

Language Politeness as A Mirror of Rejection-Free Culture In First Secondary Education Kolaka District

Nur Ihsan¹, Samsuddin²

Abstract

Language is one of the elements of culture that reflects the characteristics of every nation and ethnic group in this world. Mastering a language means mastering the world. An important aspect of language is politeness so that communication can run well, effectively and efficiently to achieve goals. This study aims to determine politeness in language as a reflection of Tolaki-Mekongga culture in the Kolaka Regency Junior High School environment. The method used is descriptive method in the form of qualitative research. The results of the study show that politeness in language as a reflection of Tolaki-Mekongga culture in the junior secondary education environment of Kolaka Regency is largely determined by context, social status between speakers and interlocutors and culture. Politeness in language as a mirror of culture is largely determined by forms of speech that use fragments of cultural elements, such as mo, ki, -ko, ji-mbe. There are utterances that contain fragments of Tolaki-Mekongga cultural elements that distinguish a high politeness rating, some that show a low politeness rating, and some that show a neutral politeness rating. Speeches that contain fragments of Tolaki-Mekongga cultural elements which are considered to have a high politeness rating are —ki. This form is always distinguished by —ko. This form is understood to have a low politeness rating. While the fragments of cultural elements that are considered neutral are ji, -ka, -mbe, -i, tawwa and -ta. These forms do not differentiate between gender, social status, and age. This form is used by all groups within the scope of the Tolaki-Mekongga community in the secondary education environment of Kolaka Regency.

Keywords: politeness, language, tolaki-mekongga, education, kolaka.

¹ Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Pemuda Street No. 339 Kolaka, Indonesia, nurihsan6411@gmail.com

² Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Pemuda Street No. 339 Kolaka, Indonesia, s4ml4str4@gmail.com

Introduction

Politeness in a language is a requirement for good, effective, and efficient communication to achieve communication goals. Ramadania (2016: 5) explains that politeness is an important tool for forming effective speech. Strategies for forming and using language politeness need to be mastered by every speaker. Politeness in a language tends to consider ethics and aesthetics as well as the culture of language users in choosing what speech to convey. The consideration referred to is the role of context, or social distance, and social status with the position of speech in communication (Rahardi: 2003:64-66). In line with this, Apriliani, et al (2021) argues that language politeness is a system that provides interpersonal relationships that are designed to provide interaction facilities to minimize conflict within humans. Language politeness which is designed to provide space for communication and avoid misunderstandings in view (Chaer, 2010) can be seen from the use of polite speech, which does not seem pushy, does not look down on the interlocutor, gives choices to the interlocutor, and the interlocutor gets benefits or pleasure. from speakers. Furthermore, Ubaidullah, et al. (2021: 343) argues that language politeness is expressed through the choice of speech and the style used in speaking which is conveyed in a good and ethical way in communicating. Politeness creates a better relationship through efforts to choose utterances that can hurt the other person. In addition, polite language can maintain self-esteem and dignity and respect the speech partner.

Politeness in the early periods was influenced by (1) George N Leech, (2) Brown and Levinson, and (3) Robin Lakof (Rahardi: 2003:57). The three understand pragmatics in different ways. Leech understands politeness based on five scales, namely (1) cost-benefit or loss-benefit scale, (2) optional scale or choice scale, (3) indirectness scale or indirectness scale, (4) authority scale or power scale and (5)) social distance scale or social distance (Rahardi: 2003:56-62). Meanwhile (Gunarwan, 2007:29) explains that Leech bases politeness on notions: (1) costs and benefits, (2) reproach or dispraise and praise, (3) approval (agreement), and (4) sympathy/antipasti.

Subsequent language politeness uses the scale coined by Brown and Levinson. Rahardi, (2003: 63) explains that three scales determine the level of politeness that appears in a speech, namely (1) contextually, (2) socially, and (3) culturally. Meanwhile Gunarwan, (2007:29) explains that Brown and Levinson base politeness on the face. Based on this notion, politeness can be based on negative faces and positive faces.

