Abstract

Politeness is very important for everyone, wherever he is. The application of politeness (including language politeness) reflects the culture of a society. Given the importance of this language politeness, it should be familiarized with children from an early age. The problem of this research is how is the realization of children’s language politeness at RT 09, Kelurahan Rawamangun? The purpose of this research is to reveal and explain the facts of language usage in relation to the realization of language politeness by the children at RT 09, Kelurahan Rawamangun. The theory used as the foundation in this research is Leech and Brown-Levinson’s politeness theory. This study used a qualitative approach with pragmatic content analysis design. The research site is at RT 09, Kelurahan Rawamangun. The data source of this research is the children at RT 09, Kelurahan Rawamangun which is under seven years old. While the data of this research is conversations conducted by the children while playing at neighborhood. The results of this study reveals that children under seven years old still use positive politeness strategy to express their desires. In this study, it is found also violations of politeness by children. Children who are accustomed to rough language (impolite) are children of uneducated families.
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A. Introduction

The utterances produced by a person not only contain statements and questions, but also contains actions (speech act). Ujaran can be used in different forms with one purpose, or vice versa with one form with various purposes. In order for the language to function as a meaningful totality, it is necessary that principles provide direction and other aspects beyond the linguistic aspect itself as the binder which gives birth to a harmonization. One of the principles of communication in question is the principle of courtesy.

Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI) means polite as gentle, kind, not grumpy, gentle. While "gentle" is defined as subtle and pleasant to hear, not rude; not loud (sound); good-hearted (subtle), not ruthless, not grumpy, gentle.

There are various sizes to assess whether a speech is judged or not. Leech (1983) suggests that politeness can be measured on a scale of cost benefit, optionality scale, indirectness scale, authority scale, and social distance scale. Based on the cost benefit scale, a person can be said to...
be polite if what he says harms himself. On the contrary, if what is said is beneficial to the speaker, then what is said is considered irreverent by his partner. Based on the optionality scale, a person can be considered polite if he allows his or her partner to choose.

Based on the scale of indirectness, a person can be said to be polite if he indirectly expresses his intent. The more indirect he conveyed his meaning, the more polite he regarded by his partner said. Based on the scale of authority, the measure of politeness is seen based on the status of social relationships among speakers and partners. The farther the position of the second authority, the more polite the speech is used. Based on the scale of social distance, the size of politeness can be seen based on the level of intimacy of the relationship between the speaker and his partner. The more familiar the speaker's relationships, the less polite the speech is chosen. Conversely, the more unfamiliar the speaker's relationships, the more courteous the chosen speech is. Meanwhile, Brown and Levinson (1987) say that there are three scales that can be used to measure a politeness in society. The three scales are the social distance between the speaker and his or her partners, the relative power or authority between the speaker and his or her spouse, and the relative position of speech in certain situations with the same utterance in other situations. The measure of politeness based on the social distance scale between the speakers and the speech partners is related to the age, gender, and sociocultural background of the participants. Based on this scale, the speech is considered polite.

Politeness is very important to everyone, wherever he is. The application of politeness (including language politeness) reflects the culture of a society. Moreover, in every society, there is always a social hierarchy imposed on groups of their members. This is because they have determined certain judgments, for example, between young people, employers, teacher-students, rich-poor, and other status. In addition, context factors also cause politeness to be applied. The formal or official atmosphere greatly emphasizes this politeness. Assessment given to the social hierarchy is an emotive assessment given to an individual or group. Assessment like this is a sign of respect or appreciation to the person concerned.

Given the importance of language politeness, this should be "implanted" or familiarized with children from an early age. No matter how advanced the technology is, or however dynamic or productive the language, the polite language should still be upheld and practiced because it is a mirror of our culture and personality.

Based on a preliminary study, the phenomenon of the child language that occurs at RT 09 Rawamangun, "cursory" seems contrary to the definition of politeness. Curse (verbal abuse), scolding, and screams adorn the children's speeches in the area. This is interesting to investigate. Therefore, the researcher put forward the topic: Realization of Children’s Language Politeness at RT 09, Kelurahan Rawamangun. The study of language politeness in this study is based on Leech and Brown-Levinson’s politeness theory which is related to situationality aspect by taking into account the dimensions of the situation as presented by Dell Hymes which is encrypted into "SPEAKING", namely (1) Setting and scene, (2) Participant, (3) Ends, (4) Act sequences, 5 Key, 6 Instrumentalities, (7) Norms, and (8) Genres (Hymes, 1980).

