

# Japanese and Javanese Perceptions of the Concept of Politeness in Their Languages: Cross-Cultural Analysis

*by* Rina Supriatnaningsih

---

**Submission date:** 30-Jun-2023 10:31AM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 2124595894

**File name:** ept\_of\_Politeness\_in\_Their\_Languages\_Cross\_Cultural\_Analysis.pdf (784.72K)

**Word count:** 7747

**Character count:** 42894



## Japanese and Javanese Perceptions of the Concept of Politeness in Their Languages: Cross-Cultural Analysis

Lisda Nurjaleka, Silvia Nurhayati & Rina Supriatnaningsih


To cite this article: Lisda Nurjaleka, Silvia Nurhayati & Rina Supriatnaningsih (2022) Japanese and Javanese Perceptions of the Concept of Politeness in Their Languages: Cross-Cultural Analysis, Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 51:5, 478-493, DOI: [10.1080/17475759.2021.2006753](https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.2006753)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.2006753>



Published online: 25 Nov 2021.



[Submit your article to this journal](#) 



Article views: 428



[View related articles](#) 



[View Crossmark data](#) 



## Japanese and Javanese Perceptions of the Concept of Politeness in Their Languages: Cross-Cultural Analysis

Lisda Nurjaleka, Silvia Nurhayati and Rina Supriatnaningsih

Japanese Language Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

### 3 ABSTRACT

Brown and Levinson's theory on politeness stated that politeness is universal. However, through cross-cultural analysis, the findings in some languages differ. This language differentiation of the politeness use raises some interesting questions concerning the evaluation by its native speakers on the concept of politeness in both languages. This study uses an open questionnaire form to collect data both for Japanese native speakers and Javanese native speakers. In total 153 participant have submitted the completed questionnaire, and the aged ranged were from 18 to 60 years old. The questionnaire consist of five questions on the perception of politeness in daily communication. Although Japanese and Javanese both have honorific levels and both as a negative politeness-oriented language. Due to cultural and social differences, the point of view of how they use hierarchical levels differs. In this study, significant findings also found that Javanese people think using honorific speech were polite. However, in Japanese, being polite means using Keigo and showing a good attitude and respect to the interlocutor.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 30 January 2021  
Accepted 10 November 2021

### KEYWORDS

Concept of politeness;  
intercultural politeness;  
verbal communication;  
japanese speech levels;  
unggah-ungguh

## Introduction

Politeness is essential in human communication; it is the key to interpersonal relationships. Both Japanese and Javanese are examples of languages with distinctive politeness and complicated honorific systems. However, in terms of the perspectives of politeness in both languages by the speakers, yet very little research is found.

Japanese and Javanese are in different groups or language families. The Javanese language is one of the westerns Austronesian language families. Meanwhile, the Japanese have their own language family (Japonic). However, some believe that the two languages are related and have similarities in their structural features; those languages have the honorific address with their degrees of politeness expressed in grammar and vocabulary. According to some linguists, there are possibly two correlated language groups (source: <https://www.ethnologue.com/guides/largest-families>).

Poedjosoedarmo (1968) and Wolff and Poedjosoedarmo (1982) classified honorifics of the Javanese language into three: 1) krama (shows respect), the highest speech level, 2) madya, the middle speech level, and 3) ngoko (showing intimacy), the lowest speech level. Ngoko is commonly used in an informal situation.

**CONTACT** Lisda Nurjaleka  [lisda\\_nurjaleka@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:lisda_nurjaleka@mail.unnes.ac.id)

Provide short biographical notes on all contributors here if the journal requires them.

© 2021 World Communication Association

The Japanese also have various honorific systems, such as Keigo, which express politeness in an interpersonal relationship in society (Kikuchi, 1997). Japanese honorifics are classified into three types: exalted, humble, and polite. (Kikuchi, 1997; Minami, 1987; Oishi, 1975).

Ide (1989), Matsumoto (1988, 1989, 1993) critiques the western norm of Brown & Levinson's theory of "the notion of the face." Ide, et al., (2019) also emphasize that the concept of politeness and being friendly in English is different from *teineina* (polite) to *shitasigena* (friendly) in Japanese.

The concept of politeness by Brown and Levinson (1987) looked at the behaviour of interpersonal considerations in general. They believed that politeness is universal and similar in every language. However, differences in each language might be inevitable. Therefore, in the present study, we consider daily individual perception through native speaker evaluation on politeness.

Some linguists also investigate the interrelation of polite expressions with gender issues (Ide, 1993; Ueno, 2004). Those experts explain that the Japanese female language tends to be more polite and less assertive. In Javanese, gender differences are also visible in the use of speech levels (Norwanto, 2016). He mentions that most Javanese females use different patterns of speech levels. In familial settings, Javanese females incorporate polite expressions more often than males. Therefore, we consider analysing both native speakers' perceptions of gender.

This study aims to determine whether or not the Japanese and Javanese politeness are similar in terms of social and cultural context. The objective of the study are twofold: 1) to try to clarify whether politeness in the Japanese language and the Javanese language has their own concept; and 2) to compare the native speaker of Japanese and Javanese in the perspectives of politeness.