Politeness is also determined based on the scale proposed by Robin. Rahardi explained that three main provisions are met to determine

politeness in an utterance, namely (1) the formality scale, (2) the hesitancy scale, and (3) the equality scale.

Based on the three politeness scales described in the previous section, this paper uses Brown and Levinson's politeness scale to examine language politeness as a reflection of Tolaki-Mekongga culture in the junior high school environment of Kolaka Regency..

Politeness in the language is not solely related to language but also involves social and cultural arrangements. According to Mardiyah (2014: 45-46) explains linguistic views that strengthen the existence of culture in language so that language more explicitly reflects the culture of the speaking community. In every linguistic expression, meaning is reflected: ideational, interpersonal, and textual, each of which is realized through transitivity systems, mood systems, and theme systems. According to Rahayu (2020: 2) principles related to the order of social, aesthetic, and moral life will be reflected in language politeness. In this regard, the view that is considered to see specifically the relationship between language and culture, namely Benjamin Worf. Gunarwan, (2007:25) explains that language (tends to) influence worldview and that because of that view, it indirectly shapes culture, so language can be said to influence culture. Yonsa's view (2020: 73) explains that the culture of a society is reflected in the politeness it applies, including politeness in language.

Politeness in the language is closely related to culture because language is a cultural product. Each language user community has different norms. Speech that is considered polite by certain social systems is not necessarily polite according to other societies (Utari, 2021: 56). In this regard, language politeness is a reflection of the culture of a society. One planting system that is built and run together. In it, some norms are reflected in the communication of certain groups of people. A system built jointly by community groups. According to Yonsa (2020: 74), the culture of a society will be reflected in politeness in language. Moreover, in every society, there is always a social hierarchy that is imposed on groups of members

Language politeness in the educational environment is very important. In line with this, Pranowo (2012: 6) argues that in the context of education, politeness is an important aspect of life to create good communication between speakers and partners. Furthermore, Arrahman (2022: 137) explains that politeness is important to pay attention to overcome misunderstandings which can lead to the breakdown of disharmonious relations between students and students, even between students and the community which is important to pay attention to overcome misunderstandings which can lead to the breakdown of disharmonious relations. between students and students, even between students and other communities.

Teachers, students, and educational actors can never be separated from the use of language. Language is the only tool for exchanging information. In this condition, language politeness is needed to convey informative messages from the teacher to students or vice versa.

Language politeness in the secondary education environment of Kolaka district is something unique. The politeness that occurs does not only involve compliance with politeness principles that have been explained through politeness parameters. More than that, language politeness involves elements of local culture (Tolaki-Mekongga culture). This can be seen in the speeches of students while communicating in the school environment. In this regard, Rahayu, (2020: 5) explains that communication procedures are influenced by the cultural norms of certain community groups

METHODS

This research is a type of descriptive-qualitative research. The use of this qualitative method refers to the opinion of Sutopo (2006) who states that qualitative research focuses on descriptions with data in the form of words or sentences that mean more than just numbers or numbers. The approach used in this study is pragmatic. The use of pragmatics is adapted to the research objective, which is to describe politeness in language as a mirror of Tolaki-Mekongga culture in the junior high school environment of Kolaka Regency.

The data source for this research is junior high school students in Kolaka Regency. The speakers who are the source of the research data are very diverse. Some like the Bugis, Tolaki, Javanese, Moronene, Balinese, Buton and Muna.

Collecting data for this research uses the technique of observing, noting, recording and documentation. The researcher listened, recorded, recorded, and documented the speeches of the students which contained politeness and elements of Tolaki-Mekongga culture. After the data was obtained, data classification and analysis were carried out concerning the politeness principles of Brown and Levinson. Finally, the researcher concludes the results of the data analysis that has been done.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

The politeness in this paper is based on the Brown and Levinson politeness scale. There are three scales of politeness that appear in an actual speech. The three scales referred to are determined

contextually, socially, and culturally. The scales are as follows: (1) the social distance between speaker and hearer, (2) the relative power of the speaker and hearer, and (3) the degree of imposition associated with the required expenditure of goods or services. The three politeness rating scales are further described by Rahardi (2003:64-66) in the following.

