



## The directive politeness level through a test approach completing the Arab Village community discourse

**Sri Parwanti\***, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Palembang, South Sumatera, Indonesia

**Ris'an Rusli**, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Palembang, South Sumatera, Indonesia

**Masyhur Duncik**, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Palembang, South Sumatera, Indonesia

\*Email for Correspondence: parwantisri12@gmail.com

---

---

### ABSTRACT

---

**Keywords:**

directive politeness  
test approach  
Arab Village  
community discourse

This study aims to understand and describe the realization of language politeness in the people of Sei Bayas Arab Village in Palembang City. The study is based on data from the Complete Discourse Test which was distributed to 40 residents living on the Sei bayas Arabic campus. The results show that the respondents use a variety of strategies, including indirect speech, fenced speech, and words that express respect, to communicate their requests and expectations. The respondents used minimizing losses, disclosing face-threatening acts, and revealing that they owe favor to their speech partners.

---

---

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

---

---

### INTRODUCTION

Language plays an important role in human communication and interaction in social life because with language humans can express what is in their thoughts or ideas. Every human communication conveys information that can be in the form of thoughts, ideas, intentions, feelings and emotions directly. According to Mardikantoro (2012), the use of language and language habits in society is closely related to sociolinguistics and pragmatics. The two fields of science are interconnected with each other, and can even be said to complement each other.

In sociolinguistics, there are at least two scales of communication functions, namely (1) referential functions and (2) affective functions. Referential function refers to communication with the aim of conveying information or messages (Hardini & Sitohang, 2019; Kanaza, 2020). Affective function refers to communication with the aim of maintaining a relationship between speaker and speaker (Amin, 2020; Morand & Ocker, 2003). Thus, in certain situations communication is not just a problem of delivering messages from the speaker's mind to the speaker's mind, but more than that, in addition to the delivery of the message, the face or self-image of the speaker, both the speaker's face and the speaker's face also need to be maintained (Manaf, 2005).

Language use in society according to a sociolinguistic perspective is influenced by several factors, both linguistic and non-linguistic factors, such as factors of relationships between speakers and speech partners, social, cultural, and situational factors. Language politeness is reflected in the way of communicating through verbal signs or language procedures.

The socio-cultural aspects that must be considered for using the greeting word are that the addressee is older, equal, younger, or childish; higher, equal, or lower social status; the situation is formal or informal, familiar or unfamiliar, female or male; already known or unknown, and so on. Different cultures have different rules for regulating volume and tonality. Speakers from North Sumatra in Batak speak a higher volume than Sundanese and Javanese speakers. In addition, for certain purposes the volume and pitch of this voice are also usually different.

The use of polite, polite, systematic, organized, clear, and straightforward language reflects the virtuous personality of the speaker. Language activity requires the principle of politeness. Pragmatically, language is one of the actions commonly called speech acts. The speech act is a pragmatic element that involves the speaker and listener or the writer and reader and the thing being talked about of course without ignoring other contexts that accompany the speech act at the time of the speech act. Viewed from the speaker's point of view, language

functions as personal. Meanwhile, in terms of listeners or interlocutors, the language functions directly, namely regulating the behavior of listeners (Chaer & Agustina, 1995). It can be concluded that the speech act is an act of language that emphasizes the functions of language and its use in communication.

Polite language is a language in which the structure of the language is arranged or arranged by the speaker so as not to offend the listener. In addition, according to Supriyatin (2007) polite language is "a regulating factor that keeps conversations running smoothly, pleasantly and not in vain". Then, according to Sariyan (2007) language politeness refers to "The use of good language, civilized courtesy, radiating noble personalities and showing respect for those who are his interlocutors".

Directives are a type of speech act that represents an attempt by a speaker to make *an addrese* do something in the future. Directive speech acts are speech acts that ask someone to do something, for example in the form of ordering, advising, and commanding, usually potentially threatening the face of others (Afriani, 2021). This directive action can be expressed in communication that includes the setting, participants, topics, and variety of languages used. With reference to Searle's (1979) opinion, Yule (1996) defines directive speech acts as those kind of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. This type of speech act includes the communicative functions of commanding, ordering, requesting/begging, and suggesting (Sumarti). A person's communicative ability is included in cultural abilities, namely comprehensive knowledge and skills related to situations, social stratification, and culture, especially about customs and habits of interaction between community members.

