

Showing “Respect” in a Multicultural Society in Central Sulawesi: A Sociopragmatics Study of Directive Speech Acts in a Local Language in a University Academic Environment

Fatma*, Sumarlam, Sarwiji Suwandi and Ani Rakhmawati

*Department of Indonesian Language, Postgraduate Education, Sebelas Maret University,
Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36A, Surakarta, (0271) 646994, Indonesia*

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to explore the use of directive speech acts in a local language in a university environment in Central Sulawesi. Pragmatics a multidisciplinary science methodology is adopted here since it focuses on things outside of the language itself. The study of pragmatics is growing and scholars of linguistics are increasingly interested in the context of language in society and its use. One dimension discussed within the field of pragmatics and linguistics is directive speech acts. In academic discourse language is used as an identifier in more ways than only a tool to communicate. The aim then is to identify the type of directive local language and function involved in the context of the conversation. The findings of this study can be used in pragmatics of teaching materials at universities. A pragmatic development in teaching materials based on multicultural differences taking into account concepts such as integration, ethnic and cultural differences, race, age, gender, roles, and religions are considered essential to suit the needs of teachers and students. Multicultural aspect is expected to be one alternative in pragmatics based local value and socio-cultural.

Keywords: Directive speech acts, local language, multicultural, teaching materials, pragmatics

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 01 December 2016

Accepted: 23 August 2017

E-mail addresses:

kasimfatma24@gmail.com (Fatma)

sumarlamwd@gmail.com (Sumarlam)

sarwijiwan@yahoo.com (Sarwiji Suwandi)

ani_rakhma@yahoo.com.au (Ani Rakhmawati)

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

Developing a global language requires a distinctive character so that speakers can grow and develop in a way that strengthens each culture and relates to the daily activities of social life. In other words, pragmatics comprises the social context of messages and parameters of variation that are often

excluded from consideration. In academic discourse or intellectual contexts, directive speech acts can be used to describe a multiplicity of social domains, the latter referring to specific characteristics of social groups, in an effort to identify equivalent features across “cultures” or “societies” (Rahardi, 2006; Riley & Johnson, 2007). Pragmatics includes how to use speech acts in social interaction and when the speaker and the hearer produce and receive utterances; it also includes about speaker and hearer that who is speaking to whom, where, when, and why everything that connects language to users, identities and meanings. A society may be distinguished by its language. Similiary, Halliday (as cited in House, 2013, p. 2) stated that in any interaction, speakers use many linguistic means to express intersubjectivity. It may develop an appropriate that will be the communicative involved in participating in academic discourse.

Central Sulawesi is a multicultural society diverse in terms of ethnicities, cultures, and religions. The diversity in culture shows up in language use. Cultural nuances can be captured in the local language used in daily interaction. This point was reinforced by Abu Bakar, Osman, Bachock, and Ibrahim (2014, p. 613) who claimed that a linguistic phenomenon known as “language shift” occurs when a mother tongue is gradually displaced by other languages in the daily lives of a particular group of people. Among the contributing factors leading to this linguistic phenomenon are demographic declinations,

interlingua distance, dialect diversity, writing systems, and mass media. The change is usually preceded by linguistic variation, and many researchers within this field focus on describing and explaining such variation and change (Nilsson, 2015, p. 6). Sometimes, many acts processing from the speaker and hearer linguistic competence is using dialect and linguistic situation in the perspective acts.

The local languages in Central Sulawesi include *Kaili*, *Buginese*, *Buginese Malay*, and *Malay Manado*. *Kaili* is a dialect used by the tribe, *Kaili*, the majority ethnic group in Central Sulawesi. *Kaili* tribes settled along the west and east coasts of the Palu Valley and some other districts located in Central Sulawesi (Gazali, 2016, p. 190). The *Malay Manado* language is the lingua franca of North Sulawesi and is regarded as a regional dialect of the Malay language. *Malay Manado* is used alongside regional languages, Indonesian and foreign languages. These languages have been found in several areas including Central Sulawesi as a result of population mobility and acculturation. *Buginese* language is one of the local languages used by the Buginese from South Sulawesi. The Buginese language became the second most widely spoken local language in Central Sulawesi as a result of the migration, intermarriage, and commercial activities of the Bugis people (Noordyun, 1991, p. 137).