1. The rating scale of social distance between speakers and hearers (social distance between speaker and hearer) is determined by the parameters of differences in terms of age, gender, and a person's sociocultural background.
2. The scale of the social status rating between the speaker and hearer relative power or the power rating, power is based on the asymmetrical position between the speaker and the hearer's partner.
3. The degree of imposition associated with the required expenditure of goods or services is based on the relative position of one speech act to another in actual speech practice.

The age difference between speakers and speech partners has implications for politeness in language. Usually, the older a person is, the higher the level of politeness in speaking. Conversely, someone who is still young usually tends to have a low politeness rating in speaking.

Gender also greatly influences the level of politeness in language. The female gender usually has a higher politeness rating than the male. This is because women tend to be more concerned with everything that has aesthetic value or beauty which is relatively higher in frequency in their daily life activities than men. On the other hand, men tend to stay away from things like that because usually, they are more concerned with hard work and the use of logic in their daily lives.

A person's sociocultural background has a very big role in determining the speech politeness device he has. People who hold positions in society tend to have a higher politeness rating than most people, such as farmers, traders, company workers, construction workers, and housemaids. Likewise, city people, tend to have a higher politeness rating when compared to people who live in rural areas and remote mountains.

Another thing that determines politeness is the strength or power between the speaker and the interlocutor. This is more determined by the asymmetrical position between the speaker and the speech partner.

In detail, the politeness parameter scale described above is presented in the following table.

Table Politeness Rating Scale

No	Politeness Rating Scale According to Brown and Levinson	Politeness Parameters	
		High	Low
1	Context or social distance between speakers and interlocutors age		
	a. Children (students) are older	√	
	b. Children (students) of lower age		√
	c. Children (students) the same age		√
	Gender		
	a. Female student	√	
	b. Male student		√
	c. Fellow female students	√	
	d. Fellow male students	√	√
	Sociocultural background		
	a. Children (students) officials	√	√
	b. Children (students) of farmers, traders, laborers		√
	c. Fellow children (students) officials		
	d. Fellow children (students) of farmers, traders, laborers.		
2	Social status between speakers and hearers (the speaker and hearer relative power) or the ranking of strength and power		
	a. Principal	√	
	b. Teacher	√	
	c. Students (president of osis, class president, chief secretary, treasurer)	√	
	d. Fellow students		√
3	Speech act rating scale, speech act or the relative position of one speech act to another speech act in an actual speech practice		
	a. Special/normal situations (teachers meet at the teacher/student house at 22.00 and above)	√	√
	b. Special situations/riots/critical situations (teachers meet at the teacher/student house at 22.00 on wards)	√	√
	c. Special/normal situations (students meet at the teacher/student house at 22.00 on wards)	√	

	d. Special situations/riots/critical situations (students meet at the teacher/student house at 22.00 on wards)		
--	--	--	--

DISCUSSION

Politeness in language as a reflection of Tolaki-Mekongga culture in the Kolaka Regency junior high school environment is determined in three ways, namely (1) contextually (social distance between speakers and interlocutors), (2) socially (social status between speakers and interlocutors or ranking of strength and power), and (3) culturally (ranking of speech acts, speech acts or the relative position of one speech act to another). Following are the findings related to politeness.

Finding 1

Student 1: I'm going, I want to fight him (shouting)

Student 2: Don't just me, take a break ki (while holding a chasing bomb his opponent)

Student 1: Let's hurry (shouting, trying to support his friend) let's run fast, kill quick-kill

(shout)

Student 2: (Trying to beat his opponent)

This conversation was obtained in the morning. Very lively atmosphere. Students are playing. Then two participants are talking. The first participant is student 1. The second participant is student 2 (class leader). Student 1 wants him to advance to defeat his opponent. However, student 2 (class leader) forbade it. He took the initiative so that he would come forward (to beat) student 1. Student 2 (class leader) stepped forward and tried to beat his friend, mean while, student 1 continued to provide support.

