

Pragmalinguistics Politeness in the Balinese Language

Nengah Arnawa

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of PGRI Mahadewa Indonesia, Indonesia

Ni Wayan Ariawati

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of PGRI Mahadewa Indonesia, Indonesia

Ni Ketut Ratna Erawati

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

I Ketut Ngurah Sulibra

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

Abstract—This study aims to determine the linguistic patterns of politeness in the Balinese language. The pragmalinguistic approach was used because the linguistic patterns and politeness of the Balinese language are related to descriptive and pragmatic aspects. Data were collected through closed questionnaires distributed to informants consisting of lecturers, teachers, and Balinese language practitioners. The respondents were asked to give a politeness score for each proposed sentence pattern using a Likert scale, where 1 = very impolite, 2 = impolite, 3 = polite, 4 = more polite, and 5 = very polite. The analysis results showed that (1) passive sentences (score 3.64 – 4.29) were perceived as more polite than active sentences (score 2.76 – 3.14), (2) modality phrase forwarding (score 4.00 – 4.79) were perceived as more polite than sentences without modalities (score 2.64 – 2.71), (3) the use of institutional personification (score 4.07 – 4.76) was perceived as more polite than using the position as the subject of the sentence (score 2.88 – 3.00), and (4) the use of indirect speech (score 4.14 – 4.79) was perceived as more polite than using direct (score 2.76 – 3.00). Furthermore, the use of these linguistic instruments to determine politeness in the Balinese language is motivated by the speaker's desire to focus on information, soften and weaken the impositivity, as well as efforts to save a positive face.

Index Terms—pragmalinguistics, politeness, Balinese language, impositivity, positive face-saving

I. INTRODUCTION

Balinese is one of the 718 regional languages in Indonesia with sociolinguistic speech levels known as *anggha-ungguhing basa*. The study of its politeness is generally associated with levels related to the caste system (Setyawati et al., 2021). According to Martens (2001), the association of politeness with the caste system is a conceptual fallacy due to the unclear concept between respect and politeness. Respect creates normative awareness, indicating that the addressee has a higher social status than the speaker. The speaker's social status, such as age, caste, position, is relatively stable (Culpeper, 2021). However, this contrasts with politeness, which is oriented towards horizontal relationships concerning awareness of equality to guard the speaker and addressee's feelings. Language politeness is seen as a desire to 'please' speakers, addressee, and other audiences.

Mubarak and Rhaif (2022) stated that politeness is a communication technique used to create and maintain compatibility in society. It is a concrete effort to maintain a harmonious atmosphere between participants during communication. The concept of equality in harmony gave rise to the idea of using an egalitarian Balinese language. However, this process does not eliminate speech levels, which are the realm of the hierarchy of respect. This is because politeness and respect are two different lingual facts in the Balinese language with the varying realm.

Several studies on politeness in the Balinese language are dominated by a sociopragmatic approach because their point of view rests on social and cultural aspects (Seken, 2013; Suwija, 2017; Warmadewi et al., 2021). Balinese language politeness is not merely a socio-cultural phenomenon, rather it is also a linguistic phenomenon that involves grammatical aspects. Therefore, the pragmalinguistic approach was used to fill this gap to make understanding politeness more comprehensive.

This study aims to determine grammatical patterns, specifically syntax, used to express politeness in the Balinese language. Therefore, there are three questions to be answered as follows:

- (1) Is the selection of Balinese language syntax patterns perceived by the community more polite?
- (2) Is the personification of the institution seen as a strategy for using Balinese language skills?
- (3) Is there a relationship between mode and sentence function for politeness in the Balinese language?

II. LIRTERATURE REVIEW

A. *Pragmalinguistic Concept*

Leech (1983) and Culpeper (2011) distinguished pragmalinguistics, sociopragmatics, and pragmatics approaches. Pragmatics is the study of the general conditions of language used from a socio-cultural perspective. Meanwhile, sociopragmatics is the study of language use from the perspective of very specific local and social conditions. The variants' explanation of the linguistic expression rests on the specificity of the local culture. Pragmatics is positioned as the superordinate of sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics, while sociopragmatic studies are closely related to relatively stable socio-cultural aspects, such as gender, age, ethnicity, religion, etc. Furthermore, sociopragmatic studies examine the interaction of language with culture and socio-culture positions as the main explanatory variable for the variety of linguistic forms. This study focuses more on the relationship between language use and sociology. Pragmalinguistics is the study of variations in linguistic patterns and the use of language to achieve certain illocutions. It is an effort to optimize linguistic potential to achieve certain effects from speech acts. Therefore, this concept focuses more on the grammatical implications of using language to determine illocutions.