One of the interesting community groups to be studied is the Sei Bayas Arab Village community because to deepen this matter, it is necessary to see the phenomenon in the community. From the results of observations in early March 2022 in Sei Bayas Arab Village, it was found that several speech acts that arise in interacting between speakers and interlocutors are generally found to be directive speech acts. Directive speech acts as the focus of the problem in this study are considered important because directive speech acts are very potential to threaten the face of the speech actor. Directive speech acts include commanding, pleading, exhorting, advising, and suggesting. Regarding matters that threaten the face of the opponent / speech partner, a directive speech action strategy is needed for the Arab Village community in the city of Palembang.

This study aims to understand and describe the realization of language politeness in the people of Sei Bayas Arab village in Kuto Batu Village, Ilir Timur III District, Palembang City. The research is expected to give a broader view of how directive speech works and become a reference for relevant future research.

## METHOD

The data collection and analysis techniques used can be said to be descriptive research. It can be seen that there is no hypothesis to be tested or proven. The focus of this research is the politeness speech of the daily Malay directive in the Sei Bayas Arab Village Community in Palembang. The data collection technique used is the Discourse Complement Test (TMW) instrument. The approach used in this study is a sociopragmatic approach. Pragmatics is an approach that can be used for the benefit of seeing and developing the use of language in society. Sociopragmatics is the study of 'local' conditions or conditions more specifically that the principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness take place changeably in different cultures or in different social situations and so on. This means that in other words, sociopragmatics is the foundation of pragmatic sociological boundaries (Tarigan, 2001).

**Table 1.** Population Data

<b>Population Data</b>	<b>RT. 02</b>	<b>RT. 026</b>	<b>Population</b>
Number of male inhabitants	195 People	84 People	279 People
Number of Female Population	293 People	102 People	395 People
Number of Heads of Families	124 People	60 People	184 People

Test data complementing the discourse analyzed through the following steps.

- 1) The test completes the discourse before being disseminated to respondents has gone through the question validation stage. The test was previously tested on  $\pm$  40 students from various regions in South Sumatra, the majority of whom use Palembang Malay in their daily lives.
- 2) After being tested, the test of completing the discourse is tested for validity through a validity test. Tests that are not suitable, then they will be replaced with other tests or eliminated or even corrected.
- 3) Furthermore, researchers disseminated the test to complete the discourse to 40 residents in the Sei Bayas area of Palembang. The number of respondents determined by the researcher is adjusted to the needs.
- 4) After obtaining the results of the test data complementing the discourse, the researcher classifies the answers obtained by grouping the answers according to the situation provided.

- 5) The final step taken is the analysis of test data to complete the discourse. Analysis of test data complements this discourse using 2 theories of directive politeness analysis, namely Leech theory (1983) and Levinson theory (1987). The two theories have different views on measuring the degree of politeness in directive speech acts. According to Leech's theory (1983), there are 3 scales that can be used to measure the degree of courtesy, namely the profit-loss scale, the favorability scale, and the indirect scale. In contrast to the theory of directive analysis according to Levinson (1987). Levinson (1987) analyzed directive speech acts based on civility strategies. As for the politeness strategy according to Levinson (1987) there are 5 strategies, namely: a) using indirect speech; b) using fenced speech; c) use speech that is not very desirable to be done by the speech partner; d) use words that express respect; and e) use apologetic expressions. To determine the level of politeness in directive speech acts, researchers provide information from the analysis according to Haverkate which distinguishes that there are 3 levels of politeness. The level of politeness in the speech act is polite, neutral, and disrespectful.

Based on these steps, the results of the analysis of test data complement the discourse presented in the form of tables. The table presented is as follows.

**Table 2.** Test Data Analysis Table Complements Discourse

Situation	Respondent's Speech	Levinson Effect Strategy (1987)									Impact Scale (Leech, 1983)			Information
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	
1														
2														
3														
etc.														