The speech delivered by student 2 (class leader) to student 1: Don't just me, contextually taking breaks or social distance between speakers in the interlocutor shows that student 2 meets the parameters of high language politeness. Student 2 as class leader relates to the speaker's sociocultural background. Student 2 is seen as occupying a position in the class, namely class leader. Likewise with the social status of speakers and interlocutors. Student 2 (class leader) fulfills the parameters of high language politeness because he is seen as someone who has power or authority. Student 2's speech about the speech act ranking scale, speech acts in an actual speech practice are considered polite or polite. The politeness or politeness of student 2 is marked by a marker of Tolaki-Mekongga cultural locality, namely ki. Ki

in the culture of the Tolaki-Mekongga people is always juxtaposed with ko. Both are considered the same in speech practice. However, there are differences in terms of the level of politeness. Ki is considered more polite, more polite, and more civilized than ko.

Finding 2

Student 1: I will help Elika (help him)

Student 2: Yes, thank you (smiles)

Student 1: Woe crazy person (calls another friend, while walking then smiles)

This speech occurred in the second subject of the class. The class atmosphere is crowded (rather rowdy and cramped). This speech involves two participants, student 1 and student 2. Student 1's speech intends to help Elika. He also accepted the student's offer.

Two things can be explained in student speech 1. First, the speech meets the parameters of language politeness. This speech intends to offer assistance to Elika, I will help Elika. Second, the form used by the speaker to offer assistance to Elika uses the –ko form which is attached to the auxiliary. The –ko form is understood as a low, coarse form.

The politeness parameter understands that female speaker are more polite than male speakers. Women are considered to display more things that are aesthetic and ethical, including in terms of speaking. This is different from what student 1 conveyed to Elika. The meaning of the speech conveyed by student 1 to Elika is considered polite, but the form of language used is considered rude in the view of the Tolaki-Mekongga community.

The impoliteness of student 1's form of speech further occurs in the next section, namely, Woe is a crazy person (calling another friend, while walking and then smiling). This speech is also understood from two things. First, the form used by the speaker is an impolite form. However, the expression used can be considered polite (smile).

The utterances above can be explained based on language politeness parameters. First, contextually, student 1 intends to be polite but uses a form that is considered rude, low, and impolite. Contextually, the speech participants are peers (classmates). So the –ko form in the Bantuko is still acceptable to Elika. Second, social status among speakers is the same, speech occurs among fellow students. Elika and student 1 are both students who do not currently have positions, for example, class president or student council president. Third, the rating scale of speech acts at the time the speech occurred was in a normal situation, there was no special situation that happened to students 1 and Elika.

In the context of the Tolaki-Mekongga culture, the ko form is considered to be lower, and coarser. However, this can be explained and accepted because the context of the speech occurred in classmates. Between student 1 and Erika, there is no difference. In addition, regarding the speaker's social status, both of them are students who do not have positions in the class. Meanwhile, in terms of the ranking of speech acts, and the position of speech acts, speech occurs in normal, relaxed situations. There is no special situation that occurs when the speech occurs.

Finding 3

Student 1: Nabila borrow your pencil

Student 2: This (while giving)

Teacher: This is another reason to borrow a pencil (annoyed)

Student 1: No, ma'am

The above story happened in the morning, in the classroom. Crowded atmosphere. The speech involves three participants, namely the teacher, student 1, and student 2. The speech begins with student 2 who wants to borrow a pen from Nabila, Nabila borrows your pencil. Nabila then lent it, This (while giving). Seeing this condition, the teacher became annoyed. This is another reason to borrow a pencil (annoyed). But student 1 denied it. No, madam.

