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ABSTRACT
The study is mainly aimed at mapping the politeness system and more specifically discusses the role of ages as one of the most crucial social variables governing politeness strategies of heritage languages in South Sulawesi. The data were taken randomly from 120 respondents of the three ethnic groups of South Sulawesi, namely Torajanese, Enrekangness, and Taeness who were interviewed and asked to fill out questionnaires and some others from the author's studies on politeness system of Makasarese and Buginese ethnics. The study reveals that ages play important part in politeness strategies among the three communities. As mentioned in many literatures, in a symmetrical relation, regardless of ages, people tend to employ a positive politeness strategy, and as such using a more casual and direct speech for intimacy, when conversing to friends, and employ a negative politeness strategy, using a more formal and indirect speech for deference, when conversing to strangers. However, the study found that, regardless the social relation patterns of participants, the community consistently employ a negative politeness strategy when the interlocutors are older and a positive politeness strategy when the interlocutors are much younger. Such a consistency is also found in an asymmetrical relation. When conversing to much younger superiors, the community who are in the inferior position tended to employ a positive politeness strategy, instead of using a negative politeness one as the unmarked form. Conversely, when communicating to much older inferiors, the community who are in the superior position tended to employ a negative politeness strategy rather than the positive one as the unmarked form.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The politeness phenomenon has become an endless issue explored by sociolinguists and pragmaticists all over the world. It is said that they are mostly driven by the need to find out a somewhat universal and effective framework for elucidating a politeness phenomenon from various language cultural backgrounds. The article mainly discusses the politeness systems of heritage language cultures of South Sulawesi, Indonesia. At the same time, it is aimed at revisiting the universality of Yassi’s politeness framework (1996, 2011) adapting Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987, henceforth, B&L) and Scollon and Scollon’s (1995, henceforward, S&S). More
specifically, the article is devoted to discuss the effectiveness of age variable as one of the most crucial social variables that the author believes to be the most dominant determinant factors to govern the participants’ choice of politeness strategies when conversing to others. The data were mostly taken from some of the author’s studies on politeness including Yassi (1996, 2011, 2012, 2016a, 2016b, and 2016c), and some other were taken from several master and doctoral studies conducted by students which were under supervision of the author.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In general, the term politeness can be associated with good behavior or etiquette. Since the emergence of Brown and Levinson’s theoretical framework of politeness in 1987, as the development of their theory initiated in 1978, the term politeness has become a major study for multi-disciplinary sciences such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, social psychology, anthropology, and language acquisition. Thus, this has certainly led to the emergence of several publications of research results on the politeness of the multidisciplinary field. Since then, the phenomenon of politeness has attracted the attention of experts or researchers of language throughout the world. They examine politeness from a different perspective. Some regard politeness as a medium to reduce friction in a personal interaction (see for instance Lakoff, 1973), others see it as a strategy to avoid conflict (see for instance Leech 1983), some others see politeness as a practice of solidarity formation (see Holmes 1995, Scollon and Scollon, 1995), and the rests see it as a behavior that shows positive attitudes toward others (see Holmes, 1995). Such conceptualizations, of course, are in line with the concepts of politeness of B & L viewing the concept of politeness as a rational behavior aimed at reducing the threat to the interlocutor’s face.

Nowaday, B&L politeness theoretical framework is one of the most widely used and cited throughout the world. Regardless of some critics from a number of researchers of politeness phenomenon particularly those who studied heritage languages cultural backgrounds of Asia such as, to name only a few, Gu 1990; Idea 1989; Matsumoto 1988; Watts, Ide and Ehlich 1992; Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1992b, B & L has succeeded in laying the foundation of the theoretical framework on the study of politeness phenomenon, especially on the concept of 'face'. As a matter of fact, concept of ‘face’ is not a new one. It was firstly touched and mentioned by Erving Goffman, a sociologist in one of his seminal papers entitled "On Face Work" in 1963.
Specifically, B & L defines 'face' as the wants of a person which consist of two; 'Negative face' and 'Positive face'. 'Negative face' is defined as the fundamental right of a person to the territory, privacy, the rights not to be intervened that is free to act and free from threats; The desire of every member of the community that his actions are not intervened by others. ‘Positive face’ positive image, or personality, including the desire that the self-image is appreciated, valued or supported. The desire of every member of society that their desires are supported or appreciated by other members of society wherever they are (B & L: 66-67). 'Negative face' refers to the so-called "formal politeness" concept. 'Positive face' refers to something vaguer, i.e. the desire to be understood, supported, liked, or admired from the community where they are. Negative face; the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – ie to freedom of action and freedom from imposition; the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others. Positive face; the positive consistent self-image or ‘personality’ (crucially including the desire that the self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactions; the want of every member (of a society) that his wants be desirable to at least some others (B&L 1978:66-67). Negative face: looked after with what we call formal politeness. Positive face: looked after in a less obvious way. It is to do with putting your best foot forward, the desire to be ratified, understood, approved of, liked or admired, whatever that entails in a given society. The former can be defined as the want of adult members of society who need to be respected, approved, liked, admired and the like from the community where they belong. The latter can be defined as the wants of the societal member not to be impeded and to intervened their privacy (Brown and Levinson, 1978, 1987).