### **Theoretical background**

The rise of the new approach of the study of politeness phenomenon began from the early 1990s – the basic ideas of the study of politeness were formed in the pragmatic approach framework. However, nowadays, the issue remains quite relevant. Several researchers have criticized Brown & Levinson's work (e.g. Gu, 1990; Ide, 1993; Mao, 1994; Matsumoto, 1988; Watts, 2003), pointing out that Brown & Levinson's theory is western-biased. Their studies contributed to a better understanding of politeness through a cross-cultural analysis in a different language. Lately, in the 20th century, the study of politeness has developed significantly. Some scholars offer new perspectives on politeness, depending on the social concept and social interaction in habitus. Watts (2003) emphasizes the term polite and politeness, so that their meaning may differ from one language to another. The interpretations of polite language usage are "the language a person uses to avoid being too direct," "a language which displays respect towards or considerations for other" or a language which displays respect towards or consideration for other,' or a language that displays certain "polite" formulaic utterances like please, thank you, excuse me or sorry.' (Vilki, 2006).

### *The concept of politeness*

The politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987) refers to the conceptual framework of the work of the concept of “face.” Brown & Levinson formulated the concept based on Goffman’s (1967) theory, whereby a person maintains a positive public image to establish social interactions. (1967), p., 5). Brown & Levinson’s “face” theory consists of two intrinsic aspects: (1) negative face, i.e. when the speaker and the listener expect social distance, and they have the right not to be disturbed; (2) positive face, refers to something positive that is consistent to help someone build their self-image or personality towards himself to gain respect from other people.

Fraser (1990) also presents his politeness theory and formulate “the conversational-contract view” (CC). According to Fraser, [...], there is always the possibility of a renegotiation of the conversational contract. The two parties may readjust just the rights and the obligations the parties hold towards each other (Fraser, 1990, p. 232). Fraser’s theory becomes the principle of conversational analysis rules, such as turn-taking and repair systems.

Gu opposed the face-work theory of Brown & Levinson. Gu (1990) claimed that in Chinese, the synonym of politeness is called *límáo*. *Límáo* is, by nature, normative; it encompasses social principles that build social bonds, strengthen solidarity, and maintain social distance. In Chinese culture, faces are related to *miánzi* or *lián* (Mao, 1994). *Miánzi* refers to acknowledging someone’s prestige or public reputation, while *lián* refers to someone’s respect earned from the group. The characteristics of *lián* are more similar to Brown-Levinson’s theory’s positive face: one needs acknowledgement from others.

Other scholars also criticize the “face-work” theory for its biases; thus, the theory cannot be applied to all languages and cultures in the world (Matsumoto, 1989; Ide, 1992; Leech, 2005). Ide, 1992 proposed *wakimae* (wisdom) as the characteristic of Japanese politeness behaviour. Communication in the concept of *wakimae* explained that expressing one’s intention is less important than what is expected by social norms. *Wakimae* means that people’s discernment of their place.

### *Cross-cultural on linguistic politeness*

The study of politeness has been developed over the past three decades. Among the theories of politeness, Lakoff and Ide (2005) proposed linguistic politeness. The norm adopted for politeness has been the benchmark from the western norm. As for Ide (1992), she introduced a concept well-known as *wakimae* in Japanese in her research. In this study, we referred to Lakoff, Ide, and Brown & Levinson’s theories.

Some studies on Japanese politeness have been investigated the different politeness concepts with another language (Kato, 1997; Matsumura et al., 2004; Tao, Yoon, Nishihima, (2016)). There are, in fact, cross-cultural differences in the concept of politeness.

As Javanese is a western Austronesian family language, some study focuses on this language’s politeness concept (Hatley, 1990; Norwanto, 2016; Wijayanto, 2013). Javanese politeness’s formal aspects contextualize semantic or pragmatic meanings and social constructs and norms. Many linguists have studied Javanese politeness strategies, such as Wijayanto (2013), emphasizing the refusal strategies used by Javanese learners of English; the study found that the Javanese applied *ngemong rasa* principles or strategies to maintain other’s feeling. Sukarno (2010) also mentioned that Javanese politeness strategies reflect



Javanese cultures, e.g. *tata krama*, *andhap-asor* and *tanggap ing sasmita* (language styles, humbling oneself while exalting others, and being able to catch the hidden meaning). In other words, the Javanese language mainly reflects the negative politeness of Brown and Levinson.

Meanwhile, according to Franz-Magnis Suseno (1984), Javanese people use the feeling of *isin* (shame) to build politeness, which is used in all social relationships outside their family. Besides, they only feel fully relaxed in the family circle.

Another study on politeness in the same Austronesian language family examines Malay's politeness strategies. Lim (2017) consider politeness as the concept of *hormat* (respect), *sabar* (patience), and *budi* (gratitude). These values are similar in terms of their main features as Javanese linguistic strategies. Khadijah (Khadijah, (1993) also discovers the similarities between the Malay language and Javanese. Malay children tend to use formal towards their father; they use polite speech. The notion resonates with Smith-Hefner (1988) concept, which discusses politeness in the Javanese community. In terms with gender issues, Smith-Hefner (2009) also studied the Javanese politeness in female university students. More intimacy (*ngoko*) is expressed by female students rather than deference (*krama/madya*). However, the speech level and these changes make the Javanese language a rich source of gender and politeness, especially concerning daily conversation norms.

Another language in the Austronesian language family is Vietnamese. It is considered one of the ancient national languages in Southeast Asia. Furthermore, according to Srichampa (2003), Vietnamese has various ways to speak and different uses of addresses depending on sociolinguistic factors, e.g. age, occupation, social status.

Although the Chinese language incorporates eastern norms, the same norms as Japanese and Javanese, these three languages are different in terms of language. The Chinese language is categorized in the Sino-Tibetan language. The politeness concept of Chinese language considers positive politeness as an attempt of the speaker to establish a "kinship" with the addressee. In contrast, negative politeness aims to soften the speech's tone and keep a proper distance (Zhan, 1992). In Chinese culture, the social system and public relations may also affect request behaviour. (Hong, 1996)

Some studies that compare the Chinese language with the American (Yongyan, 2000; Chen, 1993; Zhu & Bao, 2010) report that the Chinese and Americans' attitudes and values towards face are not similar. Chinese politeness is more positive politeness, whereas American culture is more of negative politeness.