The speech that occurred in the event above can be described from two different things. First, the fulfillment of politeness parameters is high, and second, low politeness or impoliteness. 2 fulfilled the politeness parameters, while participant 1 and the teacher did not fulfill the politeness principle. Participant 2 (Nabila) fulfills the principle of politeness, namely giving something expected by participant 1 even though using Tolaki-Mekongga cultural markers which are considered rude, and low. Conversely, low politeness or impoliteness is carried out by participant 1 and the teacher does not fulfill the politeness principle. These two participants were considered impolite because they used the form –ko which in the Tolaki-Mekongga culture is considered lowly or rude. Nabila borrowed your pencil. In addition, the teacher also showed annoyance to students 1 and 2 because what they did was considered a form of diversion (excuse).

Contextually, participant 2 still maintains the politeness parameter that women's language has higher politeness than men's, on the contrary, participant 1 and the teacher tend to ignore the politeness parameter.

In terms of social status, the one who should maintain the politeness parameter is the teacher, because the teacher should have high

politeness compared to students. However, the opposite happened. Student 2 maintained the parameters of politeness.

Judging from the position or ranking of speech acts, the teacher should maintain a high politeness parameter, because the situation occurs in the teaching-learning process (a special situation). Thus, student 1 and the teacher are considered impolite, and unethical if they perceive the situation that happened to students in a cynical, annoying way.

In the Tolaki-Mekongga cultural paradigm, there are two forms of cultural markers used, namely –ko and –ji. The two forms in the Tolaki-Mekongga culture are understood in different ways. –ko is always paired with –ki. –ko has a lower nuance of meaning, rude, on the contrary –ki is considered to have a high nuance of meaning, polite. Unlike the case with –ji. This form can be accepted by all groups, from children to the elderly. This form is considered to be the neutral form among forms like –ko and –ki.

Based on this review, student 1 should use the –ki form because he gets the benefits from student 2, namely being able to use his pen. Likewise with teachers. Should try to maintain a high parameter of politeness, because teaching and learning situations can be considered as special and formal situations.

Finding 4

Student 1: How can you not understand? (Confusion)

Student 2 : This is how many times it is equal to 6 (while explaining)

Student 3: Understand diamb,

Student 2 : No ji either

This conversation took place in the morning, in the classroom. The atmosphere is a math test. The speech involved three participants, namely student 1, student 2, and student 3. Starting from student 1 who did not understand (confused) which was conveyed to student 2. Student 2 tried to provide a way out of the confusion faced by student 1 by asking him to look for many times the answer 6. Followed by student 3 who gives support or praise to student 2 that he understands. Student 2 then tries to avoid the praise delivered by student 2.

The speech that occurred in the above event shows that student 1 meets the parameters of politeness. Student 1 fulfills the element of politeness in terms of the indirectness of the speech conveyed to student 2. This indirectness is marked by complaints of misunderstanding that are experienced which are not conveyed directly, however, he only states that he does not understand and this

is not addressed to anyone. Student 2 in the situation above is considered not to meet the politeness parameters. Because he gave an explanation to his friend in the exam situation. Even though on the other hand, he is sensitive to the issues raised by student 1. Student 2 tries to provide information about what student 1 should do to get out of the problem at hand. He explained that to solve the confusion he was facing, he had to find a number that multiplied to make 6.

Student 3 also did not meet the politeness parameters because he tried to give praise to student 2 regarding the information given to student 1, even though he was in an exam atmosphere. This information shows that he understands the problems faced by student 1, but the situation is not right because an exam is taking place. Student 3 is considered not to meet the politeness parameters because he communicates during the exam

Contextually, participant 1 meets the parameters of language politeness. Women's language has a higher politeness than men's. complaints In terms of social status and speech level ranking, students 1 and 2 are considered not to meet the parameters of politeness because students are not allowed to communicate with students during the exam process.