In pragmatic studies, every utterance in communication is seen as an act. Participants in communication comprise individuals who speak and the listeners involved in

the conversation (Cummings, 2007; Grice, 1975). In the learning process, both in the classroom and outside the classroom, and in every school and college level, teachers should have the skills and social competence to encourage interaction in the classroom. Conceptualising, and in turn, encouraging interaction across cultural groups is problematic for several reasons (Banks, 2010, p. 20). According to Bellack (cited in Suwignyo 2010, p. 148) the language or speech used by teachers in the classroom is peculiar to the context which he calls the "awakened 'cyclical'" marked by teacher structuring, reacting, reinforcement, correction or remediation with the response given by learners in learning interactions. Everything is integrated dynamically throughout the learning, to keep the educational goals intact. This goal aligns itself with the principle of reinforcing capabilities as outlined in the statute No. 14 Year 2005 about Teachers and Lecturers Article 4(5), which states that the teacher be able to have the ability to communicate easily with students. In academic discourse, communicating with ease occurs in a lecture is defined as "conversational interaction" in which lecturers and students become the speakers and listeners who participate in an exchange of specific actions to achieve certain goals.

The distinction between illocutionary force and propositional content, as was suggested earlier by the different contexts. Illocutionary acts are performed by the utterance of expression, and this fact motivates the introduction of yet another

speech act, that is, the *utterance act*: an utterance act consists simply of the utterance of an expression (Searle & Vandervaken, 1985, p. 9). The same type of utterance act can occur in the performance of different illocutionary acts. For example, while "I'm hungry" can be classified as two different types of token utterance acts, two different illocutionary acts may also be performed, since the reference and hence, the proposition is different in the two cases and this result suggests that pragmatic processes can start very early when appropriate contextual information is provided (Xiang, Grove, & Giannakidou, 2016, p. 85).

An utterance from the speaker is a directive speech act marked by content with respect to a certain conversational background. If this conversational background contains at least one possible world such the occurrence of this utterance is necessary and sufficient for the hearer to make a decision to reinforce the truth to do or not (Kissine, 2013, p. 105). In addition, directive speech acts must lead to the truth of their propositional content and this must be the only necessary condition for speakers to act, that their propositional content is made true by the hearer does not suffice for directive speech acts to be obeyed (Searle & Vandervaken, 1985). To be really compliant, the directive speech act must goad the hearer to act on receiving an utterance by the speaker. In Bach and Harnish's account (1979, p. 47), this kind of utterance is set apart from other directive speech acts, which they describe as an expression of speaker

intention, such that his or her utterance or the attitude it expresses is taken as reason for the hearer to act.

Searle (2005, p.13) classified the basic categories of illocutionary acts. He says that the illocutionary point of directive utterances consists in the fact that they are attempts (of varying degrees and with increased precision) by the speaker to get the hearer to do something in accordance with the meaning embedded in the utterance of the speaker. Verbs denoting members of this class are *ask, order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat*, as well as *invite, permit, and advise*. In oral academic discourse, speech acts between teacher and students can represent a variety of directive acts with certain functions. Therefore, the conversations between teachers and students can be seen as a form of face-to-face communication with specific social goals. In lingual expression, classroom exchange with linguistically diverse students is useful to illustrate directive acts especially to show interaction between ethnic groups and cultures (Banks, 2010, p. 33). In this study conducted at the Tadulako University and Alkhairaat University, the aim was to show that while the local languages, *Kaili, Bugis, and Malay Manado* are unique on their own merits, they can usefully to show how directive acts take place across regional languages in the form of speech acts. Based on this assumption, the authors undertook research on how “respect” was shown in a multicultural society. The study primarily adopts a socio-pragmatics approach in understanding directive speech acts between

lecturers and students in a university academic environment.

Soames (as cited in Hedger, 2013, p. 209) argues that in some cases, the semantic content of a sentence does not result in a complete proposition without requiring pragmatic contributions to clarify meaning. Sociopragmatics is an area of study which tries to understand speech behaviour of a particular language community, based on social background as an influencer of language behaviour, not only as a unit of language but also process of social interaction (Maschler & Scriffrin, 2015, p. 190; Wardhaugh, 2010, p. 118). Therefore, the sociopragmatic approach is useful for analysing the social relationships of the speaker and hearer so as to interpret the implicit meanings in the form, function and strategy of directive speech acts by teacher and students. Directive displays of heterogeneous typology include initiating moves that reflect different types of social organisation (Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013, p. 124). Thus, everyday directives constitute monitors on how to process conversations, that is, to give, to take, and to use multimodal formations of actions in directives. As described by Turner (Darmojuono, 2011, p. 20), in a multilingual society, language reflects the identity of a speaker based on the values espoused in the socio-cultural codes and symbols of that society of speakers.