Social interaction in B&L’s system consists of each speaker playing off his own positive and negative face wants againsts those of other interactants. Politeness strategies are things that are done in communication which will provide in each situation a carefully calculated balance of these wants which are continually under negotiation in public communication. When we interact in conversation, there are many situations where face is put at risk by what we say and what is said to us. These aspects are called ‘face-threatening acts or FTA’s. It might be the hearer’s face that is threatened, or the speaker’s. In this regard, B&L introduced and categorized politeness strategies into five. First, Bald on record, state something straightforwardly. Second, Positive politeness, the use of any casual and intimate utterances and expressions in an interaction. Third, Negative politeness, the use of any deferent utterances and
expressions including any deferent social attributes in an interaction. Fourth, Off record, stating something indirectly. Fifth, silence, not say anything when the imposition is higher. They further classified interaction into two; symmetrical relation and asymmetrical relation. In symmetrical relation such as an interaction between strangers, the participants are more likely to employ strategies of #3, #4 and #5 as the imposition is assumed higher. In contrast, in an interaction between intimate, close friends, and colleagues, participants are more likely to employ strategies of #1 and #2 as the imposition is assumed lower. In an asymmetrical relation, the superordinate or the superior ones are more likely to employ strategies of #1 and #2 when talking to their inferiors or subordinate whereas the subordinates mostly employ strategies of #3, #4, and #5 when conversing to their superordinate.

Similarly, Scollon and Scollon (1983) on B&L: when people interact in public they are concerned to preserve and present a public image that has two aspects;
1. Positive politeness = solidarity politeness – the positive aspect of a person’s public face is his/her concern to be thought of as a normal contributing member of his or her social world. Since the speaker’s face is his/her public image, their positive face wants are to be seen as a supporting member of that public.
2. Negative politeness = deference politeness – at the same time though, people also want to preserve some sphere of their own individuality, their own ‘territory either physical or mental’ within which they have the right of independence of movement and decision. Within their private life, people want the right not to be imposed on. This aspect of face, because it asserts the right to be independent of the social world, is negative face.

Adapting B&L’s framework, S&S classify politeness system into three; Deference, solidarity, and hierarchy. Deference is configured as ‘-P+D’ where P stands for power and D stands for distance, -/+ denotes the absence or the present of the given character respectively. This politeness system can be exemplified as the interaction between participants who are perceived to be in the same rank (-P) but they are not known one another, or strangers (+D). Solidarity is configured as –P-D which can be exemplified as interaction between close friends, colleagues, and intimates. They are in the same rank and close one another. Hierarchy is configured as +P -/+D. The participants are not in the same rank (+P), one to be in higher rank, superordinate and the other to be in lower rank, subordinate and the distance or social relation could be close (-D) and could be far (+D) (S&S, 1995).
Another theoretical framework of politeness that should be taken into account is Yassi (1996, 2011). As suggested by his data of Makassarese culture, Yassi (1996, 2011), adapting B&L’s and S&S’s framework, developed a politeness theoretical framework by introducing a new politeness system which has been empirically proven to be relatively more effective and compatible for heritage languages in Indonesia, see for instance Yassi 2011, 2012, 2016a, 2016b, and 2016c. Yassi categorized an interaction into six types of social relation patterns governing politeness strategies employed by the participants in an interaction. The following postulates and figures clarify this.