Information:

Impact scale:

1 = profit and loss scale

2 = favorability scale

3 = scale of inconsistency

Impact strategy:

1 = using indirect speech

2 = using fenced speech

3 = using speech that is not too desirable to be done by the speech partner

4 = using words that express respect

5 = using apologetic expressions

6 = not about speakers and speakers

7 = minimizing losses

8 = disclose FTA (Face Threatening Act) as usual

9 = using speech that expresses that the speaker owes (favor) to the speaker.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this finding were obtained from data from the Complete Discourse Test which was distributed to 40 respondents who were residents of Sei Bayas Arab Village. A total of 3 situations provided by the researcher, respondents completed the speech according to the situation provided. Situation 1 depicts a mother who has a child with a high school education background asking the local RT leader for an unmarried certificate. The head of the RT is younger than the mothers who asked for the certificate. How does the mother ask or speak with her directive speech act? Furthermore, in situation 2 respondents were asked how to speak when he was faced with being a vegetable vendor who faced an old vegetable subscription or a grandfather. When shopping, the money brought by these grandparents is less, while the vegetable seller also needs less money for immediate additional capital. How does the respondent give his directive speech act in this situation? Then, in situation 3 respondents were faced with being a tailor who had a subscription to an employee at a restaurant. Because he was sewing his clothes, the restaurant employee invited the tailor to tell the ugliness of others, while the tailor wanted to refuse to tell the ugliness. How did respondents say directives if they rejected their speech partners?

From these three situations, 120 varied answers were obtained from each situation. So based on these three situations, 1440 TMW analysis results were obtained. Based on the grouping / classification of answers

given by 40 respondents who are residents living on the Sei Bayas Arab campus, data from the test analysis results complete the discourse.

**Table 3.** Recapitulation of Test Analysis Complements Discourse

Situation	Number of utterances	Impact Strategy									Impact scale		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	You	LBP	TL
1	40	34	38	10	36	2	5	28	37	26	28	12	34
2	40	34	26	16	25	25	0	10	0	1	10	18	34
3	40	24	29	26	13	10	2	13	20	0	13	22	24

Analysis of test data complements the discourse carried out by providing a number of situations to the respondents. Furthermore, respondents gave their opinions about the speech commonly taught by the Sei Bayas community when faced with the situation. There are 16 situations provided by researchers to determine the level of language politeness of each respondent representing the community / residents of Sei Bayas. The test data is analyzed by knowing the politeness strategy and politeness scale. Analysis of politeness strategies using Levinson theory (1987) with 9 criteria of politeness strategies in language as follows: 1) using indirect speech; 2) using fenced speech; 3) using speech that is not too desirable to be done by the speech partner; 4) use words that express respect; 5) use apologetic expressions; 6) not about speakers and speakers; 7) minimize losses; 8) disclose how common the FTA (Face Threatening Act) is; and 9) use speech that expresses that the speaker owes the speech partner.

Furthermore, the data was also analyzed for the scale of politeness. This language politeness scale analysis was carried out based on Leech's (1983) theory. There are 3 scales of politeness according to Leech (1983), namely: 1) the scale of profit and loss; 2) the scale of favorability; and 3) the scale of indirectness. The following will describe the results of the analysis based on the analysis table of the Discourse Completing Test (contained in the appendix)

### Description of TMW Analysis on Situation 1

In situation 1 describes a mother who asked for help from the local RT leader to ask for a letter of introduction for her child to apply for a job. Based on data obtained from 40 respondents, there were 40 respondents who answered in different languages and with different levels of politeness. In politeness strategy 1, namely speech that uses indirect speech, as many as 34 and 6 other respondents answered speech directly. In situation 1, the Sei Bayas community in asking for something from the local official (RT leader) used more indirect speech. This is shown by the number of words that use the word *please*. The word *please* indicates an indirect term because it is considered an expression of supplication before asking for something desired by the speaker. For example: "*Please produce a certificate of unmarried!*" While an example sentence that shows direct speech in Situation 1 is using the language "*Make a certificate of not married...*".

Politeness strategy 2 is to use fenced speech, as many as 38 respondents answered with fenced speech and 2 others did not use fenced speech. In terms of asking or ordering something, the Sei Bayas community in general directly expresses the essence of the request or request which is limited to 1 problem only. However, there are some utterances that use speech in unfenced language, for example giving long-winded reasons and sometimes not entering into the context of request sentences or can also be proven by excessive sentence additions.