METHODS

This study, which uses the sociopragmatics approach, is mainly qualitative. In qualitative research, the research data retrieval process

occurs naturally where the conditions and the situation are not manipulated. Ericson (2010, p. 45) maintains that direct connections between the daily lives of students outside the classroom and the contents of instruction, social studies, and literature can make the stated curriculum come alive. This is a true for every school classroom situation. Each new set of students represents a unique sampling from the universe of local cultural diversity around the school area. The subjects in this study include students who had learned about pragmatics and were skilled and knowledgeable in communication, with differences in culture background, ethnicity, gender, and local languages spoken. Communication through interaction such as in conversations between teachers and students were observed and analysed based on the research problem. Arikunto (2010, p. 21) stated that in the data collecting process right up to data verification, qualitative research does not use numbers but describes the data by interpreting results. Sugiono (2010, p. 15) emphasises that naturalistic study conducted on natural conditions, not manipulated by the researcher or the researcher's presence, does not affect the research object. Sociolinguistics reveals identical form-function correlations in speech construction use. Pichler and Hesson (2016, p. 3) suggested that discourse-pragmatics variation patterns may be consistent across situational contexts and, possibly, varieties. Sociolinguistics is as socially variable language practice "use" is challenging as it is a socially unrealistic

aspect of mainstream linguistics (Fairclough 2013, p. 6). In such a context, cross-cultural pragmatics studies can play a pivotal role in illuminating the cultural differences between speakers from a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Shicshavan & Sharifian, 2016, p. 75).

Although many other approaches to data collection have been developed, the method of data collection used in this study includes interviews that are specially designed to simulate as closely as possible a relaxed conversational style. The data consist of counts of the occurrence of the sociolinguistic variable, noting the constraining linguistic and social environments (Horvath, 2013, p. 9). In this study, the research subjects are lecturers and students of the Indonesian Language Studies Programme at the Tadulako University and Alkhairaat University Palu in Central Sulawesi. The data were retrieved from the verbal utterances of teachers and students in formal and non-formal academic discourse in the classroom setting. The data analysis technique used is the interactive model by Miles and Huberman (pp. 15-20), which includes the following: (1) data collection, (2) data reduction, (3) data display, and (4) conclusion or verification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Directive speech acts are intended to produce their effects through an action by the listener. In many cases in authentic conversations and real communication, there exist restricted all many types of language functions and choice one types to using

in communicate (Kohandani, Farzaneh, & Kazeni, 2014, pp. 10-13). Searle and Austin (as cited in Waring & Hruska, 2012, p. 290) stated that directives could be used to describe certain forms in the speech acts of others. The coding of directives in the context and situation can describe power and social status that makes the speaker direct the hearer. One aspect of speech acts is that the listener produces the effect of a directive or action. Directives also serve as commands as they request the hearer to perform an action. Research about directives such as by Mauri and Sansò (2012) revealed that directives are used in contexts as a marker for future situations.

Form Directive Request in *Kaili* Language

1. *Kaili* Language

Mhs1: *begini, deskriptif itu melaporkan fakta, secara faktual, apa adanya. Seperti itu tadi menggambarkan apa adanya.* (1)

Mhs2: *iyoo... iyoo...* (2)

Mhs1: *oke teman-teman begini mangkali saya minta dari ibu guru dulu. Ibu Yul dulu lea* (3)

In English

Student 1: Well, descriptive is to factually report the facts. Describe things as they are. (1)

Student 2: *Oh, Okay. It is up to you ...* (2)

Student 1: *Maybe I should ask the teacher first. Mrs. Yuli, right?* (3)

Context: Discussion in classroom when Student 1 asks the lecturer to make clear some statements for Student 2.

In data (2) and (3) above, the directives, *iyoo* and *mangkali* used in the local language, *Kaili*, when translated into the English language are *okay*, *probably*, respectively, and which has the meaning *yes* and *perhaps*. The words in the sentences given the context have their own power in communicating as a speaker that can make the hearer do something. Interlanguage pragmatics, which contributes to the comparability of multiple interactions, includes expected norms of interaction such as turn-taking, constant social relations/roles, and asymmetrical power relationships (Harlig & Hartford, 2005, p. 9). *Iyoo* in the *Kaili* language not only shows the word *yes*, but signals to fellow students to put an end to the explanation by the speaker, so that other students can also answer the same questions. Collin (Beck, 2008, p. 163) stated that direct speech stands out from the other modes of speech representation because it requires a greater degree of interpretation and thus participation from the listener. Directive forms with the word, *mangkali*, in the *Kaili* language (in English version is *probably*) suggests respect. Rahardi (2006) stated that the relationship between speaker and listener determines how successful the meaning of a sentence has been conveyed.

