

# Directive Speech Act Politeness in a *Pediksaan* Ritual: A Sociopragmatic Study

I Wayan Rasna\*

Language Education, Ganesha University of Education, Singaraja, Indonesia

I Nengah Suandi

Language Education, Ganesha University of Education, Singaraja, Indonesia

Ida Bagus Putrayasa

Language Education, Ganesha University of Education, Singaraja, Indonesia

Ketut Paramarta

Language Education, Ganesha University of Education, Singaraja, Indonesia

**Abstract**—This study focused on the concern about the decrease in the use of language politeness among young people both in everyday communication and sacred Hindu rituals such as in a *pediksaan* ritual, in which not only the place is made sacred but also things related to the inauguration of a *sulinggih* (high priest) that is, performed in a *Geria*, home of a *brahmana*, who is still holding high the high cultural norms. This study analyzed the type of directive speech act politeness, the forms of language politeness, and the application of directive speech act politeness in the *pediksaan* ritual. The stages of a descriptive qualitative method were employed to achieve those objectives. The population of the study was the people involved in the activity of a *pediksaan* ritual. Since this event is rare, the population was directly used as the study's sample. The data were collected by observing the *pediksaan* ritual using a recording technique. The data collected were analyzed with a qualitative descriptive method. The study shows that the types of directive speech act politeness in this study are differentiated into linguistic politeness and pragmatic politeness; the forms of directive speech act politeness consist of (a) agreement maxim of suggesting; (b) sympathizing maxim of order and the politeness principles that consist of (a) the politeness principle that applies tact maxim; (b) the politeness principle that applies approbation maxim; and (c) the politeness maxim that applies sympathy maxim.

**Index Terms**—politeness, directive speech act, sociopragmatics

## I. INTRODUCTION

Communication among speakers of the Balinese community can be in the Balinese language, in the Indonesian language, or in a code-mixing to create conducive communication (Guifoos et al., 2009; Rasna, 2019). Code-mixing is probably used, especially by those living outside Bali. This is because Balinese has *unda-usuk* (speech level), as put forward by Bagus (2009) and Suwija (2019). This requires its speakers to use the language appropriately and correctly to get a positive effect (Imai et al., 2016; Tsai, 2019). The use of *unda-usuk* in the Balinese language depends on the situation of the conversation, including the sociocultural context (Rahardi, 2017; Rasna, 2018). This condition influences people's behavior patterns (Boldyrevv & Dubrovskaya, 2016). *Basa madia* is used when a person reprimands others to show a more polite manner but does not want to show the difference in the cast, which reflects the behavior pattern of the society itself (Krennmayr, 2015). Usually, Balinese communicate in *basa singgih* (the high speech level) as the manifestation of speaking etiquette (Rasna, 2019). Speech etiquette requires habituation (Chaer, 2010) as one of the important components of language politeness to develop character (Rasna, 2017).

In an interaction, there will always be a speaker and an interlocutor or interlocutors who use speech acts in speaking to each other. Haryanti (2001) stated that types of speech acts contain implicature based on locution forces which can be classified into assertive, directive, expressive, and commissive. Verbal interactions occur in a learning process (Kusumah, 2019), showing the speakers' interconnection (Alwi, 1993). Hence, communication is concerned with the critical aspect of interaction, which is humanistic (Guifoos et al., 2009) as an engine that creates a harmonious relation to producing maximal performances (Boero et al., 2016).

The focus of this study was directive speech act politeness at the time of interpersonal interactions in a *pediksaan* (inauguration of Balinese Hindu priests) ritual` directive speech act politeness was selected because, in directive speech act, there are 29 sub-speech acts that require the use of language politeness. This is caused by the fact that the directive sub-speech acts such as ordering, advising, suggesting begging, warning, reprimanding, scolding, driving out, and

---

\* Corresponding Author.

prohibiting need a politeness approach in their performances to avoid hurting the feeling of the interlocutor and directive speech act is one of the most frequent speech acts used in everyday interactions, especially in the *pediksaan* ritual condition. *Pediksaan* is naturally a self-purification (Donder, 2008; Subagiasta, 2007; Titib, 2007). In the context of politeness and an increase in spirituality, it is not only related to the aspects of behavior and thought but also to the aspect of speaking as stated in the teaching of *Sthitaprajna* in Bhagawadgita II.54 as follows.

*Shitaprajnasya ka bhasa samadhisthasya Kesawa/Stihitaadhih kim prabhaseta kim asita vrajeta kim//  
Bhagawadgita II.54.*

The excerpt above indicates the characteristic of *Shitaprajna*, who intensively performs *samadhi*. It is how he speaks, sits, and moves, including his linguistic expressions (Aderson & Lepore, 2013; Kennedy, 2002). This shows that a person who has been purified (in the *pediksaan* ritual) must be polite in thinking, behaving, and speaking. This is related to the behavior of speaking as social discourse practice (Kasper, 2011). Linguistic behavior is ideally related to age; the older a person, the more polite he or she is (E. Aziz & Aminudin, 2003; Horvath, 1985). *Diksa* is the manifestation of the *Dharma* teaching, as mentioned in *Virhaspati Tattwa* 25, which becomes everybody's obligation. In this case, *Dharma* manifests in seven acts: *silā, yajna, tapa, dana, pravṛjya, diksa,* and *yoga*. If a person was not purified through the *diksa* ritual during his or her life (*sekala*) after his or her death, his or her spirit will be purified at the cremation ceremony (*niskala*), which is called *ngaskara* ritual coming from the word *samskara* (Sanskrit) which means self-purification (Titib, 2007).

