

Politeness in Buginese Language as a Social Status Symbol in Wajo Regency

Haerany Halim

State University of Makassar, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Sjahruddin Kaseng

State University of Makassar, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Zainuddin Taha

State University of Makassar, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Akmal Hamsa

State University of Makassar, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Abstract—This study examined one aspect of qualitative-descriptive. It used the ethnography design of communication in the study of pragmatics. It explored in detail about the phenomenon in the context of real life. That is politeness in Buginese language related to social status in Wajo, including (1) the language devices used as a symbol of politeness; (2) politeness in Buginese language reflecting social status in Wajo. Words, phrases, clauses, sentences including diction are the language of data collected through direct observation and recording of the individual or group concerned. After that, the researchers analyzed the data through the five stages of data analysis procedures. They are transcription, reduction, interpretation, conclusion, and recommendations. The results of data analysis demonstrated that there is some language devices used as a symbol of politeness in Buginese language. They are honorific word meaning, second person singular pronouns, words, greetings, vocabulary as a symbol of politeness, speech in pragmatic meaning. Buginese speakers use these devices as part of a word, phrase, or sentence. The use of language devices in the speech as a symbol of politeness in Buginese language of Wajo is distinguished by social relations (position or social status). It is an evident that the politeness in Buginese language reflects the social status of the society in Wajo.

Index Terms—politeness, Buginese language, social status

I. INTRODUCTION

Politeness is very close in the Buginese life. Bugis Elders notice that the words that are the origins of human actions must demonstrate degrees. The message is contained in Bugis Lontarak and pronounced by children orally at specific times so that the children as the future inheritor do not say something to their fellow in interaction arbitrarily.

The commitment is manifested in words Sipakalebbi 'mutual respect,' sipakatau 'humanize each other,' sipakainge 'remind each other.' The series of the vocabulary shows that the social representation of the Bugis is paying attention to the harmony and politeness towards others in interaction. (Gusnawaty, 2011, p. 385).

The interaction is related to the relationship between the speakers (tau mabbicarae) and the listener (tau marengkalingae). Status related to the power is based on the parameters of age, occupation, education, economic level, gender, social strata, and social distance (solidarity) or level of familiarity. If someone puts herself in an interaction, she/he is a polite person. On the contrary, a person is rude if he/she cannot put herself in an interaction. It applies to anyone and in any situation, either formal or non-formal.

But, the reality now is when communicating, norms of language used and the social norms around it are not above begging again, including the issue of politeness language. A cultural shift began to occur. Not uncommon when communicating, especially among young people (teenagers) community of Buginese, more use of speech is abusive, swear or do not like using a greeting when the mention of the name of the older people (only name), rather than speech.

Language Politeness in Pragmatic Assessment

According, Llamas, et al. (2007, p. 226) implies that politeness is a form of language analysis showing the obedience to the acceptance of a set of social and cultural principles that emphasize solidarity and social distance.

Based on the above definition, politeness can be seen from various aspects in daily life. First, Politeness shows attitudes containing the value of good manners or etiquette in daily life. Second, Politeness is very contextual. It means that it applies to people, places or certain situations, but it is not necessarily for other people, places, or situations. Third, Politeness has a bipolar relationship. Fourth, Politeness is reflected in how to dress, how to act, and how to speak. (Muslich, 2006).

The Politeness Theories

Robin Lakoff

Lakoff (1973) argues that there are three rules that must be adhered to if we want to speak politely. The rules are formality, hesitancy, and equality or camaraderie (Fasold, 1990, p.159).

Brown and Levinson

Brown and Levinson (1978), express that the theory of linguistic politeness is about the notion face, which is inspired from the work of Erving Goffman (1956). Goffman defines the concept of face as an idea or impression of someone who created the social contact with others. In his opinion, every participant in the social process needs to be appreciated by others and need freedom and not be disturbed. He mentions that the need to be appreciated is "positive face" and the need not to be disturbed "negative face." In addition, (Renkema, 1993, p. 13) states that the face of every person can be separated (lost), maintained, or enhanced (Rohaedi, 2009, p. 108).

The negative face refers to the self-image that every rational person desires that someone is appreciated by allowing her/him to act freely (Brown and Levinson, 1978). It is in line with the opinion of Yule (1996, p. 107) that the negative face is the need to be independent, to have freedom of action, and not pressured by others. Furthermore, the same opinion is also expressed by Wardhaugh (2006, p.277) that the negative face is the desire to not be hindered by others to act. Brown and Levinson explain further that the negative face is a fundamental right to territory, personal protection, and the right not to be disturbed. (Wardhaugh, 2006, p.277 and Coulmas, 1997, p. 378).

The positive face is the opposite. Yule (1996, p. 107) argues that the positive face is the need for someone to be accepted, liked by others, treated as members of the same group and his desire is owned jointly with the others. It can be said that the positive face is the desire to gain approval from others (Wardhaugh, 2006, p.277). Brown and Levinson explain further that the positive face is positive suitability for self or "personality" (Wardhaugh, 2006, p. 277 and Coulmas, 1997, p. 378).