A. SYMMETRICAL RELATIONS
1. Deference in non kinship (-P,+D,-K), example; interaction among strangers, they are known one another.
2. Deference in kinship (-P,+D,+K), example; interaction among distant relatives.
3. Intimacy in non-kinship (-P,-D,-K), example; interaction among friends, colleagues, and close friends.
4. Intimacy in kinship (-P,-D,+K), example; interaction among family members.

B. ASYMMETRICAL RELATIONS
5. Hierarchy in non-kinship (+P,+D,-K), example; interaction between superordinate and subordinate, seniors and juniors.
6. Hierarchy in kinship (+P,-D,+K), example; interaction between parents and children, uncle/aunt and nephew/niece, grandparents and grandchildren, and the likes.
Diagram 1. Yassi’s Model of Participants’ Social Relationship Patterns

As can be seen from the diagram, politeness strategies which participants are more likely to resort on when conversing to others are governed by six types of social interaction patterns. They are (1) Deference in non-kinship, configured as (-P+D-K), (2) Deference in kinship, (-P+D+K), (3) Intimacy in non-kinship, (-P-D-K), (4) Intimacy in kinship, (-P-D+K), (5) Hierarchy in kinship, (+P+D-K), and (6) Hierarchy in kinship (+P-D+K). Patterns #1 up to #4 are categorized as a symmetrical relation and patterns #5 and #6 are categorized as an asymmetrical relation. The crucial point of Yassi’s politeness framework compared to both B&L’s and S&S’s is marked by the involvement of kinship variable. Such a variable is considered to be of paramount importance for accounting politeness phenomena in Makassarese culture including as I believe all heritage language culture in Indonesia and even in Asia. Such an aspect has been completely neglected by the two previous frameworks, B&L and S&S. Arguably,
they might say that kinship variable was allocated under the power (P) variable. However, if it is so, the frameworks seem ambiguous and as such unclear and unspecified as it is too general.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Enrekangnese Language

Graph 2 below shows the detail pattern of politeness strategies used by respondents of the Enrekang ethnic when communicating both on symmetrical and asymmetrical relations. On the graph, Q stands for question, i.e. question on questionnaire that consists of Q3 to Q18 as closed question and the rest is open type question.

3.1.1 Communication In Symmetrical Social Relations

Graph 2. Pattern of politeness Strategy of Enrekang language In both Symmetrical and Assymetrical Relation

As can be seen from the graph above, the Enrekang people generally use casual or direct variety when communicating to their close friends (Q3) and younger friends (Q5). This phenomenon is in line with B&L’s. However, when the friend is older, they prefer to use polite or deferent form rather than casual ones (Q4) because it will be regarded impolite when using casual forms to older interlocutors. This phenomenon obviously put challenges to the universality of the B & L theoretical framework.

Furthermore, when the respondents communicate to strangers or older persons, they generally use polite or deferent variety (Q6). However, when these foreigners are younger, they generally use a more casual or direct variety (Q7), and a mixture of deferent and casual varieties when their interlocutor are at the same age as theirs (Q8).
Again, this phenomenon help shed light on the inuniverasality of B & L theoretical framework.

3.1.2 Communication In Assimmetrical Social Relations

In asymmetrical social relation, respondents of Enrekang ethnic generally use a deferent variety when communicating to the superior (Q9), conversely, they usually use mixed variety when the superior is much younger than they are despite the use of deferent variety have larger portion (Q10). When positioned as superior, the respondents mostly use a more casual variety when communicating to the inferior (Q11). Surprisingly, when the inferior are much older, they tend to use a more deferent or polite variety (Q12). Again, this phenomenon provides a counter example of B & L theory (see data Q10 and Q12). Furthermore, interaction between seniors and juniors shows a universal and unmarked phenomenon, that is, seniors tend to use positive politeness when communicating to their juniors (Q13), and juniors tend to use negative politeness when conversing to their seniors (Q14).

Furthermore, communications in kinship spectrum, respondents are mostly to resort on negative politeness strategy and as such employing a more deferent variety when communicating to parents, uncles, aunts, grandparents and others (Q15) including relatives who are much older than the respondents (Q16). However, when communicating to a much younger relatives, the respondents are mostly to resort on positive politeness strategy, and as such employing a more casual variety (Q18, Q19). The following is the illustration of the strategy of politeness in the culture of Torajanese language.