B. Literature Review

Language politeness is reflected in the procedure of communicating through verbal signs or language procedures. When communicating, we are subject to cultural norms, not just conveying ideas we think about. Language procedures must be in accordance with the cultural elements that exist in the community where life and the use of a language in communicating. If a person's speech is not in accordance with cultural norms, he will get a negative value, for example accused of being arrogant, arrogant, indifferent, selfish, non-cultured, not even cultured.

Language procedures are very important to note the participants of communication (communicator and communicant) for the smooth communication. Therefore, the issue of language procedures should be given attention, especially in the process of learning to teach the language. By knowing the rules of the language, it is hoped that people will be able to understand the messages conveyed in the communication because the language procedure is aimed at arranging the following series.

1. What should be said at certain times and circumstances
2. What kind of language is naturally used in certain situations
3. When and how the turn of speech and interlocutory speech is applied
4. How to set the loudness of sound when talking
5. How attitude and gestures when speaking
6. When to be silent and end the conversation.

The language of a person is influenced by the cultural norms of a particular ethnic group or
group of people. English language procedures are different from those in the United States even
though they speak English. Likewise, the Javanese language practice is different from the Batak
language practice even though they are both speaking Indonesian. This shows that the culture
that has been ingrained in a person affect the pattern of language. That is why we need to study
or understand cultural norms before or in addition to learning the language. Therefore,
language procedures that follow cultural norms will produce language politeness.

Language politeness illustrates the politeness of the speakers. Language politeness
(according to Leech, 1983) essentially has to pay attention to four principles.

First, the application of politeness principle in language. This principle is characterized by
maximizing pleasure/wisdom, profits, salute or respect, praise, compatibility, and sympathy
with others and (at the same time) minimizing those things to oneself. In communicating, in
addition to applying the principle of cooperation (cooperative principle) with the four maxims
(rules) of coverage, namely maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and
maxim of manner; also applies the principle of politeness with its sixth maxims, namely (1) the
maxim of policy that primarily promotes the wisdom of language, (2) the maxim of acceptance
which prioritizes the advantage for others and the loss for oneself, (3) the maxim of generosity
which prioritizes obstruction/others, and lack of respect for oneself, (4) the maxim of humility
that puts praise in others and self-humility, (5) the maxim of compatibility that prioritizes
conformity to others, and (6) the maxim of conscience sympathy for others. By applying this
principle of politeness, people do not again use phrases that disparage others so that
communication will work in a conducive situation.

Principle of politeness is associated with two participants said, namely yourself and others.
The self is the speaker, while the other person is the opponent of speech (Leech 1983).

Second, the avoidance of the use of taboo words. In most societies, sexual words, words
referring to the usual body organs covered in clothing, words referring to something disgusting,
and the words "dirty" and "rough" include the words taboo and not commonly used in daily
communication, except for certain purposes. The following example is a sentence that uses the
word taboo because it is pronounced by the students to the teacher when the lesson takes place.

- Sir, please leave for a while, I want to defecate!
- Please permit, Mom, I want to piss!

Thirdly, in connection with the avoidance of the taboo word, the use of euphemism, that is a
finer expression. The use of this euphemism should be applied to avoid negative impression.
Examples of student sentences classified as taboo above would be a polite expression if changed
with the use of euphemism, for example as follows.

- Pak, mohon izin sebentar, sya mau buang air besar.
- Sir, please permit a moment, I want to go to the toilet.

Or, more subtle:

- Pak, mohon izin sebentar, saya mau ke kamar kecil.
- Sir, excuse me, may I go to the restroom?

Or, the most subtle:

- Pak, mohon izin sebentar, saya mau ke belakang.
- Sir, would it be possible for me to go to the rest room?