According to Brown and Levinson, a speech act can be a threat to face. It is called Face Threatening Act (FTA). Therefore, Brown and Levinson proposed three main strategies to perform speech acts. They are positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record. Positive politeness is to keep a positive face. The negative politeness is to keep the negative face. Off-record is avoidance of specific coercion.

Furthermore, Kasper (ed. Coulmas) (1997, p. 378) explains that politeness is an activity that is used to raise, maintain, or keep the face. It refers to the negative face sourced from negative politeness, shown in indirectness, formally emphasizing social distance, and respects the rights and interlocutor. Positive face explains the positive politeness shown in continuity, the use of informal language that emphasizes the common basics, respect for the interlocutor.

The strength of this approach is to try to explain politeness to gain more ideas about being a human (being rational and having a need for face) (Fasold, 1990, p. 161).

Geoffrey N. Leech

Leech (1983, p. 132) proposed a theory of politeness based on politeness principles, which are translated into some provisions. They are 1) tact maxim: minimize cost to other: maximize benefit to other, 2) generosity maxim: minimize benefit to self. Maximize cost to self, 3) approbation maxim: minimize dispraise of other. Maximize praise of other, 4) modesty maxim; minimize praise of self. Maximize dispraise of self, 5) agreement maxim: minimize disagreement self and other. Maximize agreement between self and other, 6) sympathy maxim: minimize antipathy between self and other. Maximize sympathy between self and other

The Scale of Politeness

Robin Lakoff

Robin Lakoff (1973) cited in (Chaer, 2010, p. 63) and (Rahardi, 2005, p. 70, 2009, p. 27), states three provisions for the fulfillment of politeness in speech. They are formality scale, hesitancy scale and equality scale.

Brown and Levinson

Brown and Levinson (1987) cited in Chaer (2010, p. 64) and Rahardi (2005, p. 68; 2009, p. 27) offer three ranking scale determinants of politeness for a speech. They are determined contextually, socially, and culturally. They consist of social distance, social status of speakers and interlocutor, and speech act

Leech

Leech (1983) provides five measuring scales for language politeness based on each interpersonal maxim. They are cost-benefit scale, optional scale, Indirectness scale, authority scale, and social distance scale. The Cost-Benefit scale is representing the cost or benefit of the act to speaker and listener. The optionally scale is indicating the degree of choice permitted to speaker and hearer by a specific linguistic act. The Indirectness scale is indicating the amount of inference required of the hearer in order to establish the intended speaker meaning. The authority scale is representing the status relationship between speaker and listener. The social distance scale is indicating the degree of familiarity between speaker and hearer.

Politeness in language cannot be separated from the study of pragmatics. The first thing that must be performed to understand the politeness in language, in the pragmatic study is to elaborate on the substance of pragmatics. Yule (1996, p. 3) mentions four definitions of pragmatic. First, pragmatic is a field that examines the meaning of the speaker. Second, it examines the meaning based on context. Third, it is a field that exceeds the study of the meaning of the uttered, examines the meanings communicated by a speaker. Fourth, it is a field that examines forms of expression by restricting social distance participants involved in a particular conversation. Kushartanti (2005, p. 104), argues that

pragmatic study about what is meant by language users when interacting. In short, pragmatic study the meaning influenced by things outside language. Leech (1985) defines pragmatics as the study of how utterances have meanings in the situation.

Speak politeness in Sociolinguistics Study

Politeness Speak as Part of Social-Cultural

Socio linguistic theory studies that also have relevance to the study of linguistic politeness is politeness in the socio-cultural perspective. Politeness cannot be separated from the cultural context. Their relationship is based on the theory of the relationship between language and culture. One is the theory of Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf. This view was later known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and commonly known as the language of relativity. In a highly controversial, hypothesis was stated that the language not only to determine the pattern of culture, but also determine the manner and nature of the human mind, thus affecting also to follow his or her (Saleh, 2009, p. 115).

Based on statements it can be concluded that a language plays an important role in the totality of culture and wide. If the language of culture and the way it affects the human mind, than the traits that exist in a language will be reflected in the attitudes and culture of native speakers. (Hudson, 1987).

Selection of the appropriate words for the benefit of social interaction is highly dependent on the culture in which the language was used and certainly very related to the use of polite language. By using polite language that can put someone on the spot he wanted, which is respectable. Alternatively in other words, politeness associated with "respect" for others. It could be said that politeness is the result of one's consideration to the feelings of others to show a special relationship and attitude towards others. Socio-cultural variables that may affect politeness such as, culture, identity, social class, gender, age, and ethnicity.

Politeness Speak as Part of Social Stratification

The relationship between the languages of social class can be traced through several linguistic variables, such as accent, dialect, honorifics. Accent and dialect are a regional variation and social variations. In addition, accent and dialect are also evidences of social information. It is also well expressed by Nababan that, in some languages, the differences between the social levels the speaker to the listener is manifested in the selection of words and / or morphological systems of particular words (Ohoiwutun, 1997, p. 87). Aspect such as language is called "politeness or etiquette to speak the language (Geertz, 1960). Furthermore, Ohoiwutun, 1997, p. 88) explains that languages differ in the complexity of systems manners speak, but all have it and are commonly expressed by a personal pronoun, the system greeting, use of titles, and so on. This illustrates the socio linguistic issues raised by Fishman (1972) that "who speak what language to Whom, when, and to end" At the end of the description describes the relationship of linguistic politeness, which is connected to the power status, and social distance (social distance / solidarity) among participants said. Based on the formula for measuring the facial disorders compiled by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 76):

$$W_x = D (S,H) + P (H,S) + R_x$$

Harris (2007, p. 123) concluded that the greater the degree of social distance and power between speaker and listener, the weight on the face disorder (FTR) is getting attached.