A speech act is an important topic in pragmatics and sociopragmatics. A directive speech act is a speech act intended by its speaker for the interlocutor to do an act that complies with what is mentioned in the speaker's utterance. To meet this, the speech act must be performed politely to address the interlocutor's feelings (Aziz, 2006). A directive speech act is a speech act that tries to influence the interlocutor to perform an act. In line with Yule (2002), a directive speech act is the type of speech act a speaker uses to order others to do something. This type of speech act states what becomes the desire of the speaker. Levinson (1983) states that the directive speech act is the speech act that encourages the interlocutor to do something, for example, proposing, begging, urging, challenging, ordering, and the like. Briefly, the speech act can "order" the interlocutor to perform an act, both verbally and nonverbally.

Politeness in the directive speech act is very important since the directive speech act is persuasive in character. With the presence of language politeness in directive speeches, it is expected that the interlocutor is not hurt or does not feel harmed. The *pediksaan* ritual, starting from the plan, the process of the event, or at the time of ritual, needs polite language, especially that which is concerned with directive speech act that is more often used for ordering. Thus, success in language politeness in directive speech act in the interactional function of language that expresses social relations and personal attitude (Ekawati, 2017).

Choice of words (diction) in language politeness must be considered when viewed from the situation, condition, and generation. Generation here means the age level of the speaker and interlocutor, the diction used also differs according to the age level. This conforms to Aziz (2003) and Eckert (1997) that change in a person's language use behavior phenomenon parallels his or her age. However, it is not uncommon for people who are adults or even old to behave like little children. In this case, the directive speech act, moreover the direct one, needs to be performed using language politeness, manifested by selecting dictions (Kuntarno, 2018).

Balinese is one of the variations of languages in the Austronesian language group. The use of Balinese itself can only be seen in Bali, and its spread to the areas outside Bali is very limited. The use of high-level Balinese is needed for certain situations, such as when speaking with strangers, the one with the high cast, or a priest.

Nugroho (2018) stated that the directive speech act is comprised of 29 sub-speech acts: which include ordering, advising, asking for permission, permitting, examining, asking for blessings, proposing, reminding, arbitrating, forcing, seducing, challenging, suggesting, begging, swearing, recommending, reminding, advocating, expecting, inviting, urging, interrupting, reprimanding, scolding, demanding someone to fulfill his or her obligation, persuading, welcoming, driving away, and prohibiting.

Polite language is a variation that keeps the interlocutor's feelings (Pranowo, 2009). In other words, language politeness emphasizes social values, social norms, and paying respect to others' feelings than one's own (Matsumoto, 1988). The forms of polite speech of directive speech acts can occur in speeches such as in the *Geriya Mas Kayuputih* environment. One of them is the following act.

Mother: *Gus Tu, tolong buka gerbangnya! Ada yang datang* (Gus Tu, please open the gate! Someone is coming).

A mother's speech was addressed to her child when welcoming a guest to *geriya* (a *brahmana* cast home). The child immediately does what his mother ordered him to do: open the gate. In the speech, the mother asked her child to open the gate of their house. In this speech, there is a directive speech act of "ordering". The sentence "*Gus Tu, buka gerbangnya*" is the linguistic marker of the directive speech act of ordering. The language politeness is seen in using the word "*tolong*". With this word, the interlocutor does not feel burdened to do what the speaker wants him or her to do. The example above was the speech act of order that was found to be used in a *geriya*. In *geriya*, politeness in speech is mandatory. Ida Pedanda Istri Mas says that from day to day and from generation to generation, language politeness is dwindling and fading with time.

The problems investigated in this study were: 1) what are the types of politeness of directive speech acts in the *pediksaan* ritual? 2) What are the forms of politeness of directive speech act in the *pediksaan* ritual? And 3) how is the directive speech act politeness applied in the *pediksaan* ritual?

## II. METHOD

This study used the design of a descriptive qualitative approach. The qualitative approach was employed to describe Balinese and Indonesian directive speech act politeness in the interpersonal interactions in the *pediksaan* ritual. The population consisted of the participants involved in speeches in the *pediksaan* ritual. The population was directly used as the sample of the study. The data were verbal as primary data in directive speech act politeness. The data came from the communication interactions among the speakers in the *pediksaan* ritual collected through a verbal recording process. The verbal data that came from video recordings were then described to obtain the needed data, namely, types and forms of directive speech acts, politeness, and gestures that might be important for the data as a whole. The data were sorted using the observation method with a recording technique inserted into a data card. The data card was used to record the context, dialog, form of speech, politeness principle used by the speaker, and type of language politeness. The data that had been collected were analyzed using a descriptive qualitative analysis technique.

## III. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

### A. Types of Directive Speech Act Politeness in the *Pediksaan* Ritual

As has been stated in the theory part, there were two types of politeness investigated based on the opinion of Agustini (2017), namely (1) linguistic politeness, which covers diction, intonation, and structure, and (2) pragmatic politeness.

#### (a). Diction Politeness

Diction (word choice) determines whether a speech is polite or not. The following shows the finding of speeches that are polite and those that are not that is related to diction.

Speech data:

(1) *Menjadi sulinggih siapapun boleh, tetapi melalui prosedur mekanisme Parisada dong.* (Becoming a high priest, anyone can, but it is through the *Parisada* mechanism procedure, isn't it?)

Data Context:

Speech (1) was spoken by a priest to the participants of a ritual of a series of events of a *pediksaan* in Geriya Amara Sari Seraya, Mataram.