Thing to remember is that euphemism should be used fairly, not excessively. If euphemisms
have shifted the notion of a word, not to refine taboo words, then euphemism leads to
dishonesty, even abuse. For example, the use of euphemism by covering up the reality, which
officials often say. The word "poor" is replaced by "prosperity", "hunger" is replaced by
"malnutrition", "deviation" is replaced "procedural error," retained "replaced by" laid off ", and
so on. Here is a public lie. The lie belongs to a part of the impoliteness use of language.

Fourth, the use of honorific word choice, which is the expression of respect for speaking and
greeting others. Although the Indonesian language does not recognize the levels, your self-
terminology, you, Brother, Father / Mom have different politeness effects when we use to greet
people. The following four sentences indicate the level of politeness when a young man asks an
older man

(1) Engkau mau ke mana?
  Where do you want to go?

(2) Saudara mau ke mana?
  Where do you want to go, brother?

(3) Anda mau ke mana?
Where do you go?
(4) Bapak mau ke mana?
Where are you going to go, Sir?

In this context, the sentences (1) and (2) are not or less politely spoken by a younger person, but the sentence (4) should be pronounced if the speaker wants to show politeness. Sentence (3) is commonly spoken when the speaker is less familiar with the person he is addressing, although it is more appropriate to use the sentence (4).

Conversations that do not use a word of salvation can lead to the cynicism of the speaker. The telephone conversation between teacher and teacher students is an example of lack of support.

Student: Halo, ini rumah Basuki, ya?
Hello, is this Basuki’s house, right?

Teacher’s wife: Yes.

Student: Are you his sister?

Teacher’s wife: No, I am his wife. Who are you?

Student: I am his student. He is my supervisor. We have an appointment to meet at school. Kok saya tunggu-tunggu tidak ada (I’m waiting for him but he does not come yet)

Teacher’s wife: Oh, begitu, toh (Oh, I see)

Student: Ok, that’s all. (The phone is closed)

The teacher’s wife assumes that the student just on the phone is not polite, just because he does not follow the norm of language politeness, that is, he does not use the word greeting when he mentions his teacher’s name. The language of such students may be appropriate in other speakers’ societies, but in Indonesian speaking societies it is judged to be lacking (not even) polite. Therefore, it is appropriate that the teacher’s wife is annoyed after receiving the call. Plus the student also does not show the identity or the previous name and ends with no thank you or best regards.

Brown and Levinson (1987) put forward the theory of politeness of Face nosi. Face consists of two facets namely negative face and positive face. The negative face refers to the self-image of everyone who wants to be rewarded by allowing him to be free to take action or to let him be free from the necessity of doing something. To clarify the theory of politeness, put forward the illustration as follows. When a speaker commands or asks, then what is threatened is a negative face. This is because by commanding or asking someone to do something, the speaker actually has blocked the freedom of the speech partner to do (even to enjoy) his actions. For example someone who was busy chatting through his smartphone was told to do something. This is equivalent to the speaker not letting him do and enjoying his activities. His face was threatened and his threatened face was a negative face.

Furthermore, what is meant by a positive face is the opposite, i.e, referring to the self-image of each person wishing that what he does, what he has or what is the values he believes, as a result of what he does or has, is acknowledged by others as a good, fun, rewarding thing, and so on.

Everyone whose normal mind has face. Examples of Indonesian like: kehilangan muka, menyembunyikan muka, mukanya tercoreng, and menyelamatkan muka, it may be easier to explain the concept of this Face. The Face in this case does not mean a physical appearance, but a public image, or self-esteem. The concept of Face is to maintain self-esteem and honor. So, polite means the ability to always maintain self-esteem, feelings, and honor both yourself and others.

Brown and Levinson are very influential figures in the study of language politeness. The concept of politeness according to him is closely related to the problem of how to avoid a conflict. In theory, politeness is also related to the concept of rationality and face. Both of these are expressed as universal features of all speakers and speech partners personified in the universal model of the person. Rationality is the reasoning or the logic of means-of-purpose, while the face means a self-image consisting of two opposite desires, namely, a negative face and a positive face. The negative face is the desire that one's actions are not hindered by others, while the positive face is the desire for someone to be liked by others. Language politeness is a way to nurture and saving face. This is based on the assumption that the majority of speech acts always threaten the faces of speakers and speech and language companions is an attempt to improve the threat of the face.