II. METHODOLOGY

This research was qualitative types of descriptive ethnography of communication based in the study of pragmatics that explore in detail about the phenomenon in the context of real life. Research Data obtained through observation and recording directly to an individual or group concerned. The result is focused on the explanation and interpretation of descriptive data of the research results.

The focus of this research was the Buginese language, politeness and Buginese community social status in this research so that the Wajo Regency is exercised four sub districts in Wajo Regency that Bola Sub district borders on Bone Regency, Pitumpanua sub district borders on the Luwu district of Tana Sitolo sub district, borders on Sidrap Regency and Tempe sub district was the center of Government in Wajo Regency so regarded could represent another sub.

The Data in this study include speech, such as words, phrases, clauses, or sentences spoken by the Buginese language speakers are distinguished based on age, gender, occupation, education, and the lineage with the proviso: the original buginese, good pronunciation, can_speak Buginese fluently, 20 to 60 years old, have a jobs, such as traders, farmers, workers, educated at least elementary school. Data sources in this study amount of 50 people. The 50 people are later seen from the age, occupation, and education. The following data sources in the research described in this table.

No	Data Source	Total
1	Ages 20-60	50
2	Occupation: a. Employee b. Dealer c. Farmer d. Lecture e. Driver f. Guard g. Tailor h. Salon Owner i. Workshop Owner j. Nurse k. Doctor l. Headman m. District	10 10 5 5 5 3 1 2 1 5 1 1 1
3	Education Elementary School Junior High School Senior High School Bachelor Degree Master	13 12 10 10 5

To obtain the necessary data in this study, researchers who act as the main instrument/key. Researchers directly observed and recorded in the field by using a recording device (tablet). The recording was done in such a way so as not to interfere with the conversation activities whether the researcher involved or not in the conversation. In addition, researchers also use the notes field so researcher digs deep the data against the Buginese language speakers. The recording field that records all data related to the research, both seen and listened.

After collected, the data is then analyzed through several phases of activity, such as do the transcription, that at this stage the use of recording language data routed to in the form of writing, the reduction, namely data that has been transcribed to be identified so they can be separated and reduced for easy analyzed, interpreted, that is, at this stage do the interpretation of the data has been reduced, concluded, based on data interpretations results, conclusion research findings taken, recommendations.

To get a valid research results, researchers doing trackbacks (triangulation). There are two forms of triangulation was done, namely (1) discussion (2) consultation with the three stages of triangulation, such as (1) triangulation data collected, (2) the triangulation of data analysis, and (3) the triangulation of findings. The third stages of the triangulation were done with colleagues as well as with community leaders who are fluent in Buginese and know well mannered of Buginese language.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Device-Device Language Used as Markers Politeness Speak Bugis

Based on this research, language devices are used as a marker of politeness in Bugis Wajo includes meaningful *klitik* [honorific], second person singular pronouns *idik*, said task, greetings, politeness marker's vocabulary, pragmatic and meaningful speech (indirect speech) . The following devices are described in detail.

Klitika Significant (Honorific)

Based on the results of research, tools of language that used as a marker of politeness Bugis-speaking in Wajo Regency covers *klitika*, personal pronouns single second person, such as task, greetings, marker of politeness vocabulary and meaningful speech pragmatics (speech is not directly). The following tools are described in detail.

The Bugis community Wajo recognizes some *klitika* to indicate a linguistic politeness formulae. The *klitika* is *proclitic ta-*, *enclitic -kik* (*mukik*), *enclitic -nik*, *enclitic - tak*, *enclitic manak* and *enclitic di* that attached at the beginning or at the end of a word.

Klitika			Tags	Description
Pronomina of first person	Pronomina of second person			
		-Honorific	+Honorific	
<i>Manak</i> (polite)			<i>Di</i>	Attached at the end
<i>-ak/-kak</i> (impolite)				Attached at the end
	<i>mu-</i>	<i>ta-</i>		Attached at the beginning
	<i>-ko</i>	<i>-kik</i> (<i>mukik</i>)		Attached at the end
	<i>-no</i>	<i>-nik</i>		Attached at the end
	<i>-mu</i>	<i>-tak</i>		Attached at the end

Proclitic *ta-*, enclitic *-kik* (*mukik*), enclitic *-nik*, enclitic *-tak*, it is *klitika* that serves as a constituent in the speech is that it refers to people who talk or act as principals. It could be said that *klitika* is greeting as the second person pronoun.

While *enclitic manak* is *klitika* that serves as a constituent at a speech referring to the speakers. It could be said that *klitika* is greeting as a first person pronoun. Users show a politeness formula language (polite).