Analysis:

According to the Indonesian Big Dictionary (2023), the word *dong* is usually used at the end of a sentence to give a sweetening or softening effect. Thus, speech (1) is felt to be more polite since it uses the word *dong* at the end of the sentence.

Speech Data:

(2) *Boleh sulinggih yang lain, boleh.*

Data Context: the same as above.

Analysis:

Unlike speech (1), speech (2) seems less polite, especially when the speaker is speaking in a formal situation. This is marked by using the question word at the beginning of the sentence without the particle *kah*, namely the word *Boleh*. It would feel more polite if it used the question word *boleh* plus the particle *kah* when asking questions. Hence the sentence is more polite. So it becomes *Bolehkah sulinggih yang lain?*

#### (b). Intonation Politeness

Intonation has a very much effect on the impression that it arises on the interlocutor. The speech will sound polite when the speaker speaks softly as a reflection that he or she can control his or her feeling or emotion when communicating with others. On the contrary, a speaker who speaks with a high tone while his or her interlocutor is at a short distance will give the impression that the speaker cannot speak politely.

Speech Data:

(3) *Menjadi sulinggih siapapun boleh, tetapi melalu prosedur mekanisme Pari- sadha dong* (Becoming a high priest, anyone can, but it is through the *Parisada* mechanism procedure, isn't it?)

(4) *Kalau misalnya mau dewe, ya ndah usah Lembaga Parisadha dong* (If for example you want it by yourself, right, no need for *Parisadha* institution, isn't it?)

(5) *Saya mewakili guru saya, boleh?* (I represent my father, may I?)

Data Context:

Speeches (4) and (5) were spoken by a priest to the participants at the time of a *pediksaan* series of rituals at *Geriyas Amerta Sari Seraya, Mataram*, with some emotion since there was an impression that the series of rituals of *pediksaan* was doubted when they were performed virtually.

Analysis:

Speech (3) was expressed with a flat intonation and softly so that the speaker gave a polite impression. Different from speeches (3), speeches (4) and 5) were spoken with a rather high tone and strongly so that they gave the impression that the speakers were less polite.

### (c). *Structure of Politeness*

In communication, many ways can be selected to deliver a message, which can be considered polite. One can view language politeness from the structure of the sentences used in addition to the politeness principle. Sentence politeness, according to Chaer (2010), covers (1) the length of speech, (2) the indirectness of speech, and (3) the use of declarative or interrogative sentences in giving an order.

A speech can become polite when it becomes longer. In general, Indonesians want longer speech forms. This is related to the attitude and culture of Indonesians, who prefer to use small talk in speaking. More specifically, the following are data that are related to that problem.

#### 1. *Length of Speech*

Speech Data

(6) Boleh begitu? (Can be like that?) (same as above)

(7) *Telpon dumun!* (call up first!)

Speech Context:

Speeches (6) and (7) were spoken by a priest to the participants of the *pediksaan* rituals at *Geriya Amerta Sari Seraya*, Mataram.

Analysis:

Speeches (6) and (7) above have an impression of being less polite since they are short; some words can be added, namely the question word *Apakah* to sentence (6), which is a question word of smoothing and the word *Tolong* (help) in a sentence (7). Hence, speeches (6) and (7) above will be more polite if each is changed into *Apakah boleh begitu?* (Can it be like that?); and *Tolong telepon dumun!* (Please call up first!)

#### 2. *Speech Indirectness*

One of the ways to make an expression or a sentence polite is by changing the sentence structure from a direct sentence structure to an indirect one. It is usually very easy to know the intention of the speaker who uses direct sentences, especially when they are imperative. On the contrary, the intention of the speaker who uses indirect imperative sentence structure is unclear, so the interlocutor does not feel that he or she is actually ordered or asked to do something that the speaker wants him or her to do. Based on the document record, the following sentences were found.

Speech Data

(8) *Siapa lagi yang menghormati kalau bukan kita?* (Who else give respect if not us?)

Speech Context

Speech (8) was spoken by a priest to the participants of the series of *pediksaan* rituals at *Geriya Amerta Sari Seraya*, Mataram.

Analysis:

Speech (8) belongs to indirect speech since it is a question sentence, but its content is a request. In this case, the speaker invites the interlocutor to pay respect to people worthy of respect. By using indirect speech, it is felt that the speaker is more polite than direct speech.

### B. *Pragmatic Politeness*

It is difficult to differentiate between pragmatic politeness and linguistic politeness. The speaker's effort to comply with the prevailing norms in society is part of pragmatic politeness. Pragmatic politeness is more related to norms/ethics that prevail in a society following the sociocultural of the community. This pragmatic politeness will strengthen linguistic politeness. Refined words/dictions as honorific forms will change the interlocutor's perception from positive to negative, such as when pragmatic politeness does not support it, such as by showing a frowning expression.

As far as the data that could be collected are concerned, no data of pragmatic politeness can be found. This seems to be caused by some factors, namely (1) the priest's and the committee members' speeches were dominated by monologues rather than dialogues; (2) the ritual that was covered was only one in a series of *pediksaan* rituals called *Resi Ghana* ritual, the preparation of *pediksaan* ritual.

From the data analysis above, it can be concluded that in the context of linguistic politeness, it seems that speeches can be differentiated into two types: polite and less polite. Linguistically, in line with the theory put forward by Agustini (2017), linguistic politeness covers diction, intonation, and structure. The results of this study are partially supported by the finding in Dahlan (2014) that the structures of polite Indonesian sentences of the students found were long and short sentence structures, direct and indirect speeches, speech series, and expressions that mark the politeness of Indonesian speeches.