Many studies on cross-cultural politeness reveal that people from different cultural backgrounds use a different politeness strategy, such as positive politeness or negative politeness. These studies support the theory of linguistic politeness by Kasper.

The linguistic politeness concept by Kasper (2005) has discovered an intersection between sociolinguistic and cognitive processes. Therefore, linguistic politeness refers to how several words are put together to consider and interpret in the interactions' social context. The term "linguistic politeness" is defined as a set of linguistic choices or a strategy to achieve particular goals in communicative interactions.

From the literature above, it can be summarized that there is very little research on the perspectives of politeness by both Japanese and Javanese speakers in a social and cultural context. Some linguists who examine politeness realize that all cultures shape polite behaviour and attitudes in each language, resulting in different language uses. Differences in politeness behaviour are likely to arise in the same situation from different background

cultures. In general, aspects (e.g. when, how, and to whom politeness is used) are, without question, not the same. Thus, people who experience life in different societies can notice the difference in politeness in daily life.

## Method

### *Sample/participants*

The present study compared the evaluation of the Politeness Concept of two different groups of native speakers. We collected the data from 67 Japanese native speakers (N = 26, males; N = 41, females). We also asked for 86 Javanese native speakers (N = 36, males; N = 50, females) to complete the questionnaire. For Japanese native speakers, there is no specific place of data collection, as we send the open questionnaire online via Google form.

As for Javanese native speakers, we first make sure the participant's first language is Javanese, not Indonesian. In total, 153 participants are submitting the completed questionnaire. The ages ranged from 18 to 60 years old. Most of the respondents in both languages are university students. The respondent's occupation is varied, but they are all in the same social class. The participants were selected through a random sampling technique. Table 1 displays the specific number of participants by languages and gender. The number of respondents representing each language varied Table 2.

### *Material*

The data consist of two sections collected through an open structured questionnaire. The first section contains demographic information, such as age, gender, and occupation. The second section of the questionnaire consists of five questions on the perception of politeness in daily communication. The present study used conceptualization politeness by Marui et al.'s (2011). The questionnaire prepared in Japanese and the Javanese version.

### *Data collection procedure*

The data collection started from 15th July to August 30th 2019. We provided a questionnaire link, and the participants were asked to fill the online form. First, we explained the study and the questions so that the participants could not be confused about answering the question. We then received the collected data through Google Doc for each completed questionnaire.

## Findings and discussion

### *Definition of politeness concept in Japanese and Javanese*

According to Haugh (2004), politeness is conceptualized differently across cultures. He studied the concept of politeness in English and Japanese. The term politeness (or polite) in English is defined as having or showing behaviour that is respectful and considerate of other people (in The New Oxford Dictionary of English (Pearsall, 1998: 1435)).

**Table 1. Speech level and honorific form of languages.**

Language	Speech Level	Meaning	Example
Javanese (unggah - ungguh)	Ngoko (lowest speech level)	Less Polite, less respectful and less formal language	Mangan "eat" Ngombe "drink" Lungo "go" Teko "come" Neda "eat" Nginum "drink" Kesah "go" Sowan "come"
	Madya (middle speech level)	The expressions of semi-polite and semiformal, <i>madya</i> vocabularies use when people in the middle-level formality	Dhahar "eat" Ngunjuk "drink" Thindhak "go" Rawuh "come"
	Krama (highest speech level)	Polite expressions, it signifies a sense of respect to those whose age and social status are higher than the speaker	Desu, masu (prefix o dan go for words)
Japanese ( <i>Keigo</i> , respectful speech)	<i>Teineigo</i> (polite style)	A sentence which contains a formal style of <i>desu/masu</i>	Using special verbs such as <i>irashaimasu</i> . <i>Tanaka sensei wa irashaimasuka?</i> "excuse me, is Mr. Tanaka here?"
	<i>Sonkeigo</i> (Honorific style)	Showing respect to someone with a higher position (a superior or a customer)	Using humble set-expressions, such as <i>orimasu</i> , <i>mairimasu</i> , <i>itashimasu</i> , <i>moushimasu</i> , etc. <i>Watashi wa sakura to moushimasu</i> . "My name is Sakura"
	<i>Kerjauigo</i> (Humble style)	Used to lower speakers' social status when speaking about themselves	



**Table 2.** Range of number of respondents by language and gender (by percentage).

Range of age	Japanese Men (%)	Japanese Women (%)	Javanese Men (%)	Javanese Women (%)
20's	54	61	57.8	62.8
30's	11.5	7.3	18.7	15.2
40's	19.2	17.1	11.2	11.4
50's above	15.4	14.6	12.3	10.6
Total	39	61	42	58

Haugh (2004) also categorizes the definition of politeness of modern English terms into four essential groups: politeness as “behaviour to avoid conflict and promote smooth communication,” politeness as “socially appropriate behaviour,” politeness as ‘consideration of the feelings of others, and politeness as an “evaluation of the speaker’s behaviour by the addressee as polite.” Therefore, the main purpose of politeness is to promote quality interpersonal communication.

Watts (2003) stated that politeness is a layperson’s concept, something individuals talk about in everyday situations. Watts also assumed that the term of politeness in some languages differs. Several examples are politeness in Chinese (mianzi), France (courtoisie), German (Höflichkeit), Italian (cortesia/urbanità), and Japanese (teineisa).