Owens (1992) and Arnawa et al. (2018), while matching the term pragmalinguistics with pragma-grammatical, stated that language consists of a form (grammatical), content (semantics), and pragmatics components. Conceptually, this shows that the study of language use becomes partial when it is only viewed from one aspect. The use of language is an effort to optimize the application of grammatical rules to achieve its pragmatic illocutionary power. Its realization is in integrating linguistic forms and their meanings in a socio-cultural context. This concept asserts that grammatical aspects are selected and used to achieve social effects in communicating. Therefore, the selected sentence needs to be adequately explained while considering the functional aspect widely examined in pragmatics. According to Leech (1983), this process is known as formalism – functional. The study of pragmalinguistics examines the data (corpus) from the aspect of grammatical form and its mapping to pragmatic function. The application of the pragmalinguistic approach aims to explain specific syntactic constructions as a presentation of politeness in Balinese. Piller (2016) stated that the study of pragmalinguistics is expected to reveal linguistic markers and patterns used to establish and maintain social harmony.

Esenova (2017) stated that pragmalinguistics is a functional linguistic study of the contextual use of language. This branch examines the interaction of linguistic units in the act of communication. It aims to investigate the use of linguistic signs to achieve the illocutionary intent of the speaker. Therefore, pragmalinguistics is the communicative grammar associated with speaking activities and speech acts. Esenova (2017) also reported 10 problems that become the focus of pragmalinguistics study. However, this study only focuses on identifying linguistic constructions perceived as more polite in Balinese.

B. *Politeness Concept*

In this study, politeness is seen as interpersonal rhetoric representing civility in language action. According to Leech (1983), the selections of linguistic expressions in acting politely are very dynamic in accordance with ongoing speech events. This is associated with the Balinese language characteristics that recognize speech levels, with the need for distinction between politeness and respect. Martens (2001) stated that politeness is a relation of equality between participants with a common and close relationship. It is motivated by the desire to take care of feelings as opposed to respect, which has a vertical relationship between the speaker and the addressee. Furthermore, audiences are perceived as having higher social status than speakers based on stable social variables, such as age, caste, and formal positions. In Hindu, most of the Balinese population embraced religion as a guide for good social behavior (Wiranata, 2020). It regulates the obligation to respect teacher chess, which consists of parents, lecturers, the government, and God. Furthermore, respect must also be given to elders, guests, strangers, and higher castes using respectful Balinese language, generally identified from the lexical selections, as in the following example.

- (1) *Jagi lunga kija?*
would go where
'Where would you go?'
- (2) *Lakar kija?*
where go
'Where are you going?'

Semantically, sentences (1) and (2) above have a similar meaning, namely the speaker asks the addressee about the location. However, these sentences are different variations of the Balinese language sociolinguistically. Therefore, for further simplification, sentences (1) and (2) are referred to as a variety of respect and disrespect. Pragmatically, sentence (1) shows respect for the addressee, while sentence (2) represents equality for both parties in a friendly atmosphere. The use of Balinese language variants in sentence (2) is a familiar speech politely used in an event. Furthermore, the use of sentence variants (1) and (2) shows the difference between respect and politeness, determined by stable social variables and dynamic selections of linguistic expression. Therefore, respect and politeness are different social relations manifested through other linguistic expressions. Politeness is represented through linguistic forms and speech contexts. According to Yule (2003), it is a means to show peace, friendship, and solidarity during an interaction. Politeness is also related to linguistic signs as a manifestation of relative social closeness.