In politeness strategy 3, as many as 10 respondents answered with speech that was not too expectant to be done by speech partners, while 30 others answered the opposite. Based on the respondents' answers, it was concluded that most Sei Bayas people when asking for a certificate to be made to the speech partner (local government), expect that the speech partner can do what he wants. As with situation 1, the speaker mostly expects the speech partner to do what he wants. Examples of words used are *please*, *ask to be made*, *there must be*, *as a condition*, *sorry to be troublesome*, and *thank you in advance*. Meanwhile, the 10 speakers who answered by not expecting the actions of the speech partner, their speech refers to words in the form of questions that express the choice or can also be the willingness of the speech partner. Examples of words *if you wish* and words *can or can't*.

Strategy 4, as many as 36 respondents said using words that express respect, while the other 4 respondents did not show speech that expressed respect. Based on respondents' data, it shows that most Sei Bayas people use words expressing respect to ask local officials (RT Chairman) for something. This is shown by the use of speech that uses a lot of respectful greetings to the Head of RT there. In addition, words that express respect can also be seen from the language used more politely, for example using the words *please*, *excuse me*, *ask permission*, *sorry to be troublesome*, and *thank you*.

In politeness strategy 5, there were 2 respondents who taught words that used apologetic expressions, while 38 others said by not using apologetic expressions. In this case, it is known that most of the Sei Bayas

community in situation 1 did not use the word *sorry* in the request for making an official letter to the local government.

Politeness strategy 6.5 respondents said with no about speakers and speakers, while 35 respondents about speakers and speakers. Based on these utterances, more utterances are about speakers and speakers. That is, when doing a directive speech *tin dak*, the Sei Bayas community will immediately use pronouns to designate speech partners. These pronouns can be in the form of greetings and pointing words to other people to speech partners. For example, in situation 1 more use the greeting *Mr. RT, Mr., Mr.*, and 2 utterances use the greeting *Dik*. However, there are 5 utterances that do not affect speakers and speakers directly.

Politeness strategy 7, as many as 28 respondents said by minimizing the loss of speech partners, while 12 respondents said without minimizing the losses of speech partners. Based on the speech of the Sei Bayas people, most of them consider the impact of speech in asking or begging for something. The consideration is not to offend or harm the opponent too much. In this case, it also shows a scale of politeness that leads to more polite speech.

In politeness strategy 8, 37 respondents said they disclosed FTAs as is customary and 3 respondents did not disclose FTAs as usual. The directive speech acts taught by the Sei Bayas community always consider the feelings of speech partners. This is evidenced by the large number of speakers who use more refined languages.

Politeness strategy 9, 26 respondents used speech that revealed that speakers owe (favor) to their speech partners, while 14 respondents felt that they did not owe (favor) to their speech partners.

Based on the language politeness strategy of situation 1, it can be concluded that the words spoken refer to the words *apologize, please, thanks, respectful greetings used* indicate that the language used by the Sei Bayas community generally refers to a positive level of politeness.

Furthermore, the analysis of the level of language politeness can be seen using the politeness scale according to Leech (1983) with 3 politeness scales. In situation 1, there are 28 utterances that show advantages for speech partners, while 12 other utterances show disadvantages for speech partners. Minimizing losses in this case is more about the way speech partners understand the teachings spoken by speakers in terms of non-directive speech. In speech 1, even if the speaker asks the speech partner for something, he does so with a good approach in the sense that the language is polite. Thus, the speech partner does not feel offended or forced to do what the speaker wants. Furthermore, the scale of politeness is also seen from more choices of speech partners in understanding speech. In situation 1, as many as 12 respondents said by giving more choices to their speech partners, while 28 respondents gave fewer answer choices to their speech partners. In this case, most Sei Bayas people when asking for help or making requests do not let the speech partner ignore his speech. The hope is that the speech will be carried out by speech partners. The 3rd scale of politeness is based on whether or not the speech is directly conveyed to the speech partner. The more it leads to indirect speech, the more polite the speech. In respondents' answers regarding the 3rd politeness scale, as many as 34 respondents answered with speech that was not directly addressed to speech partners, while the other 6 respondents directly to the purpose of their conversation.

## Description of TMW Analysis on Situation 2

Situation 2 describes a vegetable vendor who asks his subscription buyers (parents with the nickname *Yai*) to pay for the lack of spending money because the shopping money brought by buyers is less. Based on the data distributed, obtained from 40 respondents, there were 34 respondents who spoke indirectly, while 6 other respondents answered speech directly. In situation 2, the speaker uses a lot of indirect speech when talking to older people. This shows that most Sei Bayas people in directive speech acts to older people, use indirect speech strategies. For example, out of those 40 utterances, speakers use the word *sorry a lot, so be it, it's okay, later*. From these words indicate strategies that lead to civility. In addition, indirectness in speech is also shown by the reasons of the speaker before/after asking for the lack of money.