In the conversation above, the directive request by the speaker was understood by the hearer, even without the direct statement, "I want you". The extent to which the meaning of the sentence is conveyed was possible because the hearer was of a different age from the speaker. Moreover, the use of the word, *lea*, which is an honorific marker and a form of politeness in the local language, *Kaili*, also serves to convey the speaker's intent. Other research on the same theme conducted by Takada (2013) sought to show the development of communicative competence among teachers and students using the instructional settings of instructors and trainees, and experts and novices. In this case, the pragmatic approach that highlights the significance of co-text, context and meaning in speech behaviour is critical in understanding comprehension and production of the meanings people are attempting to convey (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 3). According to Byram, Grundy, Bryam, and Phipps (2002, p. 1), "context" is as complex a concept as "culture", the latter being notoriously difficult to define.

Form Directive Act in Prohibition in Malay Manado

2. Malay Manado language

Moderator: *ini jam so menunjukkan jam 9.* (1)

Mhs: *boleh sudah itu.* (2)

Moderator: *demikianlah diskusi kita ini.* (3) *Kita akan*

mendengarkan kesimpulan. Hei! (4)

Notulis: *(Notulis membacakan hasil diskusi berupa kesimpulan)*

: *ya Ok. Terima kasih.* (5)

Mhs: *season ketiga, boleh?* (6)

Moderator: *So nyanda' pake season ketiga lagi. Jang lagi ditambah.* (7)

Mhs: *So boleh e. So jam 9 dan ini. Ok tapi ditutup dulu baru pulang. Uh.* (8)

In English

Moderator: It is 9 pm now.

Student 1: This discussion is enough.

Moderator: So discussion today is over. Come along and listen to the conclusion. (reporter reads out the conclusions) Ok. Thanks.

Student1: Now, can the third session start?

Moderator: No. There will not be a third session. We will not add another session. We have done enough. See, it is already 9 pm. Let's end the discussion so that we can go home.

Context: The moderator disallows his friends to ask more questions, saying that the group discussion will end because we don't have many times this night.

With respect to type, the data showed that the level of illocutionary force may be the problem and strategic communication in the classroom is useful for some aspects of utterances, especially directive acts. According to Saddhono, Wardani, and Ulya (2015, p. 27), a discourse is considered as a group of utterances of a speech performance that is recognisable such as in a conversation. In the sentences (1), (7) and (8), a directive form of prohibition in the *Malay Manado Language* is phrase *so*, *nyanda*, *jang*, which means the same as “shouldn’t” in the English version.

According to the classified commands by Ramlan (2001), there are different classifications of sentences: (1) direct; (2) invited; (3) invitation; and (4) prohibition. Keraf (1991, p. 158) explained that commands are requests to get someone to do something or not. Among the commands are prohibition orders. The word *so* (enough) is the emphasis indirectly used by the hearer to understand that the current discussion should be halted. The use of indirect strategies is reinforced by pieces of other modalities and markers that *nyanda’* and *jang*, if seen from the structure that has meaning again the discussion should not be extended.

The same point was also expressed by Alwi, Djarjowidjono, Lapoliwa, and Moeliono (2003, p. 336) who stated that the imperative sentences in Indonesia include: (1) imperative transitive, (2) imperative transitive, (3) refined, (4) request, (5) invited, (6) prohibition, and (7) imperative? The restrictions used in Data (2) are included

in the imperative form. The function of identified imperatives is their ability to issue directives (Jary & Kissine, 2014, p. 3).

Function of Directive Commands in Malay Manado

3. *Malay Manado* Language

Dosen: *Kase’ menyala dulu dang*
Pak Azhari (tombol OHP)
(1)

Mahasiswa: Menekan tombol on dan mengatur posisi tampilan layar. (2)

In English

Lecturer: Please, turn on the projector, Azhari! (1)

Student: Yes Ma’am. (the student presses the button on and sets the position)

Context: The lecturer needs help from the student when the overhead projector in the classroom is not connected.