Some possible factors might cause impoliteness in the series of *pediksaan* rituals above; *first*, the speakers do not know the politeness rules that must be obeyed when speaking, especially to speak in a directive form. *Secondly*, the

speaker is not aware or is disappointed since there is an event or phenomenon he or she dislikes. Fourth, the habit of using certain dictions that I am actually less polite.

(a). *Forms of Politeness of Directive Speech Act*

The forms of politeness of directive speech act refer to the form of politeness and the form of directive speech act. The forms of politeness related to the directive speech act are described below. Tact Maxim states that when speaking, the speaker should adhere to the principle of always making others' losses as small as possible and maximizing the profit of others; Generosity Maxim states that the speaker is expected to be able to reduce his or her profit and make his or her profit as small as possible; Approbation Maxim that states that a person can be regarded to be polite when in speaking he or she always tries to give respect to others; Modesty Maxim that states that speech participants are expected to show modesty by minimizing praises for himself or herself; Agreement Maxim that states that speech participants can develop compatibility or agreement in the speech activities; and Sympathy Maxim that states that speech participants can maximize sympathy attitude between one party and another party.

Meanwhile, a directive speech act is a speech act that encourages the hearer to do something. A directive speech act aims to make the interlocutor be at peace and do an action like what was expressed by the speaker. This speech act needs a good form of politeness for the interlocutor to feel at ease, with no impression of being forced or looked down upon. The forms of directive speech act should be compatible with the rule and social position of the interlocutor so that there will be no misunderstanding that can trigger a conflict, for instance, ordering, asking someone to do something, asking a question, begging, ordering, suggesting, recommending and inviting.

The forms of directive speech act politeness can be described as shown in the following data quotations.

1. *Maxim of Agreement that Suggests Something*

- (9) Committee: *Mangku Giri di atas itu, di sana deketin. Mangku Giri di sana, di atas belum.* (Mangku Giri upstairs, there come close to him there, upstairs not yet)  
Mangku: *"Sudah-sudah."* (already)

Analysis:

Data (9) is a conversation between the committee member as the guide of the event and Mangku as the person in charge of the event. The committee member talked to Mangku by his nickname since the speech participant had a close relationship with him and could develop a harmonious relationship in the speech activity. This speech shows an agreement between the speaker and the interlocutor in the form of suggesting "*di sana dekati* (there, come close)" but still maintained politeness. Leech (1993) stated that in the agreement maxim, the speech participants can develop compatibility or an agreement with each other in the speech activity. In addition, there is closeness between the speaker and the interlocutor so that the communication is fluent. This is supported by Yule (2002), who stated that language politeness is influenced by some factors, including social distance and intimacy factor between a person and others, so other factors such as culture, age, and social status also influence one's politeness in speaking. With this intimacy factor, speech participants feel very close and are friendly with each other. Lakoff (1980) stated that the scale of solidarity or equality shows that to be polite, a person has to be friendly and always maintain a friendship with each other. To achieve this intention, speakers have to be able to regard the interlocutors as their friends.

2. *Sympathy Maxim of Prescribing*

- (10) Priest: *"Wusan sanggar dana wau ajengan, raris tegen-tegan, raris ajengan caru, raris purwa daksina."* (After *sanggar dana*, the next activity is "*ajengan*", then "*tegan-tegan*". Then *ajengan caru*" then "*purwa daksina*")  
Committee member: *"Sampun"* (All has already been done).

Analysis

The data above was a conversation between a priest as the event's guide and the committee member as the event implementer. The priest asked the committee member in polite language with a flat tone and a polite attitude. These speeches show that the speaker and the interlocutor have sympathetic attitudes in speaking. This conforms to Leech's rule of politeness principle (1990), which states that in the sympathy maxim, the speech participants can maximize the sympathy attitude between one party and another. In addition, the speaker did not use a tone with the impression of forcing in expressing his instruction. This is in line with the requirement to fulfill politeness in speaking as is put forward by Lakoff (1973), that is, the scale of formality, that in order for the speech participants can feel at ease in the speech activity, the speech used should not have a forced tone and should not give an arrogant impression.

3. *Sympathy Maxim of Instructing*

- (11) Priest: *"Ampunang dari belakang, nanti susah, di depan niki manten, langsung ke luar di aruh sebelah kiri* (Not from the back, Later it will be difficult, just from the front, directly go out, put it on the left)  
Committee member: *"Sampun sami?"* (All is done?)  
Priest: *"Melinggih-melinggih!"* (Please sit down)!

Analysis:

The data above was a conversation between a priest as the event's guide and a committee member as the implementer. The priest instructed the committee member in a polite language, flat tone, and polite attitude. These speeches show that the speaker and the interlocutor shared sympathy attitudes in speaking. This conforms with Leech's politeness principle maxim (1990), which states that in the sympathy maxim, the speech participants can maximize the sympathy attitude between one party and another. In addition, the speakers do not use a tone that has a forced impression in expressing the instruction. This conforms to the requirement for politeness in speaking as stated by Lakoff (1973), that is, a formality scale that speech participants can feel at ease and comfortable in the speech activity, the speech used should not have a forced tone, and it should not have an arrogant impression.

### C. Directive Speech Act Politeness Principle in Pediksaan Ritual

The politeness principle used as the basis of analysis in this study refers to Leech's (1990) politeness principles. There are three politeness principles found to be applied in this study, namely (1) the politeness principle that applies the tact maxim, (2) the politeness principle that applies the approbation maxim, and (3) the politeness principle that applies the sympathy maxim.