Politeness strategy 2 is to use fenced speech, as many as 26 respondents answered with fenced speech and 14 others did not use fenced speech. In terms of asking elders, the Sei Bayas community generally limits the context of speech, with the intention that the speech partner immediately understands the meaning of speech. However, there are some utterances that use speech in unfenced language. This is because speakers want to explain a directive speech reason by giving various reasons that may still use unfenced speech strategies in their language.

In politeness strategy 3, as many as 16 respondents answered with speech that was not too expectant to be done by speech partners, while 24 others answered the opposite. Based on the respondents' answers, it was concluded that most Sei Bayas people when asking for a lack of payment of shopping money by older buyers, they did so that their speech was carried out by speech partners. As with situation 1, the speaker mostly expects the speech partner to do what they want even if the speech partner is older. But not a few speakers also use speech strategies that are not too expected to be done by their speech partners. This is evidenced by the use of words / sentences *let it, can it not?, it's okay, and can not*.

In strategy 4, 25 respondents spoke using words that expressed respect, while 15 respondents did not show words that expressed respect. Based on respondents' data, most Sei Bayas people use words expressing respect to ask for something from their elders. This is shown by the use of speech that uses a lot of respectful greetings to parents with the greeting "Yai". However, there is speech with this greeting does not also show respect if the sentence used does not lead to polite language and does not threaten the face of the speech partner.

In politeness strategy 5, there were 25 respondents who taught words that used apologetic expressions, while 15 others said by not using apologetic expressions. In this case, it is known that most Sei Bayas people in situation 2 use the word *sorry* for the reason that the words spoken do not offend the feelings of the speech partner, especially towards the older speech partner or threaten the face of the speech partner.

Politeness strategy 6, 40 respondents said with about speakers and speakers. Based on these utterances, all utterances are about speakers and speakers. That is, all speech of speakers when performing directive speech acts, the Sei Bayas community will immediately use pronouns to refer to speech partners. These pronouns can be greetings and pointing words to other people's speech partners and speakers.

Politeness strategy 7, as many as 10 respondents said by minimizing the loss of speech partners, while 30 respondents said without minimizing the losses of speech partners. Based on the words of the Sei Bayas people, most Sei Bayas people when faced with situation 2, they will use speech that does not consider losses, especially in this situation. Words that show a politeness strategy by minimizing the loss of speech partners are *let it be*, *kalua exists*, and words that mean to let go of the lack of money, so that it becomes an advantage for speech partners.

In civility strategy 8, 40 respondents said they did not disclose FTAs as is customary. That is, all respondents in describing situation 2 used a face-threatening strategy. The reason is because in this situation the speaker will spontaneously speak speech that does not have to pay attention to the speech partner's environment, whether the speech partner is humiliated or not. So that all speech leads to speech that threatens the face of the speech partner.

Politeness strategy 9, only 1 respondent used speech that revealed that the speaker owes (favor) to his speech partner, while 39 respondents feel no debt (favor) to his speech partner. This is shown because this speech leads to a directive speech act of request whose nature wants to take away its rights. So that speakers do not feel indebted to speech partners. It is precisely the speaker who has the favor / merit towards the opponent.

Furthermore, the analysis of the level of language politeness can be seen using the politeness scale according to Leech (1983) with 3 politeness scales. In situation 2, there are 10 utterances that show advantages for speech partners, while the other 30 utterances show disadvantages for speech partners. Minimizing losses in this case is more about the way speech partners understand the teachings spoken by speakers in terms of non-directive speech. In situation 2, the politeness scale analysis has also been described in the politeness strategy analysis 7 according to Levinson (1987). In the sense that the speech partner feels advantaged if he receives speech that does not really expect him to do what is asked by the speaker. In the politeness scale analysis 2, as many as 12 respondents said by giving more choices to their speech partners, while 28 respondents gave fewer answer choices to their speech partners. That is, speakers are more likely to expect that their speech will be made by the speech partner by paying for the lack of spending money. However, not a few also more speech leads to 2 options / choices of speech partners. The 3rd scale of politeness is based on whether or not the speech is directly conveyed to the speech partner. The more it leads to indirect speech, the more polite the speech. In respondents' answers regarding the 3rd politeness scale, as many as 34 respondents answered with speech that was not directly addressed to speech partners, while the other 6 respondents directly to the purpose of their conversation. The 3rd civility scale according to Leech (1983) is the same analysis as the politeness strategy 1 according to Levinson. So that the results of the analysis can be seen in politeness strategy 1.