C. Speech Levels in the Balinese Language

One of the salient characteristics of the Balinese language is the speech level. Suwija (2018) stated that there are 7 levels in the Balinese language, namely (1) *alus sor* (low - respect variety), (2) *alus media* (medium - respect variety), (3) *alus mider* (high or low - respect variety), (4) *alus singgih* (high - respect variety), (5) *andap* (variety of disrespect), (6) *mider* (not having a form of respect), and (7) *kasar* (disrespectful variety). Suwija further stated that these speech levels are related to the layering of social status in traditional and modern Balinese society. Traditionally, the hierarchy of Balinese social strata from the highest to the lowest consists of *brahmana*, *ksatria*, *wesia*, and *sudra*. This traditional social stratification is called *catur wangsa* (caste), and it is permanent in accordance with the patrilineal culture. In contrast, modern social layers are more dynamic because they are based on one's position or profession. Furthermore, speech levels are related to the social hierarchy in Balinese society. Finally, Sujiwa concluded that speech levels are associated with participants in a speech event.

The reality of speech levels in the Balinese language is related to caste or permanent social strata. When used as a variant, it is generally associated with a form of politeness. This public perception proves the unclear distinction between respect and politeness in the Balinese language, which constitutes its hierarchy with varying perspectives. Respect is triggered by the social hierarchy of participants, while politeness is associated with speech construction parameters. According to this concept, language politeness is a 'level of solidarity between speeches represented through linguistic expressions. Therefore, the indicator of politeness is the relation of linguistic expression – illocutionary function, while the indicator of respect is the relation of linguistic expression – participant.

III. METHOD

This qualitative study (Strauss & Corbin, 2003) aims to understand the phenomenon of politeness in the Balinese language. The results are expected to describe the linguistic aspects that function when a speaker consciously wants to speak this language politely.

A. Participants

Participants were determined by the purposive sampling method in accordance with the orientation of the study objectives (Marzuki, 1986). Samarin (1988) stated that the set criteria for informants in linguistic study consist of (1) adult age, (2) skilled in the language with an adequate understanding of the culture, (3) having psychological stability, such as honesty and patience, (4) high social status, and (5) significant interest in the subject being studied. Based on these criteria, 14 informants were determined, consisting of 4, 8, and 2 for lecturers, teachers, and practitioners, respectively, of Balinese language and literature.

B. Instrument

Data were collected through a closed questionnaire consisting of 3 different corpus proposed from the Balinese language, where informants were asked to give a politeness score for each sentence. The sentence corpus is derived from the pattern of passive, modality fronting, a personification of social institutions, and indirect speech acts. The politeness scoring was determined by applying the Likert pattern to determine the perception, attitude, or opinion of a person or group concerning a social phenomenon (Pranatawijaya et al., 2019). In this study, Balinese language politeness was formulated into 5 levels, consisting of very impolite, impolite, polite, more polite, and very polite.

C. Data Collection Procedure

This study was conducted in 3 stages. The first was observing and taking inventory of Balinese language sentence patterns, from the variety of respect and disrespect, hypothesized and often used to impress politeness. The observations and inventories results found 4 sentence patterns perceived as more polite. This initial data finding was followed up with the development of a study instrument in the form of a Likert-patterned questionnaire. The second stage was selecting and determining informants through the purposive sampling method. The contact person was carried out with prospective informants who fulfilled the criteria to explain their goals and provide answers to the questionnaires. Meanwhile, the third stage was distributing and collecting questionnaires through electronic media. Questionnaire data were re-examined through limited interviews with informants online.

D. Data Analysis

Data analysis was carried out with qualitative procedures. First, the raw data were edited by checking the filled questionnaire to reveal errors due to unanswered or repeatedly answered questions. The second stage was data classification, by identifying and classifying Balinese language sentence patterns based on their politeness rating scores. Meanwhile, the third stage was coding each data group using Miles and Huberman's (2014) strategy. The passive sentence pattern data group, modality priority, institutional personification, and indirect speech patterns were coded A, B, C, and D, respectively. Furthermore, politeness ratings were coded with numbers according to the Likert pattern, with 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 denoting very impolite, impolite, polite, more polite, and very polite, respectively. The combination of capital letters and numbers is interpreted as a relationship between sentence patterns and the perceived level of politeness. Meanwhile, the relationship between capital letters and numbers is the basis for drawing conclusions.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results

The data were in the form of perceptual values of politeness to sentence patterns in Balinese. A total of 32 sentences consist of 4 main patterns, namely passive construction (code A), modality precedence (code B), institutional personification (code C), and direct action utterances (code D), with each consisting of 8 sentences. In the Balinese language, two affixes function as passive verbs, namely the suffix *{-a}* and the prefix *{ka-}*. Furthermore, in pattern A, 8 sentences were proposed consisting of 2 sentences in Balinese language with a variety of disrespect using the passive construction of verb + suffix *{-a}*. These include 1 and 3 sentences, while 2 and 4 have a variety of disrespect with the passive construction of prefix *{ka-}* + verb. Sentence 2 of respect using the passive verb construction + suffix *{-a}*, are 5 and 7. Meanwhile, 2 sentences of respect with the passive construction of the prefix *{ka-}*+ verb, namely 6 and 8.