#### (a). Tact Maxim

Every speech participant has to minimize loss for others or maximize profit for others. In Tact Maxim, there is a tendency for the speaker that holds this maxim strongly is judged to be able to avoid enviousness and other attitudes that are usually considered less polite. In the tact maxim, there is a tendency that the longer someone's speech (usually accompanied by an explanation), the greater the person's desire to behave politely toward his speech partner.

##### Speech Data

(12) *Di sinilah kita umat Hindu kan masalah rasa ya. Begini kita itu, kalau rasa ndak nyambung, tidak pede sembahyangnya, ya.* (It is here we the Hindus, our problem is feeling, yes. This way we are, if the feeling does not connect, we are not confident in prayer, yes)

##### Speech Context:

This speech was spoken by Ida Pedanda Gede Kerta Arsa (a priest) to all Hindu followers who witnessed the series of *Pediksaan* rituals at Geriya Amerta Sari Seraya, Mataram.

##### Analysis:

Speech (12) was spoken by Ida Pedanda when explaining the nature of *the pediksaan* ritual. If we examine it from the series of his speech, the data is a directive speech of advising. In that context, Ida Pedanda (Priest) gave a speech to the audience, in this case, all Hindu followers who were witnessing that virtual ritual, to return to the main principle underlying the Hindu belief that it is a problem of feeling. This speech from Ida Pedanda was strengthened by the presence of the sentence *Di sinilah kita umat Hindu kan masalah rasa ya* (It is here we, the Hindus, our problem is feeling, right) followed by a sentence that explains it, that is, *Begini kita itu, kalau rasa ndak nyambung, ndak pede sembahyangnya ya* (if the feeling does not connect, we are not confident in prayer, right). The statement applies the Tact Maxim to eliminate doubt and profit Hindu followers outside Bali Island who could keep performing the *padiksan* rituals through the virtual media.

##### Speech Data

(13) *Parisadha Lembaga umat kita. Lembaga tertinggi umat Hindu. Siapa lagi yang menghormati kalau bukan kita* (Parisadha is our institution. Hindu highest institution. Who else will respect if we do not)

##### Speech Context:

This speech was spoken by Ida Pedanda Gede Kerta Arsa (a priest) when explaining something related to *Pediksaan* regulation to all Hindu followers who witnessed the series of *Pediksaan* rituals in Geriya Amerta Sari Seraya, Mataram.

##### Analysis:

Speech (13) was spoken by Ida Pedanda when explaining the requirement set by PHDI institutions when someone wants to become a *sulinggih* or priest. Let's examine it from the series of the speech. The data is a directive speech of advising aimed at respecting *Parisadha* as in the statement, "*Siapa lagi yang menghormati kalau bukan kita*" (who else will respect if we do not). In this context, Ida Pedanda also reminded the audience, in this case, all Hindus who witnessed the virtual ritual, that the highest Hindu institution is *Parisadha Hindu Dharma Indonesia* (PHDI). Data 13 refers to the application of the Tact Maxim shown to maximize the service and profit for all Hindus since the ritual has followed the highest Hindu institution's regulation.

##### Speech Data

(14) *Menjadi seorang rohaniawan harus minimal keputusan Parisadha 40 tahun ke atas, Inilah pelajaran bagi umat Hindu, jangan /// menjadi sulinggih* (To become a priest one has to be at least, according to Parisadha decision, 40 years old. This is the lesson for the Hindu followers do not /// become a priest)

##### Speech Context:

Speech (14) was spoken by Ida Pedanda when explaining the requirement that was set by the PHDI institution. When someone wants to be a priest, one of the requirements is that the person has to be above 40 years old. The speech is a directive speech of advising aimed at learning from some cases of wanting to become a priest before 40 years old through the statement "*Inilah pelajaran bagi umat Hindu*" (This is the lesson for the Hindu followers). Ida Pedanda, in this context, also used directive speech act of prohibiting, that is, prohibiting Hindu followers who have not met the

requirement (not yet 40 years old) to become a priest, as shown in the statement "*Jangan menjadi sulinggih*" (do not become a priest). Data 14 refers to the application of Tact Maxim as shown to maximize the service and profit for all Hindu followers since the ritual has met the highest Hindu institution's regulation.

Speech Data

(15) *Dilaksanakan di sini prosesinya, kenapa? Karena tidak boleh tidak permisi pada leluhur. Kita umat Hindu apapun yang dikerjakan tanpa restu orang tua / leluhur kita tidak akan ketemu apa-apa.* (Performed here the procession, why? Since we have to ask permission to our ancestors. We Hindu followers whatever we do without the blessings of our parents/ancestors will not meet anything).

Speech Context:

The speech was spoken by Ida Pedanda Gede Kerta Arsa (a priest) when explaining something related to a series of *pediksaan* rituals to all Hindu followers who witnessed the ritual at Geriya Amerta Sari Seraya Mataram.