Graph 3. The politeness strategy of Torajanese Culture
3.2 Torajanese Language

3.2.1 Communication In Symmetrical Social Relations

As can be seen in Graph 3 above, in symmetrical social relation, the respondents (Torajanese people) tend to resort on positive politeness strategy and as such employing a more casual variety when communicating to friends (Q3). This is of course aimed at creating an intimacy among the participants. This is in line with B&L’s. However, there is a variation of such employment of politeness strategies to younger and older friends. Torajanese people are mostly to employ positive politeness strategy and as such using a more casual variety when communicating to younger friends (Q5). In contrast, they tend to use negative politeness strategy when communicating to older friends (Q4) and as such employing a more deferent variety. Again, this phenomenon provides a counter example to B&L’s.

Moreover, interaction among strangers also denote some marked phenomenon. B&L claims that in such an interaction, participants generally resort on negative politeness strategy and as such employing a more deferent variety as an unmarked phenomenon. The study again reveals some counter examples. When communicating to a much older stranger, the respondents generally use negative politeness, i.e. the use of politer or more deferent form (Q6). This is of course in line with B&L’s. However, when the interlocutor is much younger or at the same age, the respondents mostly use a mixed variety (Q7, Q8) instead of using a more deferent variety as an unmarked form.

3.2.2 Communication In Assymmetrical Social Relations

In an assymetrical social relation, the communication is said to be delivered in both negative politeness strategy and positive politeness one. Regardless the age of the participapnts, superiors may use positive politeness or negative one when communicating to inferiors while inferiors have to use negative politeness strategy when communicating to superiors as the unmarked phenomenon. This phenomenon is positively supported by this study and as such it is in line with B&L’s (see Q9 and Q10). However, the study reveals a variation in the communication between superior to inferior. The respondents tend to employ a mixed variety, i.e. positive and negative politeness strategies when communicating to the inferiors of the same age (Q11). However, they will resort on negative politeness strategy and as such employing a more deferent speech variety when communicating to a much older inferior (Q12). This phenomenon again provides counter examples to B&L’s theoretical framework.
Another asymmetrical social relation involves seniority. A much senior friends will mostly resort on positive politeness strategy and as such employing a more casual form of speech when communicating to junior ones (Q13), and juniors will resort on negative politeness strategy and as such using a more deferent speech form when communicating to senior ones (Q14). This phenomenon is in line with B&L’s.

However, when the communication involves kinship, the choice of politeness strategies by the participants will show a different behavior. The respondents tend to employ negative politeness strategy when responding to a much older relatives including parents, uncles, aunties, etc. (Q15, Q16) but switch to using positive politeness one when communicating to relatives of the same age and much younger ones (Q17, Q18). The following is politeness strategy of Tae ethnic culture of Palopo.

### 3.3 Taeness Language

![Graph 4. The Politeness Strategy of Tae Palopo Ethnic Culture.](image)

#### 3.3.1 Communication In Symmetrical Social Relations

As can be seen from Graph 4 above, it is well-known that communication in a symmetrical social relation such as communication between close friends will be delivered in a positive politeness mode and as such employing a more casual speech form. This is of course mainly aimed at having a more intimate environment among participants. This phenomenon is supported by data Q3 and is in line with those of B&L’s. Nevertheless, the study reveals a variation of participants’ choice of politeness strategies when communicating to much younger and older interlocutors. When communicating to a much younger addressee, the respondents tend to employ a mixed variety, namely positive politeness and negative politeness strategies (Q5) although
positive politeness strategy still underscores negative politeness one. This means the use of a more casual speech form is more dominant in an interaction between friends. This is in line with B&L’s framework. In contrast, when communicating to older friends, the respondents prefer employing a negative politeness strategy to negative one and as such using a more deferent speech form creating a somewhat formal situation (Q4). This again provides a counter examples to B&L’s framework.