Data (3) sentence (1) demonstrates an act which is a command directive directly addressed by the lecturer to the students. The direct command in the *Malay Manado* language includes the words *kase’* and *dang*; in English, the word “give” has the same meaning in sentences representative, which is “please turn on the projector, Azhari!” Using the command from the data is also consistent with the findings of Imbang (2014, p. 36) who found that words in the *Manado* language with one

syllable but with several variations have different meanings. Speech acts depend on a variety of interpersonal and individual variables such as degree of confidence, age differences, hierarchy, form of perception and social interaction, personal and social interaction, personal characteristics, and so forth (Stranovská, Munkova, Fráterova, & Ďuračková, 2013). Hence, some forms of rejection in Manado above indicate the characteristics of a person in terms of the use of speech to respect each other whether the spokesperson rejects or accepts.

Sometimes the structure of statement imperatives can be ungrammatically represented although they might be pragmatically accepted (Kissine, 2013). In our daily lives, utterances intended for solidarity can be achieved through words such as polite forms and language strategy communication. Similarly, Farnia (as cited in Hashempour 2016, p. 946) states that a speech act should be focused on aspects of daily life (like requests, apologies, complaints, expressing gratitude, refusals, and so forth).

Function of Directive Refusal in Local Malay or Buginese Language

We also examined form directive speech acts indicating refusal in the Buginese language in the classroom setting.

4. Buginese

Ds: Azhari? (1)

Mhs: ya Bu (2)

Ds: besok saya ada mata kuliah juga ya? (3)

Mhs: ya bu. (4)

Ds: *aii, saya bawa materi sampe malam itu je'.* (4)

Mhs: aii, pragmatik juga ibu. (5)

Ds: *ya, tapinya saya bawa materi sampe malam itu, pokoknya nanti kita cari, terakhir sudah ini, peerteaching minggu ini, selesai sudah.* (6)

In English

Lecturer: Azhari?

Student: Yes, ma'am.

Lecturer: I've schedule in this class tomorrow?

Student: Yes, ma'am. The Subject is Pragmatics.

Lecturer: But I cannot leave my job in different place tomorrow morning until evening. So, we will replace them at a different time. I promise to clear our material within this week.

Context: When the lecturer reschedules class material because of the job in the different place.

In oral communication, especially in the academic discourse in Central Sulawesi, the authors maintained that it is important to preserve the value of the local language and culture of the majority of ethnic groups. Data (4) sentence (4) and (6) constitute directive acts in the *Buginese* language. Here, we could see a refusal in the directive act. The

word for refusal in the local language of Buginese is *je'* (well) and *aii* (no). Achmad (2012, p. 2) stated that the use of the words, *pangandereng* or *ampe madeceng*, which indicates the lack of 'boorish behaviour' shows the manners of the Buginese (*in English is politeness*). From the data, the change in structure of the sentence can change its meaning. From the data, structure of language can replace something that carries meaning as a refusal. This situation can be achieved because there are different ways of communicating and language is a communication tool. According to Saddhono and Rohmadi (2014, p. 25), language has become entrenched in human life because of its dominant function in communication. House (2013, p. 65), in his research findings, described the multifunctional discourse markers "Yes" and "Okay" in the English language and in Malay Manado; their equivalents are *Ja* and *so* used to express agreement to signal a resumption of speech acts marked by hesitation and pauses if we talk about semantics subject. Mohammadi, Nejadansari, and Youhane (2015, p. 92) described the qualitative aspect of a sentence and the classification of the pragmatic functions of *je'* and *aii* in Buginese in a local context used by students.

Direct Strategy in Directive Speech Acts in *Kaili*

5. Kaili

Dosen : bagaimana kalau ibu Sumiatun menambahkan barangkali? *Totuamo e.* (1)

Moderator: silahkan! (2)

Mahasiswa: *Komiu mo Bu.* (3)

(mahasiswa yang bersangkutan menambahkan dan menjelaskan apa yang diinginkan peserta diskusi)

Peserta: ya, mantap (tepuq tangan) mantap Ibu. (6)

Dosen: *nadoyo* guru kelas 1, sudah berapa tahun Bu? (Tertawa) (7)

Mahasiswa: calon pengawas (Tertawa) (8)

Dosen: calon pengawas memang. (9)

In English

Lecturer: Mrs. Sumiatun, might you deign to add? We recommend that parents go first to explain about the progress using curriculum 2013 in elementary school)

Moderator: Please.

Student2: Just you, miss.

Student1: (Miss Sumiatun explain about the progress using curriculum 2013 in elementary school)

So, because of her explanation, the other students appreciate her. The other students proud of Miss Sumiatun too.

