore, the concepts of declarations

were proposed by Austin (1962:5) in his investigation of performatives.

2) Representatives

Representatives are the type of speech acts that commit the speaker in believing something to be the truth. In the other words, the speaker states certain utterances that he or she believed as a truth. These nomenclatures are closed to the term of expositives or expositional performatives proposed by Austin (1962:85). The acts of asserting, concluding, describing, and stating a fact are those kinds of representatives. For example, 'The moon is round', or 'Today is a sunny day' are the statements that believed by the speaker as truth.

3) Expressives

The next functions are expressives, which is stated by Yule (1996:53) as the psychological expressions regarding to the speaker's feeling. Those are including the expression of thanking, congratulating, apologizing, and welcoming. In short, these are the expression of pain, pleasure, like, dislike, and sorrow. The instance statements for this type are such as 'Congratulations', 'Thank you so much', and 'I really sorry'. These terms expressives are the same concepts of Austin's behabitives (Austin, 1962: 83).

4) Directives

Directives, these are the expressions in order to direct the hearer or the addressee to do something, it includes suggesting, commanding, or order something. When we say to someone, 'Please take me a blanket', it is included to this type of speech acts. In the other words, directives utterances used to express what the speaker wants to do by the hearer (Yule, 1996:54).

5) Commissives

The last type of speech acts proposed by Searle is called commissives. These are used by the speakers to commit themselves to some future action such as promising, threatening, refusing, and pledging. The instance sentences of this type are such as 'I promise to be there tomorrow', and 'We will come to your house next week!' (Yule, 1996:54).

e. Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Another possibility to differ the types of speech acts are from the directness of the utterances. These relate to the relationships between the structure and the communicative function of the utterances. According to Yule (1996:54), whenever there is a direct relationship between the structural/ syntactic form and the communicative function, it then called direct speech act. In opposite, whenever there is an indirect relationship between the structure and the function of certain utterance, it called indirect speech act.

For instance, the statement “I will meet you tomorrow” said by a grandmother as her promise to her grandson is then called direct speech act. The appropriate structural form of these utterances is declarative. The paradigm case happened such when a boy uttered the same sentence to his friend who had broke his bicycle in order to threaten him, then this sentence classified into indirect speech acts, since its form is declarative but has the function as imperative sentence in order to threaten somebody else that has the literal meaning, “*Don’t repair my bike and see what happens!*” (Yule, 1996:55).

f. Literal and Nonliteral Speech Acts

The further consideration is in the relationship to the literal and nonliteral speech acts. It is the phenomenon of the use of the language relates to the literal meaning of specific speech act. If the speakers say literally what they mean, it further constitutes a literal speech acts. On the contrary, if the speakers do not mean what they say literally, then it belongs to nonliteral speech acts. For instance, if a man has worked for 10 hours a day, then he says ‘It is a tiring day’, he means correctly what he say. On the other hand, if a girl is watching a TV, then her friend stands in front of her, then she announces ‘Your hair is so beautiful’, it is called nonliteral speech acts since the girl does not mean what she says (Parker, 1999: 19).

g. Criticism (The Acts of Criticizing)

There are some definitions of the term of criticism in linguistic field taken from the definition of some linguists. In order to explain that, it should be known as the key-point that criticism is also part of speech acts. Starting from the former theory of speech acts by John L. Austin in 1962, the theory of criticism is included into behavioristic category (there are five categories proposed by Austin including 'verdictive', 'expositive', 'exercitive', and 'commissive'). The reason why criticism is included into behavioristic as the function is to express the speaker's negative reaction of the addressee's bad habit. It should be underlined here that criticism is speaker's negative utterances as the response to addressee's unpleasant thing or deeds (Austin, 1962: 150-163).

Different with Austin, Searle (1971:39) divides speech act into five categories, they are Assertive, Directives, Commissive, Expressives and Declaration. The act of criticism is included in the expressives act. As criticism is an act which tries to express negative evaluation of the hearer's condition, so the classification of it is included into expressive. It is expected by the speaker that the criticism utterance is able to evaluate the bad condition of the hearer.