In pattern B, 8 sentences were proposed, consisting of 4 with modality fronting patterns, namely numbers 9 – 12. As a comparison, sentences 13 – 14 without modality were proposed, and 2 active ones that acted as the elements of their constituent phrases were changed, namely sentences 15 – 16, all representing the same meaning. Furthermore, in pattern C, 8 sentences were proposed consisting of 4 using the institutional personification process, namely sentences number 17-20 and 21 – 24. In sentences with institutional personification, the subject is filled with semantic noun [+institution] followed by the predicate of the action verb. Conversely, in a sentence without personification, the subject is accompanied by a pronoun with semantic features [+position] followed by a predicate with an action verb. The 8 sentences from pattern C represent the same meaning. Meanwhile, in pattern D, 8 utterances were proposed consisting of 4 indirect utterances, namely sentences 25 – 28. The other 4 utterances were in the form of direct speech, namely sentences number 29 - 32. These utterances of this group represent the same meaning.

Based on the answers of the informants collected through the questionnaire as mentioned above, the following perceptual data were obtained.

TABEL 1
INFORMAN RESPONSE TABULATION

| No. | Code | Informants and Politeness Score | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Average |
|-----|------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|---------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | |
| 1. | A | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4.29 |
| 2. | A | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4.29 |
| 3. | A | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4.14 |
| 4. | A | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.93 |
| 5. | A | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.93 |
| 6. | A | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4.29 |
| 7. | A | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.64 |
| 8. | A | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4.07 |
| 9. | B | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 |
| 10. | B | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.79 |
| 11. | B | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.64 |
| 12. | B | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4.79 |
| 13. | B | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.64 |
| 14. | B | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.71 |
| 15. | B | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2.76 |
| 16. | B | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.14 |
| 17. | C | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.76 |
| 18. | C | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4.57 |
| 19. | C | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.64 |
| 20. | C | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4.07 |
| 21. | C | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.00 |
| 22. | C | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2.86 |
| 23. | C | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2.76 |
| 24. | C | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.86 |
| 25. | D | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4.29 |
| 26. | D | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4.14 |
| 27. | D | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4.43 |
| 28. | D | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.14 |
| 29. | D | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.00 |
| 30. | D | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.86 |
| 31. | D | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.86 |
| 32. | D | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2.76 |

The distribution of the perceptual score data listed in Table 1 is classified and tabulated in Table 2.

TABEL 2
DATA CLASSIFICATION AND TABULATION

| No | Syntax Pattern | Politeness Perception Score Range | Description |
|----|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. | Passive construction | 3.64 – 4.29 | More polite |
| 2. | Active construction | 2.76 – 3.14 | Polite enough |
| 3. | Prioritization of modalities | 4.00 – 4.79 | More polite |
| 4. | No modalities | 2.64 – 2.71 | Polite enough |
| 5. | Institutional personification | 4.07 – 4.76 | More polite |
| 6. | Subject filled position | 2.86 – 3.00 | Polite enough |
| 7. | Indirect speech acts | 4.14 – 4.79 | More polite |
| 8. | Direct speech acts | 2.76 – 3.00 | Polite enough |

B. Discussion

The results showed that the Balinese language's linguistic instruments used for politeness are passive construction, prioritization of modalities, institutional personification, and indirect speech acts. Furthermore, the discussion is focused on these 4 linguistic instruments.

Perceptual data from the informants showed that the use of passive sentences is more polite than active ones. Linguistically, passive sentences are more concerned with the topic than the actor or agent (Oktavianti, 2014), as shown in the following example.