- Student 2: Good job! Great! Give a round of applause. a command is determined by the context in which it is understood by both the speaker and hearer.
- Lecturer: *Wow, Wonderful* that I see. How long have you taught in elementary school? (laugh) Maybe you will be able to a supervision.
- Student: Yes, that is right. I'm candidate supervisor.
- Context: When the student directs the other students to answer the teacher's question with an explanation about the curriculum.

The directive forms marked by the words, *totuamo* (parent) and *komiu* (you) and *nadoyo* (meaning 'good job') in *Kaili* signal the strong relationship between the teacher and students as encapsulated in honorific terms and the mitigation form of a request. In *Kaili*, the use of the word, *hello*, constitutes a honorific, and in a social relationship, honorifics can be used as a linguistic strategy (Kridalaksana, as cited in Agus, 2014, pp. 3-4). In its application, the use of greetings also indicates the social status of the speaker and hearer. In addition to the function of a linguistic marker, a greeting may be used as a parameter in directive speech acts to indicate kinship relations between speaker and hearer such as in the case of a conversation in the classroom. This was confirmed in the findings by Lohse, Granefenhain, Behne, and Racoczy (2014, p. 2), who asserted that the successful use of

6. *Malay Manado*:

- Mhs1: begini, saya mau bertanya. (1)
- Mhs2: eh...belum *dank* bu, torang masih bacurita. (2)
- Mhs1: belum selesai Oo, saya kira *sudami* bertanya *kita Bu. Belum pale'* (tertawa) (3)
- Moderator: ini yah, berupa tabel, dituangkan dalam bentuk kalimat berdasarkan tabel. (4) dalam bentuk kalimat? (5)
- Mhs2 : ya. secara fakta yang ada dalam tabel. Dalam kalimat. Kalau deskriptif. (6)

In English

- Student 1: I want to ask (1)
- Student 2: Wait, I have not finished. *I am still in the midst of explaining what I mean.* (2)
- Student 1: I think you've done about the question. But, in fact, it is not done. It is so long ago.
- Moderator: In this form of table, the results are written in the form of a sentence based on the table. Can you write in the form of a sentence?

Student 2: Yes. In fact based on the table. But modified in the form of a sentence; it should be a description.

Context: When a student wants to ask the other students to explain the question.

In the society, people are aware of how to speak with appropriate speech acts. In this case, the polite and refined way of asking a question would be contained in a speech act which would not be articulated clearly and openly, but only implicitly. Lakoff (1990, p. 34) explained that politeness is reflective of a system of interpersonal relationships that are designed to facilitate interaction with potential to minimise conflicts and confrontation. In this case, actual speech implicature tends to be more polite, more refined and more delicate. In the case of language as “interaction” and not only as “action”, that is, statements that goad the other person to act, linguistic strategies also encode positive directive speech acts (Reiter & Placencia, 2005, p. 15).

CONCLUSION

Tarigan (as cited in Saddhono & Fatma, 2016, p. 38) mentioned the sociopragmatic approach as critical for the study of the “local” conditions in which language is used as it reveals how the principles of cooperation and modesty operate. According to Leech (1993, pp. 10-11), sociopragmatics is two-pronged: the pragmatic side of language, and the pragmatolinguistics side of language. In the Indonesian language, pragmatics is

useful in examining the intent contained in a discourse or speech whose meaning cannot be explained by the theory of semantics which supports co-texts and context. In this study, the field socio-pragmatic approach is useful in understanding directive speech acts in a select few regional languages of Indonesia. The Pragmatics approach is also useful for determining the meaning embedded in the context since it highlights extralinguistic and intralinguistic nuances in an utterance (Rahardi, 2005, p. 93). Speech commands are essentially directives marked by the power differentials between the speaker and hearer. To suppress the illocutionary power of the speaker, several markers of politeness could be used instead in an utterance. Research has indicated that directive speech acts expressed by imperatives usually have formal structures. In fact, the meanings conveyed in formal imperatives can also be expressed by another linguistic construction depending on the context of speech.

This is consistent with the view, among others, proposed by Rahardi (2005, p. 3) that the meaning of an utterance is not only expressed in the form of the language, but also disclosed in other forms of sentence construction. Therefore, the meaning of an utterance in directives is not always in line with the form of construction but is determined by the context. Based on the research and findings of the study outlined in this paper, function directive speech acts found in the local languages in focus consist of direct and indirect strategies to convey a meaning. A direct strategy to make a request

or effect, an action in the local language of *Kaili* is accompanied by the politeness marker *komiu* (*You* in English) and *totuamo* (*parents* in English) and indirect strategies to imply politeness which include the use of the words, 'we', and any particle, 'mi (*too* in English) and 'pale' (*well* in English). Moreover, it is important to note that sociocultural nuances add meaning to an utterance. In this case, all social nuances must be considered in analysing the speech intention to understand the relevance of the utterance.