In Japanese, the term for politeness generally relates to *Keigo* that refers to honorific usages. “Teinei: 「Chuui-bukaku kokoro ga yukitodoku koto. Mata, Teatsuku reigi tadashii koto」 ‘attention deeply hear Nom fully reach the thing. And deeply etiquette right thing’. (Kojien, 6th ed., Shinmura, 2008: 1908).”

*Teinei* is also defined in the *Daikangorin* dictionary (Kamada & Komeyama, 1992). It is described as the aspect of being warm-hearted (teatsui), represented by the first character *tei* (丁) while being kind (shinsetsu) and elaborate in one’s courtesy is related to the second character *nei* (寧). (Haugh, 2004: 346)

Ide, et al. (2019) proposed their opinion on the conceptualization of politeness in Japanese. They examined the concept correlates with the notion of *teinei*; the notion associates with *keii* (respect), kanji *yoi* (feeling good), *tekisetsu* (*sa*) (appropriateness), *omoiyari* (considerateness, kindness). Ide (2001) also claimed that the term *keii hyoogen* is more appropriate than *teinei* or *reigi tadashii* in English politeness.

Javanese’s closest term for politeness is *unggah-ungguh*, which means polite manners in human attitudes and behaviour in daily life. According to Prawiroatmodjo (1989), the term *unggah-ungguh* is originally from two words: *unggah* or *munggah* means up, go up or climb up. The Javanese people have tendencies in respecting others based on a higher-level or position. In contrast, *ungguh* in Javanese *ngoko* means to belong to, appropriate, suitable personality.

Another definition of politeness from Mangunsuwito (2002) describing *unggah-ungguh* as politeness, courtesy, or manners. Meanwhile, F.M. Suseno (1984) Suseno defines politeness as respect for others following the degree and position. According to F.M. Suseno (1984), *unggah-ungguh* is identical to the principle of respect, which is an attitude that Javanese people use in conversation to show respect to others within their degree and position Table 3.

**Table 3.** The summary of the definition of the politeness concept by meaning.

Language	Definition/ Term	Source	Meaning
English	Politeness or Polite	The New Oxford Dictionary of English	having or showing behaviour that is respectful and considerate of other people
Japanese	Teinei	<i>Kojien</i> (6th edition, 2008) (Shinmura, 2008)	Act carefully and thoughtful to others – paid attention in detail.
Javanese	<i>unggah-ungguh</i>	Prawiroatmodjo	<i>Unggah</i> or <i>munggah</i> means up, go up or climb up. <i>Ungguh</i> means to belong to, appropriate, suitable with the personality

**The evaluation concept of politeness by native speaker**

**2** *With whom do you usually use polite expressions? (Q1)*

Despite some similarities, different patterns between Japanese and Javanese native speaker perception are found in Table 4. Javanese males and females mostly use polite expressions to family member and relatives. They use polite expressions to an older person, and Javanese male also thinks that they use polite expressions to their teachers.

From the evaluation to Javanese’s native speaker, the results of this study mostly suggest and support the use of a proper *unggah ungguh* mostly for their parents and family (grandparent and older relatives). The intention to uphold *unggah ungguh* (politeness) outside the family circle in this study stated that young people of Javanese close interaction besides their family are in school, such as teachers. Maintaining their face through *unggah-ungguh* is their responsibility to their immediate family members and teachers. Few respondents said they use fewer *unggah-ungguh* to their teachers because of their bilingual lives, Indonesian Javanese. Javanese is one of Indonesia’s many ethnic languages. Most Indonesian people are bilingual; they use the national language, the Indonesian language, public or formal such as in school or university. The respondent

**1** **Table 4.** Question 1 responses based on gender and language.

Type of response to Q1: With whom do you usually use polite expression	Female Javanese (Percentage)	Male Javanese (Percentage)	Female Japanese (percentage)	Male Japanese (percentage)
Family member and relatives	45.3	37.8	2.2	1.7
People who are older than me	35	21.6	29.3	23.3
People I meet for the first time	8.5	9.5	14.1	20
Teachers	3.4	9.5	4.3	1.7
People I respect	1.7			
neighbour	1.7			
Superiors	3.4		5.4	15
Classmates and friends		4.1	2.2	5
Everyone or most people		4.1	17.4	3.3
customers			4.3	13.3
Older members of the same school on workplace			5.4	5
People whom I do not know very well			6.5	5
People who I work with			5.4	3.3
children		1.4		1.7
Junior others	0.9	1.4	1.1	2.2
total	100	100	100	100

did not use unggah-ungguh because they mostly communicate with their teachers in Bahasa Indonesia, the national language of Indonesia. And Indonesian language don't have "unggah-ungguh" or "keigo" system.

Table 4 displays the response from native speakers; data from the table were categorized and analysed based on the gender and language as the responses are varied. The present study reveals that Japanese and Javanese participants have a different perspective on polite expressions. Japanese native speakers and Javanese native speakers agreed that they use polite expressions to the people who are older than them.

As based on the Japanese native speakers' responses, they mostly use polite expressions to the outgroup (soto), such as people they do not know very well, or people they work with, customer and sempai or senior the same school or workplace. They have a different approach to use honorific as they have the *uchi-soto* concept. There are no different answers in both male and female respondents from each language.

This study's results are categorized as *wakimae* at the macro level, meaning that they express their identity in terms of social status, age, role, gender, ethnicity, culture, and regional background. This result implies that the assessment of this study by Japanese native speakers emphasizes the *wakimae* macro-level focused on the interlocutors' age.