Viewed above in the Tolaki-Mekongga cultural paradigm, there are four forms of cultural markers used, namely –ka, -ko mbe and –ji. The four forms in the Tolaki-Mekongga culture are understood in different ways. –ka, -ji and -mbe are considered neutral forms. They do not refer to a higher, more polite, more polite or lesser understanding, rude, impolite or impolite. These three forms can be used by young and old age groups, officials-non-officials, farmers, traders-bureaucrats. In contrast to –ko is always paired with –ki. –ko has a lower nuance of meaning, rude, on the contrary –ki is considered to have a high nuance of meaning, polite. Thus, -ki refers to a higher cultural understanding-polite, courteous. So that this form is more likely to be used for older speakers, who have a higher position, and a more respectable social status.

Based on this review, student 2 still maintains the politeness parameter by temporarily withholding the explanation given. After the exam or after being outside the new class he explained. Likewise with participant 3. Should not give praise at that time. Because, it can interfere with the situation of the exam.

CONCLUSION

The results of the study show that politeness in language as a reflection of Tolaki-Mekongga culture in the junior high school

environment of Kolaka Regency is largely determined by context, social status between speakers and interlocutors, and culture.

Politeness in language as a reflection of culture is largely determined by forms of speech that use fragments of cultural elements, such as *mo*, in Molawan's speech, *ki* in the intermission, *ki*, *-ko* in Erika's utterance *I'm helpingko*, *ji* in No ji's utterance, *-ka* in No's utterance *understands*, *-mbe* in the speech *Understands diamb*, *-l* in the speech of what number, *tawwa* in the speech of borrowing *Tawwa HP*, *-ta* in the speech of the friend does not complain.

There are utterances that contain fragments of Tolaki-Mekongga cultural elements that distinguish a high politeness rating, some that show a low politeness rating, and some that show a neutral politeness rating.

Speeches that contain fragments of Tolaki-Mekongga cultural elements which are considered to have a high politeness rating are — *ki*. This form is always distinguished by —*ko*. This form is understood to have a low politeness rating. While the fragments of cultural elements that are considered neutral are *ji*, *-ka*, *-mbe*, *-i*, *tawwa*, and *-ta*. These forms do not differentiate between gender, social status, and age. This form is used by all groups within the scope of the Tolaki-Mekongga community in the secondary education environment of Kolaka Regency.

Bibliography

- Apriliani, E. I., Purwanti, K. Y., & Riani, R. W. (2021). Improving Early Childhood Language Politeness through Javanese Culture Interactive Learning Media. *Journal of Obsession: Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 5(1), 150–157. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsession.v5i1.319>
- Arrahman, Rudi, et al. 2022. "Strengthening Student Character Education in Language Politeness". *Scientific Journal of Studies*. 7(1), pp 136-144.
- Chaer, A. (2010). *Language Politeness*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Gunarwan, Asim. *Pragmatics, Theory and Archipelago Studies*. Jakarta: Atma Jaya University.
- Mardiyah. 2014. "Utilization of Cultural Understanding as a Basis for Mastering Politeness in Language Education". *Journal of Basic Education and Learning*. 1(1), 42-55.
- Pranowo. (2009). *Speak Politely*. Yogyakarta: Student Libraries.
- Rahardi, Kunjana R. 2003. *Acquainted with Pragmatic Language Science*. Malang: Dioma.
- Rahayu, Triwati. 2020. "Politeness in Language as a Reflection of National Character". *Journal of Language Learning and Research*. 1(1), pp. 1-5.

- Ramadania, Fajarika. 2016. "Student Character Formation by Utilizing Politeness Principles in Directive Speech in the School Environment". *Stylistics: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching*. 1 (1), pp 1-8
- Sutopo, Heribert. 2006. *Qualitative Research Methodology*. Surakarta: Eleven March University Research Center.
- Ubaidullah, Darmanto and Abdul Rahim. 2021. "Politeness in Communication in the Sumbawa Regency Government Office". *Research Journal of Technology and Environmental Studies*, 4 (2), pp 343-351.
- Utar, Tri Lisa. 2021. "Politeness in the Language of Discussion Participants in Najwa's Speech Speech, Pragmatic Studies", *Sagala Journal*, 8(2), pp. 154–165.