- a. *Bingkakga tala, Pung Aji?*
'Do you take the cake bingka, Pung Aji?'
- b. *Agapi ualekkik?*
'What else should I give to you?'
- c. *Imonrinik tu.*
'You sit in the back happens.'
- d. *Engkaga pissetak?*
'Do you have a ginger?'
- e. *Mina, tapinrengeng manak cammittak!*
Mina, please lend me your mirror!

However, *pkh ta-*, *ekh-kik* (*mukik*), *ekh-nik*, and *ekh manak* on the modus imperative utterances serve to soften or soften the illocutionary power of speech so it is considered polite because it implies messenger / commands, which are indirect. That is, *-lah*, please, in English called please. Speakers expect orders / his behests were well received, with no forcing tone, without causing offense hearer using the *klitika-klitika* alternatively, it could be said, the speaker tried to get on good terms. This is in line with the opinions expressed by White (1993, p. 195) that please beneficial to reduce the power of speech. As confirmation, White revealed the results of research Fukushima (1990) that research subjected Fukushima tried politer by adding please when faced with people who are more socially distant from them. In addition, Searle also expressed the opinion that the messengers / command can use please, although at the end of a sentence or before the verb. In fact, please, is an element of choice in the command / messenger.

In line with the above opinion, Rahardi (2005, p. 127) explains that the narrative imperative that section initially clung politeness marker, please be able to be politer than the speech without the use of politeness markers. With the use of politeness marker please, it will be imperative utterances have been meaning invited. So, please say that is attached to the beginning of the imperative utterance can serve as a smoothing politeness imperative utterance and deciding it. This is in line with the opinion Vilkki (2006, p. 327) that the use of linguistic politeness laying interpretation is the language used by someone to avoid continuity, speech-language formulations that exhibit certain manners like please and *-lah*, thank you, excuse me, or sorry.

However, different from *klitika-klitika* is *ekh manak*. *Ekh manak* is the first persona *klitika* form a stand alone or serve as a marker persona. *Ekh manak* ma-shape formed of first-person pronouns and son. *Ekh manak* containing messenger's speakers refer to themselves. In contrast, when using *oak-ak* considered polite in speech because it contains meanings that are straight messengers. It could be said that *ekh manak* and *ekh-ak* implies different connotations.

- a. *Talani tellu!*
'Take three !'
- b. *Tudang muki jolok!*
- c. *Laonik mai! Accuenik lao monri!*
'You are here! You come to the back! '
'Please sit down!
- d. *Taleng manak, nak wairenuttak dua!*
'Please give me water to drink two, son!'

In BB, *ekh -tak* be used to state-owned hearer. The use *ekh -tak* soften the speech so it is considered polite.

Aga desatak idik?

'What is the name of your village?'

Conversely, if the use is *ek -mu*, the speech is not considered polite.

Aga desatak idik?

'What is the name of your village?'

Although both refer belonging hearer, but *ekh -tak* and *ek -mu* implies different connotations.

Furthermore, *ekh* the emphatic *di*. *Ekh di* as a standalone without confirmation attached to certain words, unlike other enclitic. In BB, the usual position at the end of utterances or sentences, as a marker of familiarity, solidarity, respect, can follow the directive function as a follow-ban, errand, ask, demand, and so on.

Ussung bawannik sisebbu, pung di.

Meaning: I just returned the money a thousand dollars, yes sir.

In addition to use one by one in a speech, *klitika-klitika* is also sometimes used together in a speech when communicating. That makes these utterances have more than one device politeness marker.

The Second Person Singular Pronoun *Idik* [Honorific]

Bugis recognize the existence of two forms of personal *idik* both the singular and *iko*. Both words have the same inferential meaning, which refers both to the second person singular, but the two words are different connotations. Typically, *prh idik* especially used when communicating with people who are older or respected. But *prh idik* also sometimes used when communicating with a peer or a younger person.

Idik tu bawang.

Meaning: It's up to you (you only).

However, if the use of pronoun's *iko*, speech is considered not polite. Speakers considered arrogant, feeling self-ruling, and do not appreciate others so friendly at being uncomfortable.

Iko tu bawang.

Meaning: It's up to you (you only).

Said Task *Garek*

Garek word is mostly used in the modus imperative sentence or command sentence. The use of the word *garek* will refine / soften the illocutionary power of speech so it is considered polite as agents of indirect meaning. Its meaning can be meaningful or could you please try, which in English is called please. Keep in mind that in addition to the one meaningful and please, please also meaningful please. So according to proposed by White (1993, p. 195) that please beneficial to reduce the power of speech. He also cites research result's Fukushima (1990) that research subject's Fukushima tried politer by adding please when faced with people who are more socially distant from them. In addition, Searle also cites the opinion stating that the messenger / command can use please, although at the end of a sentence or before the verb. In fact, please, is an element of choice in the command / messenger. This is in line with the opinion Vilkki (2006, p. 327) that another example of the use of linguistic politeness laying interpretation is the language of polite speech showed specific formulations like please, and the one, thank you, excuse me (permission), or sorry.

According to Rahardi (2005, p. 125) that by using marker politeness please, speaker can refine the meaning of speech is imperative. It can be said that, because with use of the speech politeness marker please not solely regarded as imperative that meaningful command only but can also be regarded as an imperative meaning. Pranowo (2009, p. 104) suggests that through the use of specific words as word choice (diction) which may reflect a sense of manners, such as using the word please to ask someone for help.