Almost the same with Searle, Leech (1993:327-329) also includes criticism under expressive in his classification. He classifies speech act into six categories. They are Assertive, Directive,

Commissive, Expressives, Declarative and Rogative. Criticizing utterance here has the function to express a psychological act toward negative condition of the hearer. Having the same reason with Searle's, criticism by Leech is categorized under expressive because the speaker expresses the negative condition of the hearer through the criticism act.

Criticism in speech act is categorized under initiating acts as proposed by Tsui (1994). Here, Tsui (1994:52) stated that there are three main acts under the taxonomy of discourse acts, they are initiating acts, follow-up acts, and responding acts. The initiating acts stands for four subclasses including directive, requestive, informative, and elicitation. Whereas for responding acts covers positive, negative, and temporization, and for follow-up acts stands for turn-passing (Tsui, 1994:95).

The focus of the research here is criticism, so the explanation is focused on informatives subclass under initiating acts, as criticism is categorized as one of the type of informative acts. It is stated by Tsui (1994:135) that informatives not merely utterances that covers information, but it also reports events or states of affair, recount personal experiences, and express belief, evaluative judgment, feeling, and thought.

Informatives itself still has subclasses that consists of report, assessment, and expressive. For report, this is an act which gives an

account of certain events, states of affair, or personal experiences in the past, future, or present. Expressives is the acts where the speaker expresses civility and goodwill towards others, including empathy and debt-incurred. Assessment is informative acts in which the speaker conveys his judgment or evaluation of certain people, objects, events, states of affair, and so on. Thus, it consist of five types, they are compliment, assessing, self-commendation, self-denigration, and criticism. Criticism can be explained as utterances which judge negatively the addressee.

Moreover, Riekkinen (2009:18) confirms that criticism is an act that may cause Face-Threatening Act (FTA) because it expresses negative evaluation to the hearer. When a speaker employs criticism, he may threat the positive self-image of the addressee. For that reason, a speaker cannot criticize directly to anyone because he must consider some basic rules of criticizing.

Next discussion is about the crucial rules when a speaker criticizes hearer. The first point is the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Tsui (1994:147) states that a speaker may not criticize others unless they know each other well. It implies a statement that a speaker may extend his criticism baldly if he has an intimate relationship with the hearer. This will be different when a speaker criticizes someone who has social distance with him. He may be more

indirect since he considers about the distant relationship between him and the hearer.

The second point is about the relative power of the speaker over the hearer. A speaker who has greater power tends to criticize the hearer directly. On the contrary, people having lower of power tend to use indirectness with people who have greater authority (Thomas, 1995:124).

In realizing criticism, there are some precondition used in order to examine whether certain utterance is belong to criticism or other types of speech acts such as complain and blaming. In order to the criticism takes place, the preconditions below should be fulfilled from the S's view (Nguyen, 2008: 46):

- 1) The precipitating act performed, or the choice made, by H is considered inappropriate according to a set of evaluative criteria that S holds, or a number of values and norms that S assumes to be shared between him/herself and H.
- 2) S holds that this inappropriate action or choice might bring unfavorable consequences to H or to the general public rather than to S him/ herself.
- 3) S feels dissatisfied with H's inappropriate action or choice and feels an urge to let his/her opinion be known verbally.

4) S thinks that his/her criticism will potentially lead to a change in H's future action or behavior and believes that H would not change or offer a remedy for the situation without his/her criticism.

Nguyen (2008:46) explained that the specific feature of criticism that distinguished it from other type of speech acts is precondition 2, and for the other three preconditions are shared also by complaints and blaming. If the S gives 'comment' to the H because there is an inappropriate action done by H that affect or cost the S, then it is considered as complain rather than criticism. Whereas in blaming, the focus is on the assigning of responsibility from the blamer to the blamee for the bad action that probably will badly affect the blamer and the blamee or even somebody else.

h. Strategies of Criticism

As assumed by Blum Kulka (1987:133) that "the more indirect the mode of realization, the higher will be the interpretive demands"; means that the level of directness of criticism is determined by the degree of illocutionary transparency. Following Nguyen's investigation (2008), the acts of criticism are explained in the following taxonomy:

Table 2.1 Taxonomy of Criticism According to Nguyen (2008)

Type	Characteristics	Examples
1. Direct criticism:	Explicitly pointing out the problem with H's choice/ actions/ work/ products, etc.	
a. Negative evaluation	Usually expressed via evaluative adjectives with negative meaning or evaluative adjective with positive meaning plus negation.	<i>"I think ah it's <u>not a good way</u> to support to one's idea (L),</i> <i>"Umm, that's <u>not really a good sentence</u>" (NS).</i>
b. Disapproval	Describing S's attitude towards H's choice, etc.	<i>"<u>I don't like</u> the way you write that (L).</i>
c. Expression of disagreement	Usually realized by means of negation word "No" or performatives "I don't agree" or "I disagree" (with or without modal) or via arguments against H.	<i>"<u>I don't quite agree</u> with you with some points (.) about the conclusion"(L),</i> <i>"<u>I don't really agree</u> with you (as strongly as) you put it here" (NS).</i>
d. Statement of the problem	Stating errors or problems found with H's choice, etc.	<i>"And <u>there are some incorrect words</u>, for example "nowadays" (L),</i> <i>"You <u>had a few spelling mistakes</u>" (NS).</i>
e. Statement of difficulty	Usually expressed by means of such structures as "I find it difficult to understand..." "It's difficult to understand..."	<i>"<u>I can't understand</u>" (L),</i> <i>"<u>I find it difficult to understand</u> your idea" (L).</i>
f. Consequences	Warning about negative consequences or negative effects of	<i>"Someone who don't—<u>doesn't agree</u> with you (.)</i>

	H's choice, etc. for H himself or herself or for the public.	<i>would straight away read that and turn off</i> " (NS).
2. Indirect criticism:	Implying the problems with H's choice/ actions/ work/ products, etc. by correcting H, indicating rules and standard, giving advice, suggesting or even requesting and demanding changes to H's work/ choice, and by means of different kinds of hints to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice.	
a. Correction	Including all utterances which have the purpose of fixing errors by asserting specific alternatives to H's choice, etc	<i>"safer" not "safe", comparison" (L), "And you put "their" I think th- e-r-e" (NS)</i>
b. Indicating standard	Usually stated as a collective obligation rather than an obligation for H personally or as a rule which S thinks is commonly agreed upon and applied to all.	<i>"Theoretically, a conclusion needs to be some sort of a summary" (L).</i>
c. Demand for change	Usually expressed via such structures as "you have to", "you must", "it is obligatory that" or "you are required" or "you need", "it is necessary"	<i>"You must pay attention to grammar" (L), "You have to talk about your opinion in your summary" (L).</i>
d. Request for change	Usually expressed via such structures as "will you . . . ?", "can you...?", "would you...?" or imperatives (with or without	<i>"I still want you to consider some points" (L), "What I would have liked to have seen is like a</i>

	politeness markers), or want-statement.	<u>definite theme from the start like you're just TA:LKING about it</u> (NS).
e. Advice about change	Usually expressed via the performative "I advise you...", or structures with "should" with or without modality.	<u>"You should change it a little bit."</u> (L).
f. Suggestion for change	Usually expressed via the performative "I suggest that..." or such structures as "you can", "you could", "it would be better if" or "why don't you" etc.	<u>"I think if you make a full stop in here the ah (.) this sentence is clear is clear"</u> (L), <u>"It could have been better to put a comma (.) so ah ((laugh))"</u> (NS).
g. Expression of uncertainty	Utterances expressing S's uncertainty to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice, etc.	<u>"Are there several paragraphs ah not sure about the paragraphs"</u> (NS).
h. Asking/presupposing	Rhetorical questions to raise H's awareness of the inappropriateness of H's choice, etc.	<u>"Did you read your writing again after you finish it?"</u> (L).
i. Other hints	Including other kinds of hints that did not belong to (h) and (i). May include sarcasm.	<u>"I prefer a writing style which are not too personal"</u> (L).