### **Description of TMW Analysis on Situation 3**

In situation 3 describes a tailor who received a sewing order from a restaurant employee asking him to tell someone else's ugliness. However, this situation expects the speaker to refuse the invitation of the speech partner to tell the other person's ugliness. Answers from 40 respondents, there were 24 respondents who answered they used politeness strategy 1, namely indirect speech. Many words used by speakers to reject speech partners' requests tell the ugliness of others by using words of apology, diversion of the atmosphere or story, and give the speech partner an understanding of the ugliness of the story. However, the use of indirect strategies also leads to more subtle or indirect words threatening the face of the speech partner. Not a few speakers also use direct speech when asking speech partners to stop speech that tells the ugliness of others.

In politeness strategy 2, namely using fenced speech, as many as 29 respondents answered with fenced speech and 11 others did not use fenced speech. The Sei Bayas community in general directly reveals the essence of a request or request that is limited to 1 problem only. However, there are 11 utterances that use

speech in unfenced language. For example, giving long-winded reasons and sometimes not entering into the context of request sentences or can also be proven by excessive sentence additions.

Politeness strategy 3, as many as 26 respondents answered with speech that was not too expectant to be done by speech partners, while 14 others answered the opposite. Based on the respondents' answers, it was concluded that most Sei Bayas people when rejecting teachings that vilify others or stop the speech expect that speech partners do not repeat it or continue their speech. There are many strategies carried out by speakers in rejecting the speech of speech partners, one of which is by diverting the story or requesting the speech partner or providing understanding so that the speech partner does not continue his speech.

Politeness strategy 4, as many as 13 respondents said using words that express respect, while 27 other respondents did not show speech that expressed respect. Based on these data, it shows that Sei Bayas people use disrespectful words when asking speech partners to stop insulting others. Various disrespectful remarks directed by speakers to speech partners, one example is "*Never mind, we are talking about others, there are many sins*". However, 13 other respondents used respectful words to refuse to talk about others. For example, by using the word *sorry*.

In politeness strategy 5, there were 10 respondents who taught words that used apologetic expressions, while 30 other respondents said by not using apologetic expressions. In this case, it is known that speech directed at the speech partner requires the speech partner to stop his speech when insulting others. Many strategies speakers use, one of which is an apology. But out of 40 respondents, only 10 respondents expressed apology, this is because the phrase prohibitive is enough to stop the speech partner when insulting others. The word *sorry* is felt to be effective enough so that the speech partner who is told to stop his bad speech can follow what is asked by the speaker.

Politeness strategy 6, only 2 respondents spoke with no about speakers and speakers, while 38 respondents about speakers and speakers. Based on these utterances, more utterances are about speakers and speakers. This can be seen by the direct greeting that leads to speakers and speech partners. The habits of Palembang people, especially the Sei Bayas community, when asking for something or asking for something will directly hit their speech partners.

Politeness strategy 7, as many as 13 respondents said by minimizing the loss of speech partners, while 27 respondents said without minimizing the losses of speech partners. Based on the speech of the Sei Bayas community, in teaching requests to stop speech in the form of prohibition, they no longer think about the advantages or disadvantages of their speech partners.

In civility strategy 8, 20 respondents said they disclosed FTAs as is customary and 20 respondents did not disclose FTAs as usual. When asking or forbidding speech partners to insult others, half of the Sei Bayas community sample used face-threatening words and the other half did not threaten face-threatening. Threatening the face of the speech partner in this case is done by using direct language and does not see the benefits of the speech partner. Most likely the speech partner will feel embarrassed if the directive used uses harsh words or indirect rejection words, such as the sentences "*I'll go in first!*", "*Just another story*", "*Never mind, don't tell anyone else. The sin is great.*", "*I went in first, yes, can't stand the stomachache.*" Sentences like those spoken by speakers are enough to threaten the face of speech partners, because indirectly speech partners feel embarrassed and aware that speakers do not like their speech to demonize others.