In the same case with the word please, Rahardi (2005, p. 131) suggests that with use of the word try on imperatives speech will make the meaningful speech is more refine and more polite than the imperatives without the use of try. To state the meaning of the rule or to have the speech is imperative; the use of the word try will be lowered levels of the speech imperative. With the use the forms, as if the said partners are treated as being aligned with the speaker although it was in fact, ranking position (rank rating) in both the two too different. The supposition that the partner said misaligned with the speakers are will save face on both sides. Such things will sustain politeness in speech activity.

Tapenrek-penrek garek kacatak, nak!

Meaning: step up the windows please, kid!

The Greeting Words

The use of the greeting words are very tied to the local customs, the customs of politeness, as well as the circumstances of the conversation. The Bugis Wajo community using some greetings in speech, those are *pung*, *daeng/ndik*, *kak*, *nak/nanda*, *Ma'am*, *Sir*. Although not necessarily to used, says this greeting is used to declare the *ketakziman* and or familiarity to the partner said.

The word greetings *kak*, *nak/nanda*, *bu*, and *pak* absorbed from the greeting in the *Bahasa Indonesia*, which was originally a greeting word which belongs to kinship terms. However, the native BB Wajo accustomed to use it to greet partners said, although using speech is BB.

Greetings *pung* was originally used to greet someone who descendant of nobility. But now displaces. Greetings *pung* also used to greet people who are older, people who have a high position/job, people who have a higher education, or people who have more wealth.

Dek tona gaga pung modelek lainna iyatu.

Meaning: There is no other model, *pung*.

The greeting word is usual also used in conjunction with the designation of *Aji*, if said partner has been held the fifth Islamic pillars, namely the pilgrimage and the person's name. It is as well as other greeting words. For Buginese calling the name is not common except for children, especially if someone referred to an adult, have a position or power.

The greeting word *daeng/kak* shows kinship, which greets the elder siblings. However, the kinship greeting word *daeng/kak* is used as a greeting word. Greetings *daeng/kak* usually used to greet people who are older and who are regarded as a brother.

Melokik lao tega, Daeng Aji?

Meaning: Where do you want to go, *Daeng Aji*(Sir)?

The greeting words *ndik* shows the kinship, which greets the younger siblings. However, the kinship greeting word *ndik* is used as a greeting word. Greetings *ndik* usually used to greet people who are younger and who are regarded as siblings.

Siaga iyae cempatak, ndik?

Meaning: How much your tamarind, *dik* (little sister/brother)?

The greeting word *nak/nanda* shows kinship, greet children. However, the kinship greeting word *nak/nanda* is used as a greeting word. Greetings *nak/nanda* is usually used to greet people who are younger and who were regarded as a child.

Taengkalingani jolok caritana, nak!

Meaning: Listen the story first, *nak*(kid)!

Greeting words *ma'am* shows kinship, which greets mother/older women. However, the kinship greeting word *ma'am* used as greeting word. Greetings *ma'am* is usually used to greet people who are older.

Akkatenni massekkik, bu!

Meaning: holdfast, *ma'am*!

The greeting word *sir*, shows kinship, which greets father /older men. However, kinship the greeting word *sir* used as greeting word. Greetings *sir* is usually used to greet people who are older.

Ready, Sir

How much, *Sir*?

Speech is noticeably more polite if using greetings *pung, daeng/ndik, kak, nak/nanda, Ma'am, Sir*. Otherwise, if the speakers are using greetings *anu* or *wee* as a greetings *pung, daeng/ndik, kak, nak/nanda, Ma'am, Sir*, it judged not polite, though equally used to greet partners but contain different connotation meaning.

With regard in this case, Pranowo (2009, p. 104) suggests that speakers should use the word *sir/ma'am* to describe the second person or other greetings as word choice (diction) that reflect a sense of manners.

Politeness Marker Vocabulary

Politeness marker vocabulary in question here is the word *tabek* (permission), *iyek* (yes), *weddigga* (can I). These words are usually allocated on the partners said they have high social status. However, often it is also allocated on a partner said that has not been known for its status, as triggered by psychological factors to be polite to other people referred to as *mappakalebbi* 'glorify' or *mappakaraja* 'appreciate'.

The word *tabek* (permission)

The word *tabek* said meaningful permission, which means asking for permission or approval. It is commonly used when wishing to pass in front of the people, especially the people we respect. In social communication, said *tabek* is more subtle and polite so that the speakers will get the appreciation from the interlocutor. It could be said that the use of the word *tabek* is a form of cultural value *sipakalebbi* 'realization of mutual honour'. But this time, the function or purpose of use the word *tabek* not only to ask for permission, but also pronounced when giving/ask for something to or from another person or apologize to others. When speakers use the word *tabek*, for example when giving something or apologize, then it makes a sincere feeling by speakers to the interlocutor delivered.

Tabek, ndik. Ukennanik tu.

Meaning: Excuse me (sorry), *dik*. I hit you.