- (1) *I Putu ngadep carik.*
Someone's name sell-prefix-active rice field
'I Putu sells rice field'
- (2) *Carikn é adepa.*
Rice field-poss sell-suffix-passive
'The rice field is for sale'
- (3) *Gusti Ngurah ngadol sawah.*
Someone's name sell-prefix-active rice field
'Gusti Ngurah sells rice fields'
- (4) *Sawahnyan é kaadol.*
Rice field-poss sell-prefix-passive
'The rice field is for sale'

Sentences 1-4 contain the same core information, namely 'rice fields for sale.' Meanwhile, sentences 1 and 2 are examples of the Balinese language variety of disrespect, while 3 and 4 are of respect. Sentences 1 and 3 use an active construction that puts the subject forward, emphasizing the actor more than the information. Conversely, sentences 2 and 4 highlight the information and use of passive construction. According to Balinese speakers, sentences with passive construction are perceived as more polite than active ones. This is related to socio-cultural values that are upheld as norms by the community, which are based on Hindu teachings, the religion embraced by the majority of the Balinese population.

In Hinduism, there is a teaching of *wacika parisuda*, which is based on ethics (Wentin, 2017). It teaches to prioritize wisdom in speech in order to create a good and harmonious impression. Subsequently, this Hindu-speaking ethic does not emphasize talking about a person or other people's bad attributes. These linguistically, passive sentences are more concerned with information than actors. The subject is generally related to people, therefore, the passive voice does not highlight them. This syntactic concept is in line with the *wacika parisuda* aspect, which is the social norm in speaking for the Balinese people. *Waka parisuda* reminded the public not to talk about peoples' ugly attributes. Therefore, the people perceive passive sentences to be more polite than active ones based on this spoken etiquette.

Another syntactic construction that is perceived as more polite is the precedence of modality phrases. Kridalaksana (1993) stated that of these 3 modalities, *athletic* is the most relevant because it is a proposition associated with the following possibilities.

- (5) *Yán ada anak tusing mayah, patut kadendain*
If there is someone neg prefix-active-pay must confix-passive-fine
'If someone does not pay, they must be fined'
- (6) *An é tusing mayah patut kadendain.*
Someone neg prefix-active-pay must confix-passive-fine
'Those who do not pay must be fined'
- (7) *Yán prad é wánten krama san é mamuuk awig-awig, patut kapidanda.*
If there is someone who prefix-active-violate rule must confix-passive-fine
'If there is someone who violate the role must be fined'
- (8) *Krama san é mamuuk awig-awig patut kapidanda.*
Someone who prefix-Aktif-violate rule must prefix-passive-fine
'Someone who violate the rules must be fined'

Sentences 5 and 6 are a variety of Balinese language disrespect, while 7 and 8 are examples of respect. Sentences 5 and 6 have the same core message, namely 'those who do not pay are fined' but differ in syntactic construction.

Sentence 5 uses a passive construction by fronting the modality phrase of *y éni ada* or 'if any.' In contrast, sentence 6 uses a passive construction without a modality. Furthermore, sentences 7 and 8 are respect variety that contains the same core information, which states that 'those who violate the rules must be fined.' However, sentence 7 uses a passive construction by prioritizing the modality phrase of *y éni prad éw énten* or 'if there is,' while sentence 8 is without modality. In terms of Balinese speakers, sentences 5 and 7 are perceived as more polite than 6 and 8.

The use of modality phrases is seen as a linguistic marker of politeness in Balinese because it rhetorically rests on the ethnography of communication in the society. According to Arnawa et al. (2017) and Seken (2013), the importance of the *tatakan raos* or 'base for speech' is an effort to soften speech. This process is used by the Balinese people at the beginning of a sentence to produce a strong pragmatic power because it expresses conditional certainty. It is formulated as when X occurs, Y is obtained, and vice versa. The preposition of modality adverbs is generally used for illocutionary directive speech acts. Modality phrases are a speaker's linguistic strategy to weaken impositions. This process is carried out by prioritizing the modality phrase to mitigate the speaker-oriented imposition (Seken, 2013).

Other linguistic instruments also played for politeness in the Balinese language are the personification of institutions, which means that social institutions are treated like people capable of taking action. This can be seen from the syntagmatic relation of nouns with semantic features [+INSTITUTION] as well as [-POTENSI] action verbs with semantic features [+INSAN], as shown in the following example.