The main purpose of language politeness is to facilitate communication. Therefore, the use of deliberately deliberate language, which is not right on target, or that does not reveal the truth
because reluctant to the elderly is also an impolite language use. This fact is often found in Indonesian society because it is carried by the culture of “not frankly in speaking” and accentuating feelings. Within certain limits it can still be tolerated if the speaker does not mean to communicate so that the person he or she talks does not know what he or she means.

C. Methodology
1. Approach and Research Design
   This research uses qualitative approach. The design used is pragmatic content analysis. The categorization model used as the basis is the Mayring (2011) model, i.e the data obtained are analyzed and then grouped into pre-defined categories. Aspects of textual interpretation follow research questions and are incorporated into categories. Categories are revised and verified together with the course of the analysis process.

2. Setting
   This research was conducted at RT 009, Kelurahan Rawamangun. Specifically located at the badminton court where children playing, on the researcher’s porch, in the cafe where children play games.

3. Data and Data Sources
   The data source of this research is the children at RT 009, Kelurahan Rawamangun which is under seven years old. While the data of this research is the speech conversation done by the children while playing in environment RT 009.

4. Technique of Data Collection
   This study uses two data collection techniques, namely observation and recording. Observations used were participant and nonparticipant observation. In practice, the researcher records the data required during or after the conversation, especially those containing the language courtesy. Observation is done by using observation note format or field note that serves to describe the speech and the process of conversation in the family and its context. The result of observation note is called field note. This field note is coded as CL. Furthermore, recording is done to obtain actual data or authentic data. With the recording will be obtained as much as possible and complete data about the implicatures of questions in the conversation of the Indonesian family. In addition, with the data in the form of recording results, researchers can check back data that has been exposed if there is doubt. Recorded data is coded as RK and accompanied by speech number.

   Recording is done by stealth, by putting a tape recorder in a place unknown to speakers or speakers. Hidden way is done so that the data obtained is the actual data going on in the field without any engineering. This recording uses a small recording device that has a good recording range.

5. Instruments
   To obtain data that can provide a holistic picture or intact about the realization of language politeness, the researcher acts as an instrument of data collection. The involvement of researchers as an instrument is a decisive factor in order to obtain reliable data. In this case, the Researcher can use the tool in the form of recording device and observation sheet for the data collected is complete.

6. Data analysis
   Data analysis technique used in this research is data analysis technique during and after data collecting take place. As long as the data collection takes place there is a reduction stage which further summarizes, codes, chooses data, memos, summarizes, and makes temporary conclusions. The analysis after the data collection includes referring to the analytical framework in the form of drawing the conclusions of the findings, whether in the form of recording, observation, or interview.

   The data collection steps consist of three steps, namely (1) data reduction, (2) data presentation, and (3) drawing the conclusion of verification. These three steps will be described as follows (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

   Data reduction is done after or while collecting data, whether data from recordings, interviews, or field notes. This activity can be interpreted as the process of selection and simplification, coding, and data classification. With the reduction activity will be obtained a brief and clear data with respect to the realization of the politeness. The result data is described according to the scope of the research problem. This reduction persists continuously during the study.

   Data presentation is the second important flow in the analysis activity. The presentation of data is defined as a set of arranged information that gives the possibility of a tentative or final
conclusion. The presentation of this data is done by describing the data that has been collected. The data presented in the form of children's speech at RT 009, Kelurahan Rawamangun.

After the data is presented, the researcher performs the third activity, that is data deduction and verification. The intended conclusion may be a tentative conclusion or a final conclusion. The things that are done when concluded are as follows: Researchers read carefully the research data then try to understand the meaning of speech. To be able to understand the meaning of speech, the researcher determines the outward meaning of speech, correlates the outward meaning with the context of the speech, the speech situation (SPEAKING Hymes) and triangulate to match the result of the understanding.

7. Data validity

To examine the validity of data on the realization of language politeness, this study used four techniques. The four techniques are (1) observational persistence, (2) triangulation, (3) referential adequacy, and (4) peer examination through discussion.