In line with the opinion of Vilkki (2006, p. 327) that another example use of politeness language interpretation of placement is the language that exposes certain formulations of polite speech such as *silahkan/tolong* (excuse me, please, and other), *terima kasih* (thank you), *permisi* (excuse me), or *maaf* (sorry).

The words *iyek*

The word *iyek* means Yes/Yeah or affirming. It is used for approving, solidify, or soften. The use of the word *iyek* in the speech will refine speech thus considered to be polite because it shows appreciation to the interlocutor. It could be said that the use of the word *iyek* is a form of realization of cultural value *sipakalebbi* 'mutual honour'. However, if use the word *iyyo*, the speech not polite because the words *iyek* and *iyyo* are different connotations meaning.

Iyek, tataroni, Pung Aji!

Yes, Just save it, *Pung Aji!*

The word *weddigga*

The word *weddigga* means may, can, or could. It is used to certify the request for indirectly. The use of the word *weddigga* in the speech will refine speech thus considered to be polite because it shows appreciation to the interlocutor.

Weddigga pung tasentereki siseng matanna, Pung?

Meaning: May you light the eyes all, *Pung?*

A question that begins with the word *weddigga* is a suitable tool to soften the effect of imperatives. On the question which begins with *weddigga*, the speaker asks the ability of interlocutor to do a deed. The implication of *Weddigga* is 'you do not have to'. Thus, the question of *weddigga* seems to give the possibility to interlocutor says to ignore the suggestion of speakers. It is in accordance with the scale of politeness expressed by Leech, which optionally scale. The scale option refers into many or at least options that are passed to interlocutor in the speech. When a speech is expressed by the speakers does not provide options as an alternative to selected interlocutor added, then it can be said that the speech that has low levels of politeness. On the contrary, the more options a lot, or increasingly allow speakers or partners said a lot and make choices freely, a speech that will arguably higher level speech politeness. Likewise, the scale of politeness expressed by Lakoff, the scale of formality (formality scale) states that in order for the participants to feel comfortable in both speaking activities, then speech is using should not be worded and should not compel impressed arrogantly. In the speech of each participant is said to be keeping each other formalities and keep the distance reasonable and natural as possible between each other.

The usual insecurity is also called the optional scale shows that speakers and interlocutor could feel comfortable in each other to speak, then the choices in a speech to be given by both parties. In addition, it is not allowed to be too edgy and too rigid in the speech because it would be considered not polite.

Pragmatic Speech (indirect speech)

Indirect speech used to express something, for example an order, rejection, and others. The use of indirect speech is more polite than the direct speech. In line with the opinion Vilkki (2006, p. 327) that another example uses of politeness language interpretation of the language of someone who used to avoid continuity. Indirectness scale refers to rank of direct or indirect the “mean” a speech. The speech more direct is considered not polite. On the contrary, the more indirect purpose of a speech, more polite speech.

Tappettak i listrikta, Pak Amir.

Meaning: Switch your electricity go down, Pak Amir.

From the explanation above can be understood that politeness language used to indicate reverence, respect, and solidarity to interlocutor as a way to avoid conflicts and maintain harmonious relations among human beings. It is in accordance with the opinion of Vilkki (2006, p. 323) that politeness has been conceptualized in particular as a strategy of conflict avoidance or as a strategy of development cooperation social interaction. Politeness is the language that shows the direction of respect or concern for others (327). Huang (2008, p. 97) suggests that in general, people act politely to show the desire to start a friendship relationship to someone or to keep it if there has been a fix or if it has menacingly for several reasons. Likewise with Zhuand, et al. (2010, p. 848) suggests that politeness is a kind of social phenomenon, an approach that used in order to maintain the harmony of relations between individuals. To preserve the subtlety, harmony of interpersonal relationships is called by every community, politeness serves as a ready means/efforts.

The Buginese Language Politeness in Reflecting the Social Status of the Community in Wajo Regency

Explained earlier that the speech determined by the language used, If linked with politeness means participants should pay attention to the language used when communicating. Not to cause discomfort among the participants said. For that, participants being required to pay attention to who's talking and to whom speech is delivered. Based on the results of research reflect the social status of language politeness communities in Wajo Regency.

MB in Wajo Regency realization of politeness language according to social status, both in terms of education, age, employment, the economy, or descendants. Social Status, both in terms of education, age, employment, the economy, or descendants believe to be very important in realization politeness language. For Example,

Agana palek, Pung? Engkaga pessetak?

Meaning: So what should I give, Pung? Do you have any ginger?

Contexts: speech delivered by a seller to a buyer the older ones.

Usontikkik yolok di.

Meaning: I am injecting you once, yeah.

Contexts: speech delivered by a nurse to a patient when the health care process takes place.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, the found language tools used as a marker of politeness Buginese-speaking in Wajo Regency was a reflection of the social status of the community in Wajo Regency in Buginese language politeness. Any other language tools used as a marker of politeness Buginese-speaking in Wajo Regency, covering *klitika*, the second singular person pronouns, words, greetings, politeness markers vocabulary, and a speech pragmatics meaningful (speech is not directly).