The significant differences were found for male Javanese, male Japanese, female Javanese, and female Japanese because of the different response variety types. ( $X^2 = 0.0016$ ,  $P \text{ value} < 0.05$ )

*How would you feel if you did not use polite expressions with those people in Q1? (Q2)*

Both the Japanese and Javanese participants' responses regarding their feeling are examined. Table 5 summarizes the results for how you would feel if you did not use polite expressions with those people (Q1). The result reveals that the responses are varied. The Japanese females provide various answers on how they feel if they do not use polite expressions (the Q1 respondents). There are fifteen responses that the Japanese female respondents use, and the majority of the responses are different from Javanese participants' answers. We can categorize the type of answer by the

Table 5. Types of responses to question 2 classified by nationality and gender.

Type of response to Q2: How would you feel if you did not use polite expressions with those people (Q1 respondents)	Female Javanese (Percentage)	Male Javanese (Percentage)	Female Japanese (percentage)	Male Japanese (percentage)
I would feel bad	54.8	41.5	19.6	27.6
It would be impolite	14.5	19.5	25	44.8
I would get embarrassed	8.1		7.1	
It would be normal; I would not really care; casual	6.5	22	7.1	
It would be weird	6.5		5.4	
I would be happy	1.6			
I would feel guilty	3.2	4.9	5.4	
It would show lack of common sense			5.4	
It would make the other person feel uncomfortable		2.4	5.4	6.9
The other person would have a lower opinion of me				3.4
It would create a bad impression			1.8	6.9
Complicated				3.4
I would feel irritated	1.6	4.9	14.3	
other	3.2	4.9	3.6	6.9
total	100	100	100	100

Japanese people into two types: the first is what they would feel, and the last is what would affect the listeners' feels. Details on the type of responses are shown in Table 5 below.

The findings show that <sup>1</sup> each Japanese and Javanese native speaker evaluates differently. For example, Japanese individuals tend to be attentive (kikubari) to their politeness policies. Japanese people showed attentiveness, which is considered one of the significant politeness strategies. The combination of emotions and the range of Japanese females' responses show how they are attentive to the interlocutor. This result somehow supports the previous studies that explained that politeness differs cross-culturally. So, with regards to the universal politeness concept, we also should aware of some different use of how to show politeness in a different culture.

The table shows the same responses to both respondents. The most and the second common response from both participants are about their reluctance not to use polite expressions. It is shown that both Japanese native, and Javanese native answers that they would feel bad. Moreover, Javanese females and Javanese males think it would be impolite not to use polite expressions.

Moreover, Japanese females and Japanese males agree with this notion, meaning that both cultures' symbolic forms are similar. The Japanese participants' responses consist of fifteen types of feelings for Japanese females and ten Japanese males. An ANOVA analysis was performed comparing male Javanese and male Japanese, and the result is that there is no significant difference ( $P\text{-value} > 0.05$ ). Similar output occurred in the female group.

## <sup>2</sup> *What types of people use polite expressions when talking to you?*

Table 6 shows the responses classified by nationality and gender. Both Japanese and Javanese gave varied responses regarding this question.

Javanese people think that family members and relatives use polite expressions in a conversation. However, Japanese people have a different opinion about the types of people who use polite expressions. The most common type is the outgroups (soto) or the people they do not know very well or meet for the first time. The second type of response from the Javanese has the same opinion as to the Japanese people. However, they do not share the priority rank.

An ANOVA test was conducted to analyse significant differences. The results are that there is no significant difference both in gender and in the type of variance responses. ( $P\text{-value} > 0.05$ )

The table reveals that the Javanese respondents' family members and relatives use polite language. In Javanese culture, politeness use by their parents or relatives in the family circle to give some education to their children. Older family members commonly use them to socialize politeness to the young Javanese speakers. Moreover, most of the participants in this study are youngsters.

In the meantime, most Japanese people believe that people younger than the respondents choose to use polite words in the workplace (kohai). Senior (sempai) and junior (kohai) relationships are important in Japan. This reflects the roles or



**Table 6.** Types of responses to question 3 classified by nationality and gender.

Type of response to Q3: what types of people use polite expressions when talking to you?	Female Javanese (Percentage)	Male Javanese (Percentage)	Female Japanese (percentage)	Male Japanese (percentage)
Family member and relatives	26	26.2	5.1	2
People younger than me	18.2	13.4	25.6	24
No one	10.4	11.5		
Younger members on the same school or workplace	2.5	4.9	16.7	14
Courier package and waitress (customer services)		3.3		2
People older than me	2.5	3.3		
Classmates and friends (work) teachers	3.8	4.9	19.2	14
students	1.2	4.9	1.3	
People I meet for the first time	3.8	3.3	2.6	
neighbour	24.1	16.4	11.5	4
People who ask me for help	5.2	1.6	1.3	
People I do not know very well			6.4	12
Volunteer superior		1.6	1.3	6
Subordinate				8
customer			7.7	6
Most people	1.2	1.6	1.3	2
others	1.2	3.3		2
total	100	100	100	100

social conditions. In the wakimae criteria of the politeness used by the Japanese people, he or she can interact with the interactants in each scenario without friction.

### 2 What types of people generally use polite expressions?

Politeness help people deal with others in communication. Often we opt for certain vocabularies and grammar or expressions to maintain a quality conversation. We asked both Japanese and Javanese respondents what type of people generally use polite expressions.

Table 7 classifies the responses to question four by nationality and gender. The Javanese native speakers gave thirteen types of answers. Both Javanese females and Javanese males have the same two answers. The most common people who generally use polite expressions are young people. They believe that it is common in Javanese culture to use polite expressions by younger people in interaction with elderly persons. In communicating with family members, it is common to use polite language.