D. Findings and Discussion

1. Politeness realisation

It can be said that to show politeness, children need to master a number of dimensions of language use. In general, children first reveal what they want instead of asking what the partners need. They put their interests first and not the interests of others. Therefore, in interaction they usually use positive politeness strategies to express their desires. As contained in the following conversation fragment.

(1) Pada sesi bermain mobil listrik di lapangan bulu tangkis, Irvan mendekati Fauzi. Pada saat itu Fauzi sedang mengendarai mobil listrik di tengah kerumunan teman-temannya. Irvan ingin berpartisipasi dalam permainan itu.

In an electric car play session on the badminton court, Irvan approached Fauzi. At that time Fauzi was driving an electric car in the middle of a crowd of his friends. Irvan wants to participate in the game.

Irvan: Pa Sopir, aku Aku keneknya ya?

Driver, I'm I'm the conductor, right?

Fauzi: Oke, cabut...

Okay, move ...

Fauzi: Cepetan Van.

Hurry, Van.

Irvan: Pulogadung... Pulogadung... Pulogadung... (mereka kemudian tertawa)

Pulogadung ... Pulogadung ... Pulogadung ... (they then laugh)

In this fragment of conversation, it appears that Irvan had an interest to be accepted within the group headed by Fauzi. Therefore, he expresses his wishes directly. Irvan realized that Fauzi had the authority to manage the game because he owned the electric car. Therefore, he asked permission Fauzi to play as kenek (conductor). Irvan's strategy is positive politeness characterized by the use of my word. This strategy seems to work. Irvan accepted in this game. Positive politeness is also used by the child to ask for something or ask for help to a friend. In the conversation fragment (2) Irvan asked permission to Anik to take the crackers that Anik brought.

(2) Irvan mendekati Anik dan melihat kerupuk yang dibawa Anik. Irvan mendekati Anik and saw the crackers Anik had brought.

Irvan: Aku minta ya?

May I?

(3) Anik meminta tolong kepada Fadil untuk mengambilkan boneka barbie yang ada di dekat Fadil.

Anik asked Fadil for help to get the barbie doll near Fadil.

Fadil: Ambilin dong!

Take it for me, please!

In the conversation fragment (2) it appears that Irvan uses positive politeness to express his desires. The use of Aku ('I' as informal use) indicates that he and Anik are not distant
Irvan also did not wait for Anik to agree; he immediately took the Anik's crackers. Because Irvan has asked permission, then Anik did not protest. The same is true of Anik's request to Fadil in (3). Anik does not use *Aku* and does not use the word *Tolong* (please). Nevertheless, it seems that Fadil did not object to what Anik said. Interactions between Anik and Fadil run smoothly because the social distance between them does not exist. Children also begin to realize that they also need to provide choice options to the partners he said. As Leech said, politeness can also be measured from the choice given to the said partner. During the game session, Fauzi, who served as a driver, gave the choice of "passengers":

(4) Fauzi (to Desya): *Wuih... Asyik nih. Berapa putaran Mbak?*  
Wow... It's fun. How many rounds, Mbak (sister)?

Desya: *Aku tiga kali ya?*  
I (Aku) will take three times, all right?

Fauzi: *Iya tapi kita istirahat dulu.*  
Yeah, but we should take a rest first.

Although 'decision' remains in the hands of Fauzi as a higher authority holder, it seems that giving choice is a strategy that needs to be considered to be 'good' to his partners. By using word 'we', Fauzi expects Desya the passenger to understand that they have a common interest. Utterance that uses the choice as a form of politeness like this has not been found in children as old as Fauzi. Most likely, what Fauzi is saying is the result of mimicking an adult (in the game he acts as an adult). The form of choice as mentioned above is more likely to be revealed by their mother:

(5) *Pada saat menjelang petang, anak-anak tampak sibuk bermain-main dan tidak mempedulikan ibunya Fauzi. Sementara itu, si ibu menunggu sampai anak-anak tenang.*  
In the late afternoon, the children seemed busy playing games and ignoring Fauzi' mother. Meanwhile, the mother waits until the children are calm.  
Fauzi's mother: Let's go, wanna go home or still playing here? Those who want to play here still will sleep with a cat, all right! There, the cat is coming.

The next day at the same place, children playing ball. Desi could not open the biscuit. A mother approaches her.