The social status of the community in Wajo Regency reflects/reflected in the Buginese politeness language, both in terms of education, age, employment, economy, or lineage i.e. employees using tools of language politeness markers in speech as a form of reverence, respect, solidarity to superiors, subordinate, a fellow employee, older, younger, as well as with the nurses, the dealer, and others.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, Gillian dan Yule, George. (cari nam kecil) (1996). Analisis Wacana (Discourse Analisis). Terjemahan oleh I Soetikno. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [2] Chaer, Abdul. (2010). Kesantunan Berbahasa. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- [3] Coulmas, Florian. (1997). The Handbook of Sociolinguistics. Oxford. Blackwell Publisher.
- [4] Fasold, Ralph. (1990). The Sociolinguistics of Language. USA: Basil Blackwell.
- [5] Geertz, Clifford. (1960). Linguistic Etiquette. Dalam Fishman, Joshua A. (ed)., *Reading in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton & Co. (282-295).
- [6] Gusnawaty. (2011). Kesantunan Positif dalam Bahasa Bugis: Suatu Analisis Teks Percakapan dalam Interaksi Sosial. Jurnal Kebahasaan, Sastra, dan Pendidikan. Makassar: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya UNHAS.
- [7] Harris, Sandar. (2007). Politeness dan Power. Dalam Llamas, dkk (ed), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistic*. New York: Routledge. (122-129).
- [8] Hudson, R.A. (1987). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Huang, Yongliang. (2008). Politeness Principle in Cross-Culture Communication. *English Language Teaching* 1/1 (96-101).
- [10] Kasper, Gabriel. (2000). Linguistic Etiquette. Dalam Florian Coulmas (ed), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: BlackWell Publisher. (374-385).
- [11] Kushartanti, dkk. (2005). Pesona Bahasa: Langkah Awal Memahami Linguistik. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [12] Leech. Geoffrey N. (1983). Principle of Pragmatics. New York: Longman Inc.

- [13] Llamas, Carmen, dkk. (2007). *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [14] Muslich, Masnur. (2006). *Kesantunan Berbahasa: Sebuah Kajian Sosiolinguistik*. Pendidikan Network (Online). Access on 5 Agustus 2012. <http://www.Artikel Pendidikan Network – Kesantunan Berbahasa.htm>.
- [15] Ohoiwutun, Paul. (1997). *Sosiolinguistik: Memahami Bahasa dalam Konteks Masyarakat dan Kebudayaan*. Jakarta: Kesaint Blanc.
- [16] Rahardi, R. Kunjana. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: PT. Gelora Aksara Pratama.
- [17] Renkema, Jan. (1993). *Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [18] Rohaedi, D. Wahyudin. (2009). *Kesantunan Berbahasa di Ruang Kelas*. Dalam Anshori, Dadang S., dkk (ed). *Wacana Bahasa: Mengukuhkan Identitas Bangsa*. Bandung: Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia FPBS UPI.
- [19] Saleh, Muhammad. (2009). *Representasi Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa dalam Wacana Akademik (Kajian Etnografi Komunikasi di Kampus Universitas Negeri Makassar)*. Disertasi (tidak dipublikasikan). Universitas Negeri Malang.
- [20] Vilkki, Lisa. (2006). Politeness, Face, and Facework: Current Issues. *SKY Journal of Linguistic* vol. 19. (322-332).
- [21] Wardaugh, Ronald. 2006. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Fifth Edition*. Oxford: BlackWell Publisher.
- [22] White, Ron. (1993). Saying Please: Pragmalinguistic failure in English Interaction. *ELT Journal* 47/3. (193-202).
- [23] Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Terjemahan oleh Indah Fajar Wahyuni Tahun 2006. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [24] Zhu, Jiang dan Yuxiao Bao. (2010). The Pragmatic Comparison of Chinese and Whestern "Politeness" in Cross-Cultural Communication. *Journal of Language Teaching and Teaching* 1/6. (848-851).



Haerany Halim, was born in Lompo, on 14 february 1983. Indonesia citizenship. Head Teacher of Post Graduate Program of State University of Makassar. She graduated her kindergarten in TK Aisyiyah Bustanul Athfal, Tempe branch in 1990. In the same year, she continued her elementary school in SDN 238 Lompo and graduated in 1996. She continued her junior high school in Madrasah Tsanawiyah Pondok Pesantren Darul Arqam Gombara, Makassar in 1996 and graduated in 1999. In the same year, she continued her senior high school in Madrasah Aliah Pondok Pesantren Darul Arqam Gombara, Makassar and graduated in 2002. In the same year, she continued her bachelor, Department of Indonesian Language and Literature and Region, State University of Makassar and graduated in 2006. In 2007, she continued her master in Post-Graduate, State University of Makassar specificity in Bahasa Indonesia Education and graduatd in 2009. In 2010, she accepted as student of PhD program in Post-Graduate, State University of Makassar, specificity in Bahasa Indonesia Education.

Haerany Halim, S. Pd., M. Pd. Has gave rise scientific work, namely (1) Keefektifan Penggunaan Kamus dalam Pembelajaran Kosakata di kelas VII SMP Negeri 1 Ajangale, Kab. Bone (Thesis), in 2006 and (2) Karakter tokoh dalam Naskah Film *The Terminal* Karya Sacha Gervasi dan Jeff Nalham(Kajian Psikologi Sastra) (dissertation), in 2009.