- (9) *D ésa adat é wenang nibakang pamidanda*
 Village traditional-suffix-det has a right active-impose sanctions
ring krama san é sisip.
 prep-on residents who guilty
 'The traditional village has the right to impose sanctions on guilty residents'
- (10) *Bendesan é wenang nibakang*
 Village head traditional-suffix-det have a right active-impose
pamidanda ring krama sane sisip.
 sanction prep residents who guilty
 'The traditional village head has the right to impose sanctions on guilty residents'

The difference between sentences 9 and 10 lies in the subject phrase. The core is sentence 9 where the nomina *d ésa adat*, represents a traditional village-level institution with autonomy based on Hindu customary law. Meanwhile, the subject of sentence 10 is the noun *bend ésa*, namely the position of the traditional village head. The semantic components of traditional village and *bend ésa* nouns are presented as follows. The difference between these two sentences lies in the subject phrase. The core subject of sentence 9 is the nomina *d ésa adat*, a traditional village-level institution with autonomy based on Hindu customary law. Meanwhile, the subject of sentence 10 is the noun *bend ésa*, namely the position of the traditional village head with the semantic components shown as follows.

d ésa adat +INSTITUTION
-POTENCY *bend ésa* +POSITION
+PERSON

Based on its semantic features, the semantic structure of noun *d ésa adat* cannot pair with the predicate of an action verb, as indicated in sentence 9. It is possible to pair noun *bend ésa* with the predicate of an action verb, as in sentence 10. However, in sentence 9, nomina *d ésa adat* is paired with the action verb *nibakang* 'impose,' thereby leading to the occurrence of personification. Sentence 9 is perceived as more polite than 10 by Balinese speakers.

The use of personification as a polite linguistic instrument in the Balinese language is motivated by the characteristics of its communal society. An example is the strong social ties institutionalized into a traditional village 'at the *Banjar* 'territorial,' and *témp ékan* 'regional' subsections. Furthermore, they tend to appreciate and live up to the norms of these traditional institutions, with fear of customary than official sanctions. The appreciation of these customary norms creates hegemonic politeness in the use of language, which is represented through the personification of customary institutions (Arnawa et al., 2018). The use of institutional personification is a representation of collective actions, therefore, it is an effort to face-saving politeness (Seken, 2013; Sumarsono, 2010).

Furthermore, another linguistic instrument also used for politeness in the Balinese language is indirect speech acts. Conceptually, a speech is indirect, assuming the sentence mode does not match its function (Grundy, 2000; Wijana, 1996), as shown in the following data.

- (11) *Sira semeton titiang é san é madu w é ayam brumbun?*
 who family 1st-pron-suffix-poss that have chicken brumbun-colored
 'Who is my family owns a brumbun-colored chicken?'
- (12) *Titiang n énten madu w é ayam brumbun.*
 1st-pron neg have chicken brumbun-colored
 'I do not have brumbun-colored chicken'
- (13) *Titiang nunas ayam brumbun duwen é*
 1st-pron want chicken brumbun-colored have-2nd-pron-suffix-poss
 'I want your brumbun-colored chicken!'

The mode shows that sentences 11, 12, and 13 denote interrogative, statement, and request, respectively. However, the three sentences have the same illocutionary, with varying directives. Therefore, sentences 11 and 12 are identified as

indirect speech, while 13 is direct. Based on data from informants, the use of indirect speech is perceived to be more polite than direct. This perception is motivated by Hindu speaking ethics that the social position of the requester is lower than the giver. The etiquette is often expressed by the lower position of the hands-on face. The essence is to avoid the appearance of coercion in requests. This is in line with Lakoff's (1973) and Seken's (2013) studies that the rules of politeness cannot be forced.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, passive sentence patterns, modality phrases, institutional personification language style, and indirect speech acts are politeness strategies in the Balinese language. Furthermore, using these linguistic instruments for politeness is motivated by the desire to soften the speech, weaken the imposition, and form a positive face-saving strategy oriented to the speaker.