Analysis:

Speech (15) was spoken by Ida Pedanda Gede Kerta Arsa when explaining why the series of processions were performed in Mataram, not in Bandung. This was because the *nabe* (teacher) of the priest candidate lived in Mataram; if this is related to the context of the speech, a student (a priest candidate) has to ask permission and the blessings of his parents (*nabe*). The speech is a directive speech that makes it a must for a person who will become a priest to ask permission first and blessings, which are strengthened by the statement "*karena tidak boleh tidak permisi pada leluhur*" (since it is not allowed without asking permission to the ancestors). Ida Pedanda, in this context, also used directive speech act of reminding, that is, reminding the Hindu followers to always ask for blessings from the ancestors or parents when doing something, as shown in the statement "*Kita umat Hindu apapun yang dikerjakan tanpa restu orang tua/leluhur kita ndak akan ketemu apa-apa*" (We Hindu followers whatever we do without the blessings of our parents/ancestors will not meet anything). Data 15 refers to the application of the Tact Maxim as shown for the profit for the audience, in this case, all the Hindu followers, since there is the wisdom that if blessings from the ancestors and parents have preceded an activity, it will be successful.

#### (b). *Approbation Maxim*

The approbation maxim explains that we can regard a person as polite when in speaking, he or she tries to give appreciation to others. In this maxim, a speaker is obliged to minimize respect toward himself or herself and maximize it toward others.

Speech Data:

(16) *Umat meminta untuk nabe saya itu buatkan tirta karena beliau di Lombok, beliau sudah ga bisa, tenaganya sudah tidak mampu. Diwakilkan sama saya, anaknya sekaligus sisianya.* (People request my teacher to make tirta since he is in Lombok, he cannot, he is weak. He represents to me, his child and at the same time his student.).

Speech Context:

This speech was spoken by Ida Pedanda Gede Kerta Arsa (a priest) when explaining the chronology of the request from the people until he was asked by his teacher (*nabe*) to perform a series of *Pediksaan* rituals.

Analysis:

Data (16), when analyzed comprehensively, was an indirect speech that refers to the directive speech act of asking permission. Ida Pedanda indirectly asked permission from *nabe* (a teacher), who had given him the mandate to lead a series of *pediksaan* rituals. The politeness principle in the form of the approbation maxim is shown by the statement "*anaknya sekaligus sisianya saya*" (his child and, at the same time, his student) as the form of appreciation and respect of a student to a teacher. In addition to giving an appreciation to *the nabe*, *the statement of Ida Pedanda in speech (16)* also manifests as the maximizing of respect from a priest to his people who need protection and guidance.

#### (c). *Sympathy Maxim*

Speech participants' sympathy maxim is expected to maximize sympathy attitudes toward one another. Antipathy attitude toward a speech participant can be taken as an impolite act. To explain the application of the politeness principle to the sympathy maxim, data (11) and (16) are presented once again.

Speech Data:

(11) Priest: "*Ampunang dari belakang, nanti susah, di depan niki manten, langsung ke luar di aruh sebelah kiri* (Not from the back, Later it will be difficult, just from the front, directly go out, put it on the left)

Committee member: "*Sampun sami?* (All is done?)

Priest: "*Melinggih-melinggih!*" (Please sit down!)

(16) *Umat meminta untuk nabe saya itu buatkan tirta karena beliau di Lombok, beliau sudah ga bisa, tenaganya sudah tidak mampu. Diwakilkan sama saya, anaknya sekaligus sisianya.* (People request my teacher to make tirta since he is in Lombok, he cannot, he is weak. He represents to me, his child and at the same time his student.).

Data (11) and (16) refer to the directive speech act of prohibiting and asking permission. The politeness Principle in Approbation Maxim in data (11) is shown by the statement "*nanti susah, di depan niki manten*" (Later, it will be difficult, just from the front). The statement functions as the form of the priest's sympathetic attitude toward the

committee who helped him (*pengayah ida*), who prohibited starting the series of rituals from the back since it was considered more difficult. Meanwhile, the application of the politeness principle of sympathy maxim to data (16) is shown by the statement of the priest, "*Beliau sudah ndak bisa, tenaganya sudah ndak mampu*" (*He cannot, he is weak*). This statement is a form of sympathy toward the condition of his teacher, who is old and implicitly asking permission to represent serving people.

Based on the result of the data analysis described above, there were three principles of directive speech act politeness in the *pediksaan* ritual, namely (1) the politeness principle that applies the tact maxim, (2) the politeness principle that applies the approbation maxim and (3) the politeness principle that applies sympathy maxim. From the three politeness principles, data supported mostly the politeness principle that applies tact maxim (4 data), which occurred in the directive speech act of advising, reminding, obliging, and prohibiting. The politeness that applies the sympathy maxim was supported by two data that occurred in the directive speech act of prohibiting and asking permission. The politeness that applies the approbation maxim was only supported by 1 data of directive speech act of asking permission. The main politeness principle that was mostly found in the application of the tact maxim was closely related to the characteristic of data that came from speeches in the series of processions of the *pediksaan* ritual. Speeches in this *Pediksaan* ritual mostly came from the speeches of Ida Pedanda Gede Kerta Arsa, whose position was *nabe* (teacher) of the priest candidate who was going to be ordained. According to the result of Paruman Sulinggih Parisada Hindu Dharma Indonesia of Bali Province from 1990 to 1998 (2000), the most outstanding requirement to become a *nabe* is that the candidate must be calm and wise. The findings of the politeness principles that are dominated by the application of the tact maxim align with the position of the priest as a *nabe* who is required to prioritize the interest and benefit of the people. This confirms Leech's (1993) opinion that in tact maxim, there is a tendency for the speaker holds firm to the principle of minimizing loss for the interlocutor and maximizing profit for the interlocutor; in this context, the priest's speech act aimed to maximize profit for Hindu followers.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this study are as follows.