Fauzi' mother: *Desi mau makan biskuit? Terus bisa buka sendiri? (Desi menggeleng)*  
Desi, want have biscuits? Can you open it up? (Desi shooked his head)

Fauzi' mother: *Kalo nggak bisa gimana caranya? Digigit.*  
If you cannot, how to do it? Bitten, right.

*Nggak boleh. Nanti giginya rusak. Plastiknya keras. Mau minta tolong Ibu nggak? (Desi mengangguk)*  
You may not. Your teeth will be broken. The plastic is hard. Wanna me give a help?

(Desi nodded)

Fauzi' mother: *Bilang gimana?*  
How to say it?

Desya: *Tante, tolong bukain dong.*  
Aunty, please help me.

Fauzi' mother: *Oh ya. (Ibu membukakan bungkus biskuit tersebut)*  
Oh yes... (Mom opened the biscuit packet)

Fauzi's mother: *Kalo udah dibuka terus bilang apa?*  
When it's opened then what you should say?

*Bilang apa? Coba, bilang apa hayo...*  
Say it? Try, say something...

Desya: *Terima kasih Tante*  
Thank you, aunty.

(7) *Di tempat lain, Anik menunggu Ibu tersebut.*  
Elsewhere, Anik waited for the mother

Fauzi's mother: *Tolong apa?*  
What's up?

Anik: *Tolong minum.*
Drinking water, please.

Fauzi's mother: Tolong minum? Tolong minum? Tante yang disuruh minum? Apa?
Bilang gimana?
Please drink? Please drink? You ask Aunty to drink? What? How to say?

Anik: Tante, tolong...
Aunty, help...

Fauzi's mother: Tolong apa?
What help?

Dika: Tolong minum.
Please drink.

Fauzi's mother: Bukakan.
Open it up.

Anik: Bukain... Bukakan...
Open it up...Open it up...

Fauzi's mother: Minumnya...
The drink...

In the segment of the conversation, it is also seen that Fauzi's mother did not only teach how to ask for help; she also taught how to use standard language when asking for help. Notice how the teacher says "Bukakan..."-"open it up" followed by "Bukain..."-"Open it" then followed by "Bukakan..."-"Open it up". What the child says shows that he is aware that something has to be fixed. Through the forms of interaction like the two examples above, preschoolers also begin to recognize the standard variety of Indonesian as one of the markers of politeness.

As stated in the previous section, preschoolers are beginning to realize the function of continuity as a means of expressing their desires. This form has begun to be used by the age of 3 years, as found in research Dardjowidjojo (2000).

Echa: Eyang kong mau men?
Eyang Kakung: Nggak.
Eyang Putri: Eyang ti mau men?
Echa: Papa mau men?
Echa: Mbak Etsa mau.
Echa: Eyang kong mau men?
Eyang Kakung: Nggak.
Eyang Putri: Eyang ti mau men?
Echa: Papa mau men?
Echa: Mbak Etsa mau.

Children also use indirectness as a form of permission application to adults.

(8) Fadil mendekati seseorang yang sedang memegang ipod.

Fadil approached someone who was holding an ipod

Fadil: Om, ini apa sih?
Uncle, what is this?

Penulis: Ipod.
Ipod.

Fadil: Buat apa?
What is this for?

Penulis: Buat dengerin musik.
It's for listening to music.

Fadil: Papa juga punya. Bagus ya Om.
My father also has this one.. Good right, uncle.

(memegang alat dan tersebut sambil melirik ibunya)
(holding the tool and is glancing at his mother)

What Fadil said reveals that this question is a question to test information, not to get information. The answer obtained becomes a means to continue the intention of Fadil expressed his desire to borrow the tool. What Fadil says and does shows that he wants to hold the tool: Papa also has (I can borrow?). This form of continuity that begins with this question is a productive form for children of his age. The indirectness expressed by the children shows a predictable pattern, the question followed by the statement. Often, children rely on authority as a means of getting what they want. In the following conversation it was revealed that they used indirectness and Mother's authority that were nearby as a means of expressing his wish.
Vina and Anik and her friends are opening snacks. Vina has seen what Anik had brought that afternoon, a chocolate wafer. He is interested in what Anik bringing.