The value of “santun” (“inward” politeness or “self-oriented politeness”) presented on this table results. Here in this data, individuals must follow etiquette as a youngster to demonstrate their “Javaneseness” quality by being “santun” to the older people. These values generate Javanese native speakers’ thoughts and perceptions that younger individuals are not shameful by obeying *tata krama* by maintaining politeness; they obey the rules of language levels or styles.

However, the Japanese respondents have different answers. Generally speaking, the most common answers are well-educated or well-mannered use polite expressions. The Japanese female respondents’ second common answer is that people with common sense use polite expressions. Meanwhile, the Japanese male respondents have contrasting



answers; they think that people who understand manners are necessary for social contact. This type of answer is somehow related and similar to the Japanese female answers, yet it differs.

Table 7 below displays the results of question four regarding the type of answers and their percentage. Here we can find cultural differences between Japanese and Javanese in the perception of people who use politeness in daily communication.

For the types of people generally use polite expressions, ANOVA analysis reveals a significant difference between the type of responses between Javanese native speakers and Japanese native speakers. (p-value <0.05) Meanwhile, in the female group, a significant difference also occurred. (p-value <0.05)

**2 Who uses polite expressions more often: males or females?**

Some studies related politeness with gender issues have been an important topic in sociolinguistics research. (Hobbs, 2003; Lakoff, 1973). From these studies we know, that there are gender differences.

In this study, we ask Japanese and Javanese native speakers to find out who uses polite expressions more often: males or females. The result is shown in Table 8 below.

Table 8 reveals that the Javanese and the Japanese native speakers have the same opinion about who uses polite expressions according to gender. The Japanese female respondents and the Javanese male respondents tend to use the same polite expressions. Japanese respondents share the same response. There was no significant difference between gender regarding who uses polite expressions more often. (p-value >0.05)

**1 Table 7.** Types of responses to question 4 classified by nationality and gender.

Type of response to Q4: what types of people generally use polite expressions?	Female Javanese (Percentage)	Male Javanese (Percentage)	Female Japanese (percentage)	Male Japanese (percentage)
People younger than oneself	31.3	19.6	3.1	
Family member and relatives	17.9	15.7		
students	9	9.8		
People in formal environment	4.5	9.8		
Everyone or almost everyone	9	7.8	1.5	13.3
Children to their parents	10.4	7.8		
People one meets for the first time	10.4	5.8	1.5	
Well-educated or well-mannered people	1.5	7.8	35.4	26.7
teachers		4		
People older than me	3	4	7.7	
Honest people			3.1	3.3
People who understand manners are necessary in social contacts		4	9.2	20
People with common sense			21.5	6.7
Considerate people				6.7
People who do club activities				3.3
People who smart				3.3
People I do not know very well				3.3
People who wants to keep distance			1.5	6.7
Sensitive person				3.3
People who know their place	1.5		7.7	3.3
Adults			3.1	
other	1.5	4	4.6	
total	100	100	100	100

**Table 8.** Types of responses to question 5 classified by nationality and gender.

Type of response to Q5: who uses polite expressions more often, males or females?	Female Javanese (Percentage)	Male Javanese (Percentage)	Female Japanese (percentage)	Male Japanese (percentage)
Females	22	22.2	12.2	12
Males	4	5.6	-	166
Same for both	74	72.2	88.8	72
total	100	100	100	100

10 However, Javanese people believe that Javanese women use polite expressions more frequently than men. Males are less likely to use polite expressions during the respondent's evaluation. These findings are reflected in the image of "the friendly, calm and polite Javanese women." The Javanese women are considered very gentle. This is done to avoid offending the other person.

The results above tables show that Javanese and Japanese people have different perspectives on using polite expressions. The Japanese tend not to use politeness in interacting with families and relatives, despite some similarities in their response to the people who are older than them. However, the Javanese people use a degree of formality based on their social class, status, age, and profession (the macro level). Moreover, those who have a higher position should be respected by the lower position.

The most important point is that politeness, or *teinei* in Japanese, mostly describes feelings, such as being warm-hearted (*teatsui*), kind (*shinsetsu*), or considerate (*omoiyari*). These emotions and their incorporation represent the kind of responses of Japanese native speakers into politeness in daily life. The Japanese people express feelings about themselves like they feel bad, or it would be impolite. However, they also consider how the opponent feels, making the other person feel uncomfortable or creating a wrong impression.

The Javanese people describe politeness as a courtesy or manners (*unggah-ungguh*). They use polite expressions to respect others within their degree (age) and position. Their classification types vary from people who use polite expressions in the Japanese group. The Javanese people tend to point to specific people, such as younger age, family, relatives, teachers, children, etc. However, The Japanese respondents mention different types of people who use polite expressions, such as a well-educated person, a well-mannered person, a person with common sense, a person who knows their place, etc. In other words, both native speakers' perceptions are not the same. Both the Japanese and the Javanese people agreed that men and women in daily communication use polite expressions.

The findings of both native speakers of Japanese and Javanese language on politeness perspectives are different across gender and class. Concerning the Javanese norm of indirection, power relations analysis reflected more significant agreement. Moreover, women in their relational networks actively negotiate and adopt the norms for contextual purposes. However, from these respondents of the Javanese speakers, this study both equally admitted that women and men play a role and used politeness.