Another symmetrical speech event is a conversation between strangers. As claimed by B&L’s politeness theoretical framework, conversation between strangers is generally delivered in a negative politeness strategy, i.e. the employment of a more deferent and formal speech form. The study lends a strong support to B&L’s. Regardless of the ages, the respondents are mostly fond of employing a negative politeness strategy when conversing to both older strangers (Q6) and younger ones (Q7). Surprisingly, this phenomenon shows a bit different behavior to those of the two previous ethnics. Argueably, the author believe that such a different behavior is motivated mainly by the need for Tae people to keep being polite and kind to anyone including strangers after experiencing lots of disaster social conflicts in their villages. This is mainly aimed at mitigating or even preventing the social conflict among them reoccur. As we know that, compared to the two previous ethnics, Tae people have experienced a severe and long lasting social conflict with their neighbor ethnics.

3.3.2 Communication In Asymetrical Social Relations

In an asymmetrical social relation, for example, the usual conversation between seniors and junior, senior tends to use positive politeness, i.e. the use of more casual speech variety when communicating to his junior. Contrarily, junior generally use the negative politeness, in this case the use of deferent speech form. This phenomenon is said to be unmarked phenomenon for most culture. The data of the present study lend a strong support to the phenomenon (see Q9 and Q10). However, there is a variation of such phenomenon found in this study. When the junior is in the same age, the senior tends to use a mixed variety (Q11), but when his junior is older, the senior tends to use negative politeness (Q12), i.e. the use of more polite speech variety. This pattern of politeness strategy tends to be similar to the pattern shown by the two ethnic groups above. This 'marked' or unusual phenomenon, of course, raises the questions, what factors or variables contribute significantly to the occurrence of the 'marked' phenomenon? There must be another variable that really plays important role in governing such a phenomenon i.e. ages. Therefore, politeness strategy applied by
participants depends on the seniority. Juniors use negative politeness (Q13) while seniors use positive politeness when they communicate (Q14).

In other asymmetrical speech events, that is the conversation between participants in kinship relation. The pattern is almost similar to the Enrekang ethnic data above. Speakers generally use negative politeness, i.e. the use of politer speech variety when communicating with older relatives including parents, uncles and others (Q15 and Q16). In contrast, speakers generally use positive politeness, that is, the use of more casual speech varieties when communicating to relatives at the same age or younger age (Q17, and Q18).

Illustration of the pattern of politeness strategies applied by the three ethnic groups mentioned above; Enrekang, Toraja and Tae Palopo, clearly show the crucial role of 'ages' as one of social variables governing politeness strategies chosen by the participants when communicating to others. Interaction among friends, if the interlocutor is older, the speaker tends to use negative politeness instead of employing positive politeness as claimed by B & L. Similarly, in the conversation between the superiors and juniors. Superiors or bosses, despite having superior positions and as such they have a privilege right to choose freely between positive and negative politeness strategies, tend to be more inclined to use negative politeness strategy when conversing to older inferiors. This 'marked' phenomenon obviously provide counter examples to B & L’s politeness theoretical framework. Other counter data can found from the data of Q4, Q6, Q10, and Q12. Moreover, the crucial part of 'age' is further confirmed by the data of Q13 and Q14 in the graph above, showing clearly that juniors generally use negative politeness when communicating to seniors whereas seniors tends to use positive politeness strategy when communicating to his junior.

The followings are some data of recorded authentic utterances of heritage languages in South Sulawesi. These recorded data clearly show that 'ages' have a very vital role to politeness strategies chosen by the participants when they communicate.

Data 1 (Enrekang Language)
The conversation between two people who do not know each other. A is older than B (-P + D-K).

A: leppangki ' (could you stop by?)
B: iye ', makasi. (Yes, thank you)
A: inja umborako tu'u makale-kale? (Where are you going this morning?)
B: inja jio te'e, pasa. Deen kuanga. Matki '
(Down there, in the marketplace, there's something I want to find.)
As can be seen from the exchange above, the two participants use different politeness strategies. A starts to open the conversation using honorific -ki as polite form (-ko is impolite). However, after realizing that the interlocutor was much younger, the speaker switched to using a more casual variety namely honorific -ko. In contrast, speaker B uses polite speech form consistently because he is younger than speaker is.

**Data 2 (Makassarese Language).**

A dialogue between two colleagues, S= older H= younger (-P-D-K)

S. Manna+njo tana roso bajik+ji bate+na akbua ?
   although+DCT soil infertile good+