Vina: Wafer ya?
Anik: Mm?
Vina: Enak ya?

Anik's mother sat on the bench watching his son play. That day Vina brought an egg nut. While eating his eggs, he said to his mother.

Vina: Ma, aku maunya mie wafer.
Mother: Apa? Wafer siapa?

Davina pointed to Anik's place.

Mother: Anik's Wafer?
Anik: I've been...
Mother: Flirt her again. Tell to Anik.
Anik, may I...
Vina just stretched out her hand.
Anik gave her fallen wafer.
Mother: The fallen Wafer is dirty, just through it away.

My mother picked up the wafer and helped Anik unpack the wafer.

In the above conversation segment, Vina has indirectly indicated his desire to get food from Anik (Nice, right?). Apparently Anik did not catch the cues conveyed by Vina. Therefore Vina asks for his mother's help (Mum, I want Wafer mie).

Mother: Mum, she gives me a bit, Mum!

An interesting development is the use of words aku at preschool age. At this very young age, they use the word aku after they understand the use of their own names. The use of this word is very productive. Along with the word aku, children also understand who is called kamu and dia. At this age, it seems they have not realized that there are social rules that limit the use of those words. Children freely use the words to talk to adults and talk about adults, when children feel familiar with the adults who talk to them.
when to use the word *kamu* for second person, or use another word. Children assume that *kamu* can be used to call someone who is considered close or be their friend. To be able to call *kamu* to adults, children experience the introduction process until they become playmates. At the first meetings in a play group, for example, the children greet the author with *tante*. To get closer to the children, the author uses my word to call myself and this word is used when playing with them. As they are getting used to the presence of writers in the classroom, they do not hesitate to greet the author with *kamu*:

(11) Anik (telling her about her grandmother to the author):

*Kamu* tau nggak, nenek aku kan bobbya sama aku. Dia sukanya ciumin kepalkaku.

You know, *my* grandmother sleeps with *me*. She likes kissing my head.

What Leech says about social distance and authority in the measure of politeness applies to children as well. When the relative distance is smaller, the politeness decreases. However, toddlers begin to take account of authority. Therefore, children never call their Father or Mother as *kamu*. What is interesting about the above conversation fragment is the term *dia* which refers to the grandmother. The child mentions *dia* to refer to the grandmother, instead of calling *beliau*. This shows that the awareness of the greeting rules is still not well established.

2. Politeness violation

In a cafe, the atmosphere is really noisy. In a room measuring only 4x4 meters there are eight units of CPU online. Children playing games.

(12) Ucil : *Game apaan tu?* (anak yang biasa dipanggil Ucil mendekati Fauzi). Sini aku mainkan ya?

What game is it? (A child who is always called Ucil are approaching Fauzi). Let me play it?

Fauzi : Game Tarzan.

It’s Tarzan game.

Ucil : *Ah lemot lu. Itu cepat panah!* (lalu mengambil mouse dan menggerak-kannya)

Ah, you are so late. Hurry to archery it! (then take the mouse and move it)

Fauzi : *Komputer yang di ujung kosong.*

That computer there has no user.

From conversation 12 it is seen that Ucil who is a much older age trying to take over the game. This is not fun for Fauzi. According to Leech, this maxim requires each participant to maximize his own loss and minimize his own gain. Ucil’s utterance is impolite because the speaker tries to maximize his own profit by distressing others. Maxim violated by Ucil is the maxim of acceptance. The disagreement also appears from the mocking/ridicule and command: *Ah lemot lu. Itu cepat panah!* On the other hand, Fauzi tried to be polite by saying: *Komputer yang di ujung kosong.* This is an indirect speech act which is a polite form of telling Ucil to move away from him and look for another computer.

(13) Di komputer yang lain seorang anak tiba-tiba histeris. Rupanya ia baru saja memenangi game tinju.

On another computer a child suddenly hysterical. Apparently he just won the boxing game

Fikri : *Hore aku menang! Aku hebat bisa mengalahkan jagoan itu!*

Hurray I won! I’m great to beat the whiz!