The role of modifiers also used in mitigating criticism. There is also taxonomy of mitigating devices that explain the categorizing of modifiers based on their relative locations within criticism. It is

adapted from House and Kaspers as quoted in Nguyen (2008:49). The taxonomy is explained in the table below.

Table 2.2 Taxonomy of Mitigating Devices (House and Kaspers, 1981)

Type	Characteristics	Examples
1. External:	The supportive moves before or after the head acts.	
a. Steers	Utterances that S used to lead H onto the issue he or she was going to raise	<i>“I read your essay and <u>here are some my own ideas of this</u>” (L), “Ah I <u>have some comments about your writing</u>” (L)</i>
b. Sweeteners	Compliments or positive remarks paid to H either before or after a criticism to compensate for the offensive act	<i>“There are quite good <u>relevant ideas</u> that you presented (.) ah but...” (NS).</i>
c. Disarmers	Utterances that S used to show his or her awareness of the potential offense that his or her speech might cause H.	<i>“You had a few spelling mistakes (.) but I think <u>that’s because you’re writing too quickly, (.) nothing too major</u>” (NS).</i>
d. Grounders	The reasons given by S to justify his or her intent.	<i>“I think “is” is better than “are” there <u>because traffic (.2) ah single?</u>” (NS).</i>
2. Internal:	Part of the criticism and criticism response.	
a. Syntactic	Syntactic devices to tone down the effects of the offensive act	

- Past tense	With present time reference.	<i>I <u>thought</u> you missed out something</i>
- Interrogative		<i><u>Should</u> we change a little for its clearness?</i>
- Modal	All structures showing possibility	<i>May, could, would</i>
b. Lexical/phrasal:		
- Hedges	Adverbials	<i>Sort of, kind of</i>
- Understaters	Adverbial modifiers	<i>Quite, a (little) bit</i>
- Downtoners	Sentence modifiers	<i>Maybe, possible, probably</i>
- Subjectivisers		<i>I think, I feel, in my opinion</i>
- Consultative	Usually ritualized	<i>Do you think? Do you agree?</i>
- Cajolers		<i>I mean, you see, you know</i>
- Appealers		<i>Okay? Right? Yeah?</i>

i. The Factors Influencing the Choice of Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987:74-77) argue that the circumstances in most culture involve following factors:

- a) The 'social distance' (D) of speaker and hearer. D is a symmetric social dimension of similarity/difference between S and H. It is based on the frequency of interaction and the kinds of face that S and H exchanged.
- b) The relative 'power' (P) of speaker and hearer. P is an asymmetric social dimension of relative power. In general, there are two sources of P; either authorized or unauthorized and material control (over economic distribution and physical

force) or metaphysical control. Thomas (1995:127) also states that there are three kinds of power, they are: *Legitimate power*: one person has the right to prescribe or requests certain things by virtue of role, age or status; *Referent power*: one person has power over another because the other admires and wants to be like him/her in some respect; *Expert power*: in this case, one person has some special knowledge or expertise which the other person needs.

- c) The absolute ranking (R) of imposition in the particular culture. R is defined as the ranking of impositions by the degree to which FTA entails. There are two ranks which contribute to do FTA; the ranking impositions of service and goods (like information and other face payment).

j. Javanese Values in Language Use

In Javanese language, there are some principles and complex relationships in the use of language that also called as language levels (Errington, 1988). The “levels” are illustrated primarily in sets of lexical alternant (see table 2.3), although their differences are actually not only lexical.

Table 2.3 Javanese “Language Levels” or “Speech Styles”

(Errington 1988:90–1)

KRAMA:	1. menapa	nandalem	mundhut	sekul	semanten
	2. menapa	panjenengan	mendhet	sekul	semanten

MADYA:	3. napa	sampéyan	mendhet	sekul	semonten
	4. napa	sampéyan	njupuk	sega	semonten
NGOKO:	5. apa	sliramu	mundhut	sega	semono
	6. apa	kowé	njupuk	sega	semono
Gloss:	Question marker	you	take	rice	that much
Translation	Did you take that much rice?				

Although the Javanese “language levels” are often described as differing mainly in lexicon (sets of lexical alternants) and in some special affixes, Errington (1984:9) has pointed out that they also differ in prosody and morphophonemics, although these aspects have been little studied.