Sjahruddin Kaseng was born in Pangkep, on 7 Mei 1940. Indonesia citizenship. Head Teacher of Post-Graduate Program of State University of Makassar dan Post-Graduate Program of Hasanuddin University. He graduated his Bachelor in IKIP Bandung in 1964, beliau he appointed as lecturer in Department of Indonesian language and literature FKSS IKIP Makassar. In 1971 – 1973 he assigned to follow Postgraduate Study in Royal University, Leiden, and PhD degree in the science of literature in Indonesia University in 1975, he is the first PhD in IKIP Ujung Pandang.

His career and dedication to society, he (Prof. Dr. H. Sjahruddin Kaseng) has assume as Head of Publishing in IKIP Makassar in 1965, Head of Major of Indonesian Language and Literature FKSS IKIP Makasaar, Dean Assistant I of FKSS IKIP Makassar, Dean of FKSS IKIP Makassar, Secretary Kopertis Region IX, President Assistant of IKIP Ujung Pandang two periods in 1978-1986, Secretary Senate of IKIP Ujung Pandang in 1986-1991, Expert Staff Kopertis Region IX in 1986-present, Chairman of Employee Training of Department of Employment in Sulawesi Selatan in 1986-1991, Kelompok Kerja Bina Keluarga dan Balita Kantor Urusan Peranan Wanita in 1983, dan President of IKIP Ujung Pandang in 1991. Courses and science meeting inside dan outside of the country has followed, such as: 29th *Conference of Orientalis*, Paris, Perancis, in 1973, *Problem on Bilingualism*, Gent, Belgia in 1973, *ASANAL Conference*, Jakarta in 1974, and some of courses and another science meetings. Science work namely research results and books such as: *Kedudukan dan Fungsi Bahasa Makassar di Sulawesi Selatan* in 1978 (karya bersama), *Pemetaan Bahasa di Sulawesi Tenggara* in 1979 (karya bersama), *Kata Tugas Bahasa Bugis* in 1984 (karya bersama), and another scientific works.



Zainuddin Taha was born in Soppeng, on 5 April 1937. Indonesia citizenship. Head Teacher of Post Graduate Program of State University of Makassar. He graduated his formal education in Sekolah Rakyat in 1948, Sekolah Sambungan in 1951, Bhg Junior High School in 1964, Sekolah Guru Atas in 1957, BI (B One) Bahasa Indonesia Negeri in 1961, *Bachelor of Arts (B.A)* in FKIP UNHAS in 1962, Bachelor of Indonesia Language and Literature in IKIP Makassar in 1965, *Postgraduate on General and Austronesian Linguistics* in Rijks University, Leiden in 1978, and PhD (S3), of Sosiolinguistic in UNHAS in 1985.

He has follow some courses/training/upgrading such as: (1) Upgrading of Sosiolinguistic, Center of Language of Depdikbud in 1975, (2) Upgrading and Lokakarya (PENLOG) P3G Depdikbud RI, (3) *Achievement Motivation Training*, Yayasan Pembina Insani Makassar in 1993, and another some courses/training/upgrading. Scientific result is generated such as: (1) *Penelitian Bahasa dan Dialek dalam Rumah Tanggadi Kota Makassar*, in 1975, (2) *Pengertian dan Fungsi Bahasa Indonesia pada Populasi Tertentu di Desa Tugu Selatan Jawa Barat*, in 1975, (3)

Satu Wacana Dua Bahasa: Faktor-Faktor Sociolinguistik Alihkode Bahasa Bugis-Bahasa Indonesia, in 1985, and another scientific works. Many books, articles, n papers has published and in book/scientific newspaper.

Prof. Dr. H. Zainuddin Taha has experience as instructor in schools and universities (Present, he is professor of UNM, UNHAS, dan UIM), working experience in structural/assignment in teams (Present, he is Ketua Umum Asosiasi Professor Indonesia of Sulawesi Selatan), working experience in government/society, and experience as consultant. He achievements has acquire such as:some Satya Lencana, some another achievement in govenrment organization, and some another achievements.



Akmal Hamsa, was born in Sinjai, on 2 Mei 1955. Indonesia citizenship. His elementary school in 1968. Economics Junior high school in 1971, Sekolah Pendidikan Guru Negeri in 1974, he graduated his bachelor of Department of Indonesian Language and Literature in IKIP Ujungpandang in 1983. H graduated his master of Department of Indonesian Language and Literature in PPs IKIP Malang in 1997, and graduated his PhD program of Indonesian Education in PPS UM Malang in 2009.

He is a lecturer in department of Language and Literature, State University of Makassar. He has scientific works such as (1) Peningkatan Profesionalisme Guru Bahasa Indonesia, in 2009, (2) "Pemanfaatan Media Audio dan Gambar dalam Pembelajaran Menulis Ekspositori pada Siswa Kelas VIII SMP N 21 Makassar, in 2008, dan (3) Kajian Terhadap Jenis Kata dalam Bahasa Indonesia, in 2012.

Dr. Akmal Hamsa, M.Pd. has achievement form President of Republik of Indonesia Dr.H. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono is Satyalencana Karya Satya XX in 2011.