This is confirmed by the findings of Lauzon and Berger (2015, p. 16) who analysed conversations focused on how identity, role, social categories, norms, and gender show up in practice communication. The study of sociolinguistics is important since it captures the social aspects of language communication in a classroom between teachers and students, and students with students. The positive side of this phenomenon can be an effective way to deliver lesson to students because both teachers and students understand the language. As a multidisciplinary science study, pragmatics focuses on studying the aspects outside of language itself. Pragmatics is a growing field of study which examines the nature of language and how linguistic boundaries are changing and expanding. The study of pragmatics allows for the understanding of linguistic contexts in society and how language is used. In this case, language is not merely seen as a tool for communication but it also signals the sociocultural aspect related to language use.

REFERENCES

- Abu Bakar, A., Osman, M. M., Bachock, S., & Ibrahim, M. (2014). An analysis on the transmission of ethnic languages in selected communities in the world heritage site of Malacca, Malaysia. *Journal Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 20, 612-621.
- Achmad., S. (2012). Strategi kesopanan berbahasa masyarakat Bugis Pinrang di Sulawesi Selatan [Pinrang Buginese public speech strategy in South Sulawesi]. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, 40(1), 1-11.
- Agus, N. (2014). The form of Buginese language greeting in gender pragmatic context. *Jurnal Sawerigading*, 20(1), 1-13.
- Alwi, H., Dardjowijoyo, S., Lapoliwa, H., & Moeliono, A. (2003). Indonesian standard grammar Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik [Research procedures a practice approach]*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Bach, K., & Harnis, R.M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech act*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Banks, A. J., & Banks, A. M.C. (Eds). (2010). *Multicultural education: Issue and perspective* (Ed). USA: Wiley.
- Beck, D. (2008). Character-quoted direct speech in the ILIAD. *Phoenix: Spring*, 62(1/2), 162-241.
- Byram, M., Grundy, P., Bryam, M., & Phipps, A. (Eds.) (2002). *Context and culture in language teaching and learning: Languages for intercultural communication and education* 6. USA: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Cummings, L. (2007). *Pragmatik: Sebuah perspektif multidisipliner [Pragmatics: A multidisciplinary perspective]*. Ibrahim, S.A. (Ed.). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

- Darmojuono, S. (2011). Peran etnopragmatis dalam komunikasi masyarakat multikultural [Ethnopragmatic role in multicultural communities]. *Jurnal Linguistik Indonesia*, 1, 19-34.
- Ericson, F. (2010). Society and in educational practices. In Banks, A. J., & Banks, A. M. C. (Ed.). *Multicultural education: Issue and perspective*. USA: Wiley.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Language and power*. New York: Routledge.
- Gazali. (2016). The Structure, function, and values of the people's song of Kaili. *LITERA*, 15(1), 189-200.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Cekaite, A. (2013). Calibration in directive/response sequences in family interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46, 122-138.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Harlig, K. B., & Hartford, B. S. (2005). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher.
- Hashempour, Z. (2016). A study on Iranian funeral posters: Speech acts analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(55), 946-952.
- Hedger, A. J. (2013). Meaning and racial slurs: Derogatory epithets and the semantics/pragmatics interface. *Journal Language and Communication*, 33, 205-213.
- Horvath, B. M. (2013). Ways of Observing: Studying the interplay of social and linguistic variation. In Mallinson, C., Childs, B., & Van Herk, G. (Ed.). *Data Collection in Sociolinguistics Methods and Applications (pp. 7-17)*. New York: Routledge.
- House, J. (2013). Developing pragmatics competence in English as a lingua franca: Using discourse markers to express inter(subjective) and connectivity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59, 57-67.
- Imbang, D. (2014). Bentuk-makna dan fungsi kata tugas dalam bahasa Melayu Manado [Shape-Meaning and Function of Tasks in Manado Malay Language]. *Jurnal LPPM Bidang EkoSosBudKom*, 1(1), 21-37.
- Jary, M., & Kissine, M. (2014). *Imperative: Key topics in semantics and pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Keraf, G. (1991). *Tata bahasa Indonesia [The grammar of Indonesia]*. Ende: Nusa Indah.
- Kissine, M. (2013). *From utterance to Speech Act*. Newyork: Cambridge University.
- Kohandani, M., Farzaneh, N., & Kazemi, M. (2014). Critical analysis of speech act and language functions in top notch series. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1009-1015.
- Lakoff, R.T, (1990). Logic and politeness, or minding your p's and q's. In C. Corum, T.C. Smithstark, & A. Weiser (Ed). *Paper from the Ninth Regional Meeting of Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago, II: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lauzon, V. F., & Berger, E. (2015). The multimodal organization of speaker selection in classroom interaction. *Linguistic and Education*, 31, 14-29.
- Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-prinsip pragmatik [The principles of pragmatics]*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Lohse., K., Granefenhain, M., Behne, T., & Racoczy, H. (2014). Young children understand the nominative implications future-directed speech acts. *Plos One*, 9(1), 1-9.