The Balinese language politeness is the relative status of the relationship between speech acts and their illocutionary functions. It is not the same as respect related to a permanent social hierarchy and presented with speech levels. Furthermore, politeness can be realized through linguistic patterns in various languages, both in terms of respect and disrespect.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arnawa, N; Gunatha, I W. and Sdwika, I N. (2017). The use of modality markers to perform hegemony politeness in using the Balinese language: a case study on a wig-awig. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 1(1), 32 – 37. Retrieved on January 6, 2018, from <https://ojs.pnb.ac.id/index.php/JASL/article/view/670>
- [2] Arnawa, N; Gunartha, I W. and Sadwika, I N. (2018). Pragma-gramatikal kesantunan hegemonis bahasa Bali dalam awig-awig. *Bahasa dan Seni*, 46(2), 143 – 152. Retrieved on August 20, 2018 form <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jbs/article/view/3942/pdf> DOI: 10.17977/um015v46i22018p143
- [3] Arnawa, N; Gunartha, I W; and Sadwika I N. (2018). Balinese hegemonic poltness in awig-awig of desa pakraman. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8 (11), 1485 – 1493. Retrieved on December 6, 2018, from <http://www.academypublication.com/issues2/tpls/vol08/11/13.pdf> DOI: 10.17507/tpls.0811.13
- [4] Culpeper, J. (2011). *Historical sociopragmatics*. Retrieved on December, 16, 2021 from <https://benjamins.com/catalog/bct.31.01cul> DOI: 10.1075/bct.31.01cul
- [5] Culpeper, J. (2021). *Sociopragmatics: root and definition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved on November 16, 2021 form: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms> DOI: 10.1017/9781108954105.003
- [6] Esenova, K. (2017). *Pragmalinguistic studies in linguistics. Concorde: Académie Internationale Cncorde*. Retrieved on December 26, 2021 form https://kaznpu.kz/docs/institut_filologii/zhalpi_til_bilimi/pragmalinguistic_studies_in_linguistics.pdf
- [7] Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: or, minding your p's and q's. in Corum, C. et al. (eds). *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp.292 – 305). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- [9] Leech, G. (1983). *The principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- [10] Martens, C. (2001). *Politeness principles*. Germany: GRIN Verlag. Retrieved on December 16, 2021, from: <https://www.grin.com/document/2901>
- [11] Marzuki. (1986). *Metodologi Riset*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Islam Indonesia Press.
- [12] Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (2014). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
- [13] Mubarak, A. S. J. and Rhaif, K.K. (2022). Politeness strategies in motivational storytelling by American commencement. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 22 – 39. Retrieved on December 24, 2021, from: <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/2945>
- [14] Oktavianti, I.M. (2014). Realisasi pementingan informasi pada kalimat bahasa Inggris. *Adabiyat*, 13(2), 206 – 228. Retrieved on December 29, 2021 from http://eprints.uad.ac.id/2524/1/Realisasi_pementingan_informasi.pdf
- [15] Owens, Jr. R.E. (1992). *Language development An introduction*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- [16] Piller, I. (2016). Monolingual way of seeing multilingualism. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11(11), 25 – 33. Retrieved on December 25, 2021, from <https://www.tandfonline.com> DOI: 10.1080/17447143.2015.1102921
- [17] Pranatawijaya, V.H; Widiarty; Priskila, R. and Putra, P.B.A.A. (2019). Pengembangan aplikasi kuesioner berbasis web menggunakan skla Likert dan Guttmman. *Jurnal Sain dan Informatika*, 5(2), 128 – 137. Retrieved on December 27, 2021 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337987732>
- [18] Samarin, W.J. (1988). *Ilmu bahasa lapangan*. Yogyakarta: Kasius.
- [19] Seken, I K. (2013). Penggunaan peranti pendukung untuk melembutkan ujaran: Sebuah kasus kesantunan bahasa Bali. *Prasi*, 8(5), 33 – 42. Retrieved on December 25, 2021 from <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/PRASI/article/download/8952/5785>
- [20] Setyawti, M.S., Artawa, K. and Kardana, I N. (2021). Social contexts of pronoun usage in Balinese. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(4), 1837 – 1852. Retrieved on December 24, 2021, from: <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/2842>
- [21] Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. *Dasar-dasar penelitian kualitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [22] Sumarsono. (2010). *Pragmatik*. Singaraja: Undiksha Press.
- [23] Suwija, I N. (2017). Identification of anggah-ungguh krana Balinese language. *International Journal of Linguistic, Literature, and Culture*, 3(6), 14 – 21. Retrieved on December 25, 2021, from <https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/article/view/2/701>
- [24] Suwija, I N., Muliawan, I N.R.and Adhiti, I.A.I. (2018). Tingkatan-tingkatan bicara bahasa Bali. *Sosiohumaniora*, 21(1), 90 – 97. Retrieved on December 27, 2021 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332803913_TINGKAT-