## Conclusion

The present study reveals that the Javanese people mostly use polite expressions among family members. However, the Japanese people mostly use polite expressions depending on the speaking partner's social status (a person older than the speaker, or someone they

just met or the outgroup (soto) such as stranger or customer). The result shows significant differences between Japanese and Javanese in terms of a typical person who generally uses polite expressions. The Japanese believe a well-educated person, and a well-mannered person is most likely to speak politely. They also think that the person who understands manners also generally use polite expressions. Such a result differs from how the Javanese use polite expressions (youngsters or students who use polite expressions more often).

In conclusion, there are significant differences between the Japanese and the Javanese evaluation of the general type of polite expressions. The interpretation of research findings is restricted due to the number of participants. However, according to the data, we conclude that the Japanese and Javanese have cultural similarities in verbal communication. Furthermore, this research's politeness concept validates several Japanese and Javanese people's opinions regarding cultural awareness and evaluating intercultural politeness concepts. These facts suggest the existence of cross-cultural differences in the concept of politeness.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

### Funding

This work was supported by the DIPA UNNES No. DIPA-042.01.2.400899/2019 [DIPA UNNES No. DIPA-042.01.2.400899/2019].

### Notes on contributors

*Lisda Nurjaleka* is an Assistant Professor at Faculty of Language and Art, Universitas Negeri Semarang in Semarang, Center Java, Indonesia. Her research interest is sociolinguistics focused on politeness, conversation analysis, intercultural communication. She can be reached at [lisda\\_nurjaleka@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:lisda_nurjaleka@mail.unnes.ac.id).

*Rina Supriatnaningsih* is an Associate Professor at Faculty of Language and Art, Universitas Negeri Semarang in Semarang, Center Java, Indonesia. Her research interests include interlanguage pragmatics, pragmatics and Sociopragmatics. She can be reached at [rinasupriatnaningsih@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:rinasupriatnaningsih@mail.unnes.ac.id)

*Silvia Nurhayati* is an Associate Professor at Faculty of Language and Art, Universitas Negeri Semarang in Semarang, Center Java, Indonesia. Her research interests is in Second Language Acquisition mainly on Japanese learners. She can be reached at [silvinur@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:silvinur@mail.unnes.ac.id)

### References

- <https://www.ethnologue.com/guides/largest-familie>. 2008 Koujien. Iwanami Publishers
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chen R. (1993). Responding to compliments A contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 20(1), 49–75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(93\)90106-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90106-Y)



- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 219–236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90081-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N)
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Routledge 280 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203788387>.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 237–257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- Hatley, B. (1990). Theatrical Imagery and Gender Ideology in Java. In J. M. Atkinson & S. Errington (Eds.), *Power and Difference: Gender in Island Southeast Asia* (pp. 177–207). Stanford University Press.
- Haugh, M. (2004). Revisiting the conceptualization of politeness in English and Japanese. *Multilingua*, 23(1/2), 85–110. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.2004.009>
- Hobbs, P. (2003). The Medium is the Message: Politeness Strategies in Men's and Women's Voice Mail Messages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(2), 243–262. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00100-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00100-5)
- Hong, W. (1996). An empirical study of Chinese request strategies. *Int'l Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (122) 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1996.122.127>
- Ide, S. 1992. Gender and Function of Language Use: Quantitative and Qualitative Evidence from Japanese. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 3, 117–129
- Ide, S., Hill, B., Carnes, Y.M., and Kawasaki, A. Ide, S., Hill, B., Carnes, Y., Ogino, T. & Kawasaki, A. 2019 The concept of politeness: An empirical study of American English and Japanese. In R. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Ed.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* (pp. 281–298). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886542-014>
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2–3) 223–248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223>
- Ide, S. (1993). Linguistic politeness, III: Linguistic politeness and universality. *Multilingua*, 12(1), 223–248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223>
- Ide, S. (2001). Kokusai Shakai no naka no keii hyogen [Keii hyogen in an internationalizing society]. *Nihongogaku*, 20 (4), 4–13. <https://ndlonline.ndl.go.jp/#!/detail/R300000002-I5730054-00>
- Kamada, M., & Komeyama, T. (eds.). (1992). *Daikangorin*. Shuukan Shoten.
- Kasper, G. (2005). Linguistic etiquette Kiesling, Scott F., and Paulston, Christina B. In *Intercultural Discourse and Communication* 1st (pp. 58–77). Blackwell publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758434>
- Kato, Akiko. (1997). Cross-cultural analysis of the concept of politeness. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 5, 59–72. <https://journals.uair.arizona.edu/index.php/AZSLAT/article/view/21174>
- Khadajah, I. (1993) Politeness in Malay directives (Universiti Malaya).
- Kikuchi, Y. (1997). *Keigo (Japanese politeness)*. Kodansha Gakujutsubunko.
- Lakoff, R. T., & Ide, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness* (Vol. 139). John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.139>
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 45–79. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500000051>
- Leech, G. (2005). Politeness: Is there an East-west divide. *Journal of Foreign Language*, 6 (3), 1–30. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.122.4402&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Lim, B. S. (2017). Malay sayings as politeness strategies. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 15 (1), 65–79. <https://jml.um.edu.my/index.php/JML/article/view/3390>
- Mangunswito, S. A. (2002). *Kamus Lengkap Bahasa Jawa* (Bandung: Yrama Widya).
- Mao, L. R. (1994). Beyond Politeness theory: 'Face revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(5), 451–486. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)90025-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90025-6)
- Marui, I., Nishijima, Y., Noro, K., Reinelt, R., & Yamashita, H. (2011). *Concepts of communicative virtues (CCV) in Japanese and German*. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110811551.385>
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12(4), 403–426. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(88\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(88)90003-3)