1. This study's types of directive speech act politeness were differentiated into linguistic and pragmatic politeness. Regarding linguistic politeness, it seems that speeches can be differentiated into two types: polite and less polite. Linguistically, whether a speech is polite can be seen from diction, intonation, and structure. As far as the data that have been collected, no data on programmatic politeness could be collected.
2. The form of directive speech act politeness in this study refers to the politeness form and the directive speech act form. Based on the references, the forms of politeness found are 1) agreement maxim of suggestion, 2) sympathy maxim of prescribing, and 3) sympathy maxim of instructing.
3. There are three politeness principles found to be applied in this study: (1) the politeness principle that applies the tact maxim, (2) the politeness principle that applies the approbation maxim, and (3) the politeness principle that applies the sympathy maxim.

This type of sociopragmatic study still needs investigation of other aspects, for example, measuring the politeness scale of groups of different people or in different domains and how politeness expressions differ from one culture to another. This kind of study will enrich the domains of sociopragmatics with its new findings.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Aderson, L., & Lepore, E. (2013). Slurring. *Word*, 47, 25–28.
- [2] Agustini, R. (2017). Bentuk kesantunan berbahasa Indonesia [Indonesian form of politeness]. *Literasi*, 1(1), 1–9.
- [3] Alwi, H. (1993). *Kebijakan pengembangan dan pembinaan bahasa dalam konteks transformasi budaya* [Language development and coaching policies in the context of cultural transformation]. Pusat Bahasa Depdiknas.
- [4] Aziz, E. A. (2006). Realisasi pertuturan meminta maaf dan berterima kasih di kalangan penutur bahasa Indonesia: Sebuah kajian kesantunan berbahasa [Realization of speech of apologizing and thanking Indonesian speakers: A study of language politeness]. *Jurnal Linguistika Wahana Pengembang Cakrawala Linguistik*, 13(25), 12–142.
- [5] Aziz, E., & Aminudin. (2003). Realisasi kesantunan berbahasa: Sebuah studi pragmatik pada para penutur bahasa Indonesia [Realization of language politeness: A pragmatic study of Indonesian speakers]. In *Pertemuan Linguistik Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya Atmajaya Keenam*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- [6] Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa. (2023). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* [Big Indonesian Dictionary]. Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia [Big Indonesian Dictionary]. <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- [7] Bagus, I. G. N. (2009). *Perubahan pemakaian bentuk hormat dalam masyarakat Bali* [Changes in the use of respectful forms in Balinese society]. Balai Bahasa.
- [8] Boero, L., Cello, M., Marchese, M., Mariconti, E., Naqas, T., & Zappatore, S. (2016). Statistical fingerprint based instruction detector system. *International Journal of Communication Systems*, 30(10), 1–11. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/dac.3225>
- [9] Boldyrevv, N. N., & Dubrovskaya, O. G. (2016). Sociocultural specificity of discourse: The interpretive approach to language use. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 236, 59–64.
- [10] Chaer, A. (2010). *Kesantunan berbahasa* [Language politeness]. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- [11] Dahlan, M. H. (2014). *Analisis kesantunan berbahasa indonesia siswa kelas XI SMK Negeri 1 kabupaten Sudebreng Rappang*

- [Analysis of politeness in Indonesian for class XI students of SMK Negeri 1 Sudeureng Rappang Regency]. Tesis Mahasiswa Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Makassar.
- [12] Donder, I. K. (2008). *Teologi memasuki gerbang ilmu pengetahuan ilmiah tentang Tuhan paradigma sanatadharma* [Theology enters the gates of scientific knowledge about God in the sanata dharma paradigm]. Paramita.
- [13] Ekawati, M. (2017). Kesantunan semu pada tindak tutur ekspresif marah dalam bahasa Indonesia dalam adabiyajat [Pseudo politeness in expressive speech acts of anger in Indonesian in adabiyajat]. In *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra (Vol. 1, pp. 1 – 22)*. Fakultas Adab dan Ilmu Budaya Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga.
- [14] Geoffrey, L. (1993). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Guifoos, T., Miao, H., Traandafir, S., & Uchida, E. (2009). Social learning and communication with threshold uncertainty. *Elsevier: Resource and Energy Economics Journal*, 55, 81–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco>.
- [16] Haryati, S. (2001). *Implikatur percakapan dalam prosa fiksi bahasa Inggris: Suatu kajian pragmatik* [Conversational implicature in English fiction prose: A pragmatic study]. Program Pascasarjana UNS.
- [17] Horvath, B. M. (1985). *Variation in Australian English: The sociolects*. CUP.
- [18] Imai, M., Kanero, J., & Masuda, T. (2016). The relation between language, culture, and thought. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 70–77. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2015.10.011>
- [19] Kasper, G. (2011). Locating politeness in interaction. *Jurnal Ilmiah MLI*, 29(1), 1–17.
- [20] Kennedy, R. (2002). *Nigger: The strange career of a troublesome word*. Ventage Books.
- [21] Krennmayr, T. (2015). What corpus linguistics can tell us about metaphor use in newspaper texts. *Journalism Studies*, 16(4), 530–546. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670x.2014>
- [22] Kusumah, Y. S. (2019). *Enhancing teachers teaching competency*. School of Postgraduate Studies UPI.
- [23] Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press.
- [24] Lakoff, R. T. (1973). The Logic of Politeness: Minding Your P's and Q's. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292–305.
- [25] Leech, G. N. (1990). *Semantics: The study of meaning*. Penguin Books.
- [26] Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [27] Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the university of face: Politeness phenomena in Javanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12(4), 403.
- [28] Pranowo. (2009). *Kesantunan berbahasa tokoh masyarakat ditinjau dari aspek pragmatik* [Politeness in the language of community leaders is seen from a pragmatic aspect]. FKIP Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- [29] Rahardi, K. (2017). Linguistic impoliteness in the sociopragmatic perspective. *Jurnal Humaniora*, 29(3), 309–315.
- [30] Rasna, I. W. (2017). *Representasi bentuk tuturan gugu yang memotivasi siswa belajar: Kajian psikolinguistik pendidikan pada siswa SMA dan SMK di kota Singaraja* [Representation of gugu speech forms that motivate students to learn: Psycholinguistic study of education on high sc]. LP2M.
- [31] Rasna, I. W. (2018). *Bentuk tuturan guru sebagai komunikasi pendidikan dan efeknya terhadap kualitas belajar: Kajian linguistik pendidikan pada siswa SMA dan SMK di kota Singaraja* [The form of teacher speech as educational communication and its effect on the quality of learni]. LP2M.
- [32] Rasna, I. W. (2019). A creative construction model of language acquisition in linguistic politeness for elementary school children. *1st International Conference on Innovation in Education (IcoIE 2018): Atlantis Press*, 178(4), 265–268. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoie-18.2019.60>
- [33] Subagiasta. (2007). *Pelaksanaan diksa bagi umat Hindu sebagai upaya penyucian diri lahir batin dalam diksa pentu menapaki jalan rohani* [Implementation of diksa for Hindus as an effort to purify oneself physically and spiritually in diksa is necessary to tread the spiritual pa]. Paramita.
- [34] Suwija, I. N. (2019). Tingkat-tingkatan bicara bahasa Bali: Dampak anggah-ungguh kruna [Balinese speech levels: The grammatical impact of sentences]. *Sosiohumaniora - Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 21(1), 90–97.
- [35] Titib, I. M. (2007). *Rajavidya yoga landasan isoterik seorang pandita dalam diksa pintu menapaki jalan rohani* [Rajavidya yoga isoteric foundation of a pandita in the door diksa treading the spiritual path]. Paramita.
- [36] Tsai, I. I.-Y. (2019). The effect of peer collaboration-based learning on enhancing English oral communication proficiency in mice in journal of hospitality. *Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 24, 38–49. <https://doi.org>
- [37] Yule, G. (2002). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.