TINGKATAN_BICARA_BAHASA_BALI_DAMPAK_ANGGAH-
UNGGUH_KRUNA/link/5ccaed6ca6fdcce35cd2e6fd/download

- [25] Warmadewi, A.A.I.M; Suarjaya, A.A.G, Susanthi, I G.A.A.D. and Dewi-Artana, N.L.G.M.A. (2021). Kesantunan berbahasa dalam bahasa Bali oleh selebgram pada media sosial instagram. *Lingua*, 18(2), 2417 – 260. Retrieved on December 25, 2021 from <https://lingua.solocls.org/index.php/lingua/article/download/713/612> DOI: 10.30957/lingua.v18i2.713
- [26] Wentin. (2017). Wacika parisuda: etika ujaran dalam Hindu. *Dharma Duta*, 15(2), 89 – 102. Retrieved on December 29, 2021 from <https://ejournal.iahntp.ac.id/index.php/Dharma-duta/article/view/251>
- [27] Wijana, I D.P. (1996). *Dasar-dasar pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- [28] Wiranata, A.A.G. (2020). Etika Hindu dalam kehidupan. *Widya Katambung*, 11(1), 1 – 17. Retrieved on December 26, 2021 from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/336867173.pdf> DOI: 10.33363/wk.v11i1.498
- [29] Yule, G. (2003). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



Nengah Arnawa is an associate professor at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas PGRI Mahadewa Indonesia. His field of interest are semantics, pragmatics, and the philosophy of language. Some of his scientific publications include The use of modality markers to perform hegemony politeness in using the Balinese language: a case study on *a wig-awig* (2017); Pragma-grammatical hegemonic politeness of the Balinese language in *awig-awig* (2018); Personification in *cecimpedan*: semantic structure of the tradition of Balinese children (2019), Metaphor about Balinese women: from semantic analysis to cultural pragmatics interpretations (2021), and Indonesian Language Characteristics of Deaf Children and Implications for Literacy Skills (2021).



Ni Wayan Ariawati is an associate professor at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas PGRI Mahadewa Indonesia. Her field of interest is related to social culture. Some of her scientific publications include: Women's strategies in achieving gender equality and justice in the family (2008); Women fish traders and their actualization achieve economic independence (2014); and The role of teachers in teaching management (2019).



Balinese (2021), and Passive Diathesis in Old Javanese (2021).

Ni Ketut Ratna Erawati is an associate professor at the Old Javanese Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia. Her field of interest relate to macro linguistics and landscape linguistics. Some of his scientific publications include Sandhi in Old Javanese: An Up-to-date Theory Approach (2017), Lexical Optimality of Speech Texts in Traditional Balinese Literature Revitalization of Local Wisdom (2017), Interpretation of Old Javanese Sound Segments Analysis of Speech Analyzers and Distinctive Features (2017), The Relativity Strategy of Old Javanese (SJR-2017), Implementation of Speech Texts: Perspectives on the Harmonization of Balinese Society in Bali (2018), Guidelines for Conservation of Lontar Manuscripts in the Conservancy of Cultural Heritage (2018), Linguistic Landscapes In Kuta Village (2019), Restoration and Implementation of the Archaic Lexicon in



I Ketut Ngurah Sulibra is an associate professor at the Balinese Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Udayana University, Bali. His field of interest is related to linguistics, cultural linguistics. Some of his scientific publications include: Use of Balinese by the Young Generation of Bali (Case on International Tourist Destinations in Kuta Bali) (2016), Use of Pairs of Balinese Scripts on Trilingual Bilingual Signboards in Bali (Traditional and Modern Areas) (2017), Phonological Heritage Ancient Balinese Language in the Balinese Kepara Language Preliminary Study (2017), Morphological Structure of the Ancient Balinese Language and Its Heritage in the Balinese Kepara Language (2021).