- Matsumoto, Y. (1989). Politeness and conversational universals—observations from Japanese. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(2-3), 207-222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.207>
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. (1993). Linguistic politeness and cultural style: Observations from Japanese Clancy, Patricia M. In *Japanese/Korean linguistics* (Vol. 2, pp. 55-67). Stanford University Stanford, CA.
- Matsumura, Y., Chinami, K., & Kim, S. J. (2004). Japanese and Korean politeness: A discourse-based contrastive analysis. In *International Conference on Language, Politeness and Gender: the pragmatic roots 2-4 September* Helsinki University of Helsinki.
- Minami, F. (1987). *Keigo (Linguistic Politeness)*. Iwanami Shoten.
- Norwanto, N. (2016). *Gender and politeness in Javanese Language*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis] Univeristy of Huddersfield.
- Oishi, H. 1975 *Keigo [Polite language]*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shoboo.
- Pearsall, J. (ed.). (1998). *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*. Clarendon Press.
- Poedjosoedarmo, Soepomo. (1968). Javanese speech levels. *Indonesia* 6,(, 54-81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3350711>
- Prawiroatmodjo, S. (1989). *Bausastra Jawa-Indonesia Jilid II*. CV. Haji Masagung.
- Shinmura, I. 2008 *Kojien 6th* (Iwanami Shoten)
- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (1988). Women and politeness: The Javanese example. *Language in Society*, 17 (4), 535-554. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500013087>.
- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (2009). Language shift, gender, and ideologies of modernity in Central Java, Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1), 57-77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1395.2009.01019.x>
- Srichampa, Sophana. (2003). Politeness strategies in Hanoi Vietnamese speech. *Mon-Khmer Studies*, 34, 137-155. <http://54.209.33.149/archives/mks/pdf/34:137-157.pdf>
- Sukarno, S. (2010). The reflection of the Javanese cultural concepts in the politeness of Javanese. *K@ Ta*, 12(1), 59-71. <https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.12.1.59-71>
- Suseno, F.-M. (1984). Javanese Ethics and World View. In *The Javanese Idea of Good Life 1*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama 257 <http://repo.driyarkara.ac.id/45/1/FMS-etikajawa%20%282%29.pdf>.
- Tao, L., Sumi, Y., & Nishijima, Y. (2016). Teinei (丁寧), Limao (禮貌), and Kongson (恭遜): A Comparison of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean Concepts of Politeness. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 25(3 112-124 <https://www-s3-live.kent.edu/s3fs-root/s3fs-public/file/Lin-TAO-Sumi-YOON-Y-NISHIJIMA.pdf>).
- Ueno, J. (2004). Gender differences in Japanese conversation. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 13, 85-100. <https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/08-Junko-Ueno.pdf>
- Vilkki, L. (2006). Politeness, Face and Facework: A Man of Measure: Festschrift in honor of Fred Karlsson on his 60th birthday. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 19. The Linguistic Association of Finland 19 , 322-332 1456-8438 . <https://researchportal.helsinki.fi/en/publications/politeness-face-and-facework-current-issues-2>
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615184>
- Wijayanto, A. (2013). The emergence of the Javanese Sopan and Santun (politeness) on the refusal strategies used by Javanese learners of English. *The Internet Journal Language, Culture and Society*, 36 (1), 34-47. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED561959>
- Wolff, J. U., & Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1982). Communicative codes in Central Java. Cornell Univeristy Press. <https://ecommons.cornell.edu/handle/1813/11778>
- Yongyan L. (2000). Surfing e-mails. *English Today*, 16(4), 30-34. [10.1017/S0266078400000523](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400000523)
- Zhan, K. (1992). *The strategies of politeness in the Chinese language*. Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California.
- Zhu, J., & Bao, Y. (2010). The pragmatic comparison of Chinese and Western "Politeness" in cross-cultural communication. *Journal of Language and Research*, 1(6), 848-851. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.6.848-851>



# Japanese and Javanese Perceptions of the Concept of Politeness in Their Languages: Cross-Cultural Analysis

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

16%

SIMILARITY INDEX

14%

INTERNET SOURCES

13%

PUBLICATIONS

10%

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

1	<a href="http://www.mdpi.com">www.mdpi.com</a> Internet Source	3%
2	<a href="http://docplayer.net">docplayer.net</a> Internet Source	2%
3	<a href="http://discovery.researcher.life">discovery.researcher.life</a> Internet Source	2%
4	<a href="http://research-repository.griffith.edu.au">research-repository.griffith.edu.au</a> Internet Source	2%
5	<a href="http://open.metu.edu.tr">open.metu.edu.tr</a> Internet Source	1%
6	<a href="http://research.engineering.uiowa.edu">research.engineering.uiowa.edu</a> Internet Source	1%
7	<a href="http://dokumen.pub">dokumen.pub</a> Internet Source	1%
8	<a href="http://www.degruyter.com">www.degruyter.com</a> Internet Source	1%
9	Submitted to University of Huddersfield Student Paper	1%
10	Submitted to Monash University Student Paper	

1 %

---

**11** Submitted to University of Strathclyde  
Student Paper

1 %

---

**12** Fareed H. Al-Hindawi, Musaab A. Raheem Alkhazaali. "A Critique of Politeness Theories", Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2016  
Publication

1 %

---

**13** Submitted to King's College  
Student Paper

1 %

---

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography Off

# Japanese and Javanese Perceptions of the Concept of Politeness in Their Languages: Cross-Cultural Analysis

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

**/0**

GENERAL COMMENTS

**Instructor**

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15

PAGE 16

PAGE 17