The differences among these styles, and the rationales for choosing one or another style, are conceived (by users) in terms of ideas about affectivity and social hierarchy. The “higher,” more “refined” styles, called *krama*, are considered to be depersonalized, flat-affect, and regulated by an ethic of proper order, peace, and calm. In them one “does not express one’s own feelings” (Wolffand Poedjosoedarmo 1982:41). The lower, “coarser” levels (called *ngoko*), in contrast, are the “language ... one loses one’s temper in” (Errington 1984:9). Actually, the point is considered to lay not so much in one’s own feelings as in one’s addressee’s sensibilities. A high-ranking addressee is supposed to be relatively disengaged from worldly concerns and to “need” protection from vulgarity and stormy emotion.

Supposedly, it is because a speaker recognizes the importance of showing respect for those “needs,” that he or she refrains from expressing strong feelings to exalted interlocutors.

This principle of differentiation, conceived as concerning coarseness and refinement, organizes not only the prosodic differences among the styles, but, evidently, at least some of the differences among the lexical alternant. The more “refined” alternant tend to draw on loan words or loan morphemes taken from Sanskrit sacred texts, and they bring some of that aura of sacredness and learnedness along with them into the Javanese construction. Semantically, too, the more “refined” alternant reflect the ideology of “elevated” speech, in that they are relatively abstract and vague, less explicitly engaged with the messy details of worldly existence than are their low style counterparts. Thus an ideological principle relating rank to refinement recruits at least some of the linguistic characteristics that differentiate the styles, and recruits them consistently, whether they are prosodic or lexical.

Although the Javanese speaker’s choice among language levels is governed by situational factors, in particular the relationships among a situation’s personnel and the appropriateness of displaying affect in their presence and in the course of that situation’s activities, there is also a sense in which the levels distinguish categories of speakers. It has been claimed (Geertz, 1960) that the members of

different Javanese social ranks also differ significantly in the range of varieties they control within the total repertoire, the traditional elite controlling a larger range, including the more “refined” levels especially associated with their high rank, while the “coarser” levels are associated with the peasantry. To speak in a “refined” manner is not only to show respect for an addressee’s emotional delicacy; it is also to display one’s own knowledge ability, pragmatic sensitivity, and refinement. As images of “refinement” and affective display, then, the language levels evoke both the situations characteristically connected with such responses and the persons characteristically manifesting them.

It is also should be noticed that Javanese “language levels” admit internal variation. As table 2.3 shows, there are sublevels distinguishable within the three major levels, according to similar principles of contrast. (The middle level, *madya*, is in fact a kind of compromise constructed on the basis of the principal opposition between *alus* “refined” and *kasar* “coarse” ingredients.). And there are also further subtleties of style admitted by the structure of the system, although complicated by a distinction between addressee and referent honorifics, among other things. Those participant-role complexities aside, the principles of differentiation that organize this system provide several degrees of difference, with varieties distinguishing

groups and situations as well as intra-speaker variation according to addressee and mood.

The Javanese case thus illustrates an ideologized, culture-specific principle of stylistic differentiation that motivates some of the linguistic characteristics of Javanese styles and provides various degrees of differentiation.

k. Criticism in Javanese

As explained before, criticism is one of speech acts that highly potential threaten the hearer face. In Javanese, the way people speak is important as there is a language levels in delivering the utterances in communication. The way people criticizing others in Javanese are influenced by this language levels. So, when they intend to criticize someone else, the strategies are varied. It depends on the language levels or speech styles that used when they meet person with different age and different level of education.

In the other hand, the realization of criticizing act is not co-varying with sex (Gunarwan, 2001:191). It comes to the possibility that the occurrence of criticizing act is more often in younger Javanese as they say something more straightforward to their generation.

3. Theoretical Framework

Based on the theory about interlanguage pragmatics, speech act,

strategies of criticism in interlanguage pragmatics research, and theory of criticizing strategies by Nguyen, the writer can analyze the data taken from DCTs technique to two groups of participants (Javanese EFL learners and NJ/ Native Speakers of Javanese Language).