**I Wayan Rasna** is a linguistics professor at the Ganesha University of Education. He has 35 years of experience conducting research and community service focusing on linguistics, especially those related to educational linguistics, anthropological linguistics, and education in cultural contexts.



**I Nengah Suandi** was born in Klungkung on December 31, 1956. Undergraduate education was completed at the Department of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Udayana University in 1982; Masters degree at Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta in 1997; and S3 at Udayana University in 2007. He was appointed professor in 2010 in the field of linguistics. Before becoming a lecturer at the Ganesha University of Education, he was an honorary lecturer at the IKIP PGRI Denpasar in 1983-1985. Currently serving as a permanent lecturer at the Department of Language, Indonesian Literature and Regional Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, University of Education of Ganesha with tutoring of several courses, such as general courses on Indonesian and Tri Hita Karana; Sociolinguistics; Research methods; Indonesian Error Analysis (all undergraduate programs); Sociopragmatics; Recent Linguistic Developments; Research methods; Indonesian Language Problems (all Undiksha Postgraduate programs). The positions he has held include Secretary for the Diploma Program at the Singaraja State IKIP; Head of the STKIP Singaraja Field Experience Program; Head of Education and Teaching Journal of IKIP Negeri Singaraja; Secretary of the Undiksha Research Institute; Head of the Language Education Study Program (S2 and S3) Undiksha Postgraduate Program; Head of the Undiksha Research and Community Service Institute. The textbooks that have been compiled are Indonesian Language Skills Oriented to National Integration and Social Harmony (2011); and Sociolinguistics (2014).



**Ida Bagus Putrayasa** is a professor at the Ganesha University of Education in Singaraja, Bali. He completed his doctoral degree at the Indonesian University of Education, Bandung (1998-2001), and earned a professorship on October 1, 2004. Currently he is active in various academic activities, such as teaching in the Undergraduate, Masters and Doctoral Programs at Undiksha Singaraja. Some of his books include: Indonesian: Theory and Application (2010), Morphological Studies: Derivational and Inflectional Forms (2010), Types of Sentences in Indonesian (2012), Learning Foundation (2013), Effective Sentences: Structure, Diction, and Logic (2014), Sentence Analysis: Functions, Categories, and Roles (2014), Pragmatics (2014), Indonesian Sentence Grammar (2016), Syntax: Understanding Single Sentences (2017), Learning Evaluation (2018), Grammar of Language Elementary School Indonesia (2019), Myself: K-13 Thematic Books Filled with Ecoliteracy (2020), Latest Linguistic Developments (2022), Sociopragmatics (2022), Flexible Learning and Character Education (2022), and Sentence Structures Filled with Character Education Values (2022).



**I Ketut Paramarta** is a lecturer at the Balinese Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Ganesha University of Education. He completed his undergraduate study in Balinese Language and Literature at Udayana University (2005), Masters in Linguistics at Udayana University (2009), and Doctor of Linguistics at Udayana University (2015). His research interests are studying the Balinese language from the perspective of comparative historical linguistics and sociolinguistics, and studying the Balinese writing system from a graphematics perspective. One of his recently published research results is "Types of Balinese Script Block Structure using Symbol Block Analysis" published in LINGUA CULTURA Vol. 17 No. 1 (2023).