- Maschler, Y., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *Discourse markers language, meaning, and context*. In D. Tannen, H.E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 189-222). UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Mauri, C., & Sansò, A. (2012). The reality status of directives and its coding across language. *Language Sciences, 34*, 147-170.
- Miles, B. M., & Huberman, A. (2014). *Analisis data kualitatif [Qualitative data analysis]*. Tjjeep Rohendi Rohidi (transl.). Jakarta: UI Press.
- Mohammadi, M. A., Nejadansari, D., & Youhaneh, M. (2015). The index of pragmatics uses and functions of WELL in University EFL classroom discourse: A case study in IRAN. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL, 12*(2), 86-116.
- Nilsson, J. (2015). Dialect accomodation in interaction: Explaining dialect change and stability. *Journal Language & Communication, 41*, 6-16.
- Noordyun, J. (1991). Language of Sulawesi. *Austronesian Linguistic, 1A*(81), 37-150.
- Pichler, H., & Hesson, A. (2016). Discourse-pragmatic variation across situations, varieties ages. *Journal Language and Communication, 49*, 1-18.
- Rahardi, K. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan imperatif bahasa Indonesia [Pragmatics: Imperative in Indonesian language]*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rahardi, K. (2006). *Dimensi-dimensi kebahasaan [The dimensions of language]*. Yogyakarta: Erlangga.
- Ramlan, M. (2001). *Ilmu bahasa Indonesia: Sintaksis [Science Indonesian: Syntax]*. Yogyakarta: Karyono.
- Reiter, R. M., & Placencia, M. E. (2005). *Spanish pragmatics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Riley, P., & Johnson, S. (Ed). (2007). *Language, culture, and identity an ethnolinguistic perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Saddhono, K., & Fatma. (2016). The form and function of local language in directive speech act at a university in central of Sulawesi. *Lingua Cultura, 10*(1), 37-42.
- Saddhono, K., & Rohmadi, M. (2014). A sociolinguistics study on the use of the javanese language in the learning proces in primary schools in Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia. *International Education Studies, 7*(6), 25-30.
- Saddhono, K., Wardani, E.N., & Ulya, C. (2015). Sociopragmatics approach on discourse structure of Friday Prayer's Sermon in Java and Madura island. *Journal of Language Literature, 6*(1), 26-30.
- Searle, J. R. (2005). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shicshavan, H. B., & Sharifian, F. (2016). The refusal speech act in cross-cultural perspective: A study of Iranian English-language learners and Anglo-Australian speakers. *Journal Language and Communication, 47*, 75-88.
- Stranovská, E., Munkova, D. Fráterova Z., & Ďuračková, B. (2013). Analysis of politeness speech acts in Slovak and foreign language texts of request in the context of cognitive style. *Procedia-Sosial and Behavioral Sciences 82*, 764-769.
- Sugiono. (2010). *Metode penelitian pendidikan [Educational research methods]*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suwignyo. H. (2010). Manifestasi tindak tutur pembelajaran among dalam wacana kelas [Manifestations of among speech in among the classroom discourses]. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 17*(2), 147-158.

- Takada, A. (2013). Generating morality in directive sequences: Distinctive strategies for developing communicative competence in Japanese caregiver-child interactions. *Language and Communication Journal*, 33, 420-438.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics*. UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Waring, H. Z. & Hruska, B. L. (2012). Problematic directives in pedagogical interaction. *Linguistic and Education*, 23, 289-306.
- Xiang, M., Grove, J., & Giannakidou, A. (2016). Semantic and pragmatic processes in the comprehension of negation: An event related potential study of negative polarity sensitivity. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 38, 71-88.