Ahmad : *Bersik lu (sampil mendorong kepala si Fikri). Begitu aja teriak. Itu kan gampang.
Coba yang satunya kalau bisa menang.*

You are so noisy (skillfully push the head of the Fikri). Just shouted. That’s easy.

Try the other one if you can win.

*Si Fikri kemudian diam. Ekspresinya tampak kecewa.*

Fikri then silent. His expression looked disappointed.

In the above speech, both Fikri and Ahmad both violate the politeness of language. The maxim being violated is the maxim of humility. According to Leech, Maksim humility requires every participant to maximize self-respect or minimize self-respect.

In the utterance 13, Fikri tried to praise himself, while Ahmad denied it. Ahmad’s denial is indirectly indicating that he is much more powerful than Fikri. In addition, Ahmad also violated the maxim of inference. This maxim requires each participant to maximize the sympathy and minimize the feeling of antipathy to his or her opponent. If the opponent of speech gets success or happiness, the speaker is obliged to congratulate. That’s not what Ahmad did.

On another occasion, a child who was playing on the front porch of my boarding was called by his friend with a *dog (shits) call*.
Dodo: Njing (anjing) mana benang layanganku?
Shits (dog) where is my kite thread?

Rahmat: Di bawah pohon Mangga. Udah putus-putus.
Under the Mango tree. Already dashed.

Dodo: Ah elu sih... sambil melompat ke punggung si Rahmat.
Ah yeah ... while jumping into the Rahmat’s back.

Rahmat: Aww! Berat tahu! Kemudian Si Rahmat gantian naik ke punggung Dodo. Mereka tertawa bersama.
Aww! Weight you know! Then the Grace turns up to Dodo's back. They laughed together.

After investigation it turns out that both Rahmat and Dodo are not offended or angry in such speech models. At first glance it looks rough, but that’s the intimacy. The utterance after being considered by involving the situational aspects of SPEAKING Hymes, is still acceptable as a polite speech, especially for Dodo and Rahmat who have an understanding of the background of communication.

E. Conclusion

This study revealed that basically children under seven years old still use positive politeness strategies to express their desires. Based on data on strategies to express this desire it was revealed that toddlers were able to make a number of differentiating forms of politeness strategies to express demand. To peers who have a small social distance, children can immediately express their desires. For example when asking for food or when asked to be accepted in the group. Children are also aware that although the distance of relationships among peers is virtually non-existent, they also recognize who is in charge and who is controlled. Therefore, there is a form of meaningful disclosure of wishes for permission.

Also found a form of signals that children use to express the desire. Nevertheless, it seems that the child who was given the signal did not grasp the meaning to be conveyed. Therefore, this form appears to be very rarely used. Through the adults they know, children learn to express the request for help. Nevertheless, the word tolong-Please only spoken to the teacher, or based on the teacher’s request to speak the word. The children begged their friends without saying a word tolong-Please. This shows that children differentiate age and may be the authority of the partners. Although children are quite close to adults, it seems that they are still considering the age and authority of adults. Therefore they are more polite when asking for help. Besides asking for help with the word tolong-Please, children also express their desire to be helped through statements to/adults. The statement form is also used to indirectly seek permission to adults. This strategy is not used by children when they interact with their peers. They mostly use intonation when asking for permission to friends, like Aku papanya ya? Aku minta ya? or Kita istirahat dulu ya.

In short it can be said that children under the age of seven have been able to reveal several different politeness strategies to different speech partners. This distinction shows that at this very young age they have realized social distance, age, and authority. However, more comprehensive research on the politeness strategy of preschoolers is required, to provide a complete picture of the development of civic skills as part of pragmatic development. There are a number of things that have not been investigated in this study, for example the influence of home-brought habits in them including the pattern of care received by each child, the influence of the teacher’s socio-cultural background that provides knowledge of manners, and the use of other forms of politeness which may have been revealed by children but missed from recording.

In other places (cafe) found violation of politeness by children. In the area around the cafe was indeed a community different from the community in the field badminton. Children who are accustomed to rough language (not polite) are children of uneducated families. Their parents work odd jobs. Most of them are poorly groomed. While the community on the front porch boarding researcher is educated but has a distinctive culture (Betawi). In this case the rough language shows intimacy, unlike the one in the cafe.
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