In politeness strategy 9, none of the respondents expressed their sense of indebtedness to speech partners. The reason is because this speech is a speech that prohibits speech partners from committing crimes. So it is precisely the speech partner who owes a debt of gratitude to the speaker for raising that the speech being taught is wrong.

Furthermore, the analysis of the level of language politeness can be seen using the politeness scale according to Leech (1983) with 3 politeness scales. In situation 3, there were 13 utterances that showed advantages for speech partners, while 27 other utterances showed speech that harmed speech partners. Minimizing losses in this case is more about the way speech partners understand the teachings spoken by speakers in terms of non-speech directives towards politeness. Based on responses from 40 samples of Sei Bayas people in prohibiting their speech partners from telling the ugliness of others, they prefer to speak with no regard for the benefits of speech partners. This is because these actions are not good actions, so they immediately express them with strict prohibitions or by diversion of the subject of conversation. Furthermore, as many as 22 respondents said by giving more choices to their speech partners, while 18 other respondents gave fewer answer choices to their speech partners. There is a way for speakers to prohibit their speech partners from insulting others, namely by giving choices, or directly banning their speech partners. The 3rd scale of politeness is based on whether or not the speech is directly conveyed to the speech partner. The more it leads to indirect speech, the more polite the speech. In respondents' answers regarding the 3rd politeness scale, as many as 24 respondents answered with speech that was not directly addressed to speech partners, while 16 other respondents directly to the purpose of their conversation. The more indirectly the speaker conveys his directive speech, the more it leads to language politeness. From the data obtained that more Sei Bayas people use indirect language to prohibit speech partners from insulting others.

---

The directive politeness level through a test approach completing the Arab Village community discourse

## CONCLUSION

The results showed that the respondents used a variety of strategies, including indirect speech, fenced speech, and words that express respect, to communicate their requests and expectations. The study also found that most respondents expected the speech partner to carry out their requests, and they used words like "please," "ask to be made," and "there must be" to convey their expectations. The study concluded that the Sei Bayas community generally uses indirect speech and respectful language when communicating with local officials or asking for something. The study also found that the respondents used a range of politeness strategies, including minimizing losses, disclosing face-threatening acts, and revealing that they owe favor to their speech partners.

## REFERENCES

- Afriani, S. H. (2021). Berkelakar and directives in Palembang Malay: the Islamic humor discourse in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Islam*, 301-328.
- Amin, A. (2020). Attitude towards language in sociolinguistics settings: A brief overview. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 2(1), 27-30.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.
- Chaer, A., & Agustina, L. (1995). *Sosiolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Rineka Citra.
- Hardini, S., & Sitohang, R. (2019). The use of language as a socialcultural communication. *Jurnal littera: fakultas sastra darma agung*, 1(2), 238-249.
- Kanaza, F. U. (2020). A language function: The analysis of conative function in Meghan Markle's speech. *Etnolinguial*, 4(1), 43-55.
- Leech, G. (2011). *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. UI Press.
- Mardikantoro, H. B. (2012). Pilihan bahasa masyarakat Samin dalam ranah keluarga. *Humaniora*, 24(3), 345-357.
- Manaf, N. A. (2005). *Realisasi strategi kesantunan direktif di dalam bahasa Indonesia di kalangan anggota kelompok etnis Minangkabau di Padang (Realization of Politeness Strategies on the Directives in the Indonesian Language produced by members of Minangkabau ethnic group in Padang)*. [Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Indonesia].
- Morand, D. A., & Ocker, R. J. (2003, January). Politeness theory and computer-mediated communication: A sociolinguistic approach to analyzing relational messages. In *36th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2003. Proceedings of the* (pp. 10-pp). IEEE.
- Sariyan, A. (2007). *Santun berbahasa*. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In *Speech acts* (pp. 59-82). Brill.
- Sumarti, S. (2016). Strategi Tindak Tutur Direktif Guru dan Responswarna Afektif Siswa (Kajian Pragmatik dan Implikasinya dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di SMP). *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 15(2).
- Supriatin, Y. M. (2007). Kesantunan berbahasa dalam mengungkapkan perintah. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 25(2), 54-62.
- Tarigan, H. G. (2011). *Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa*. Angkasa.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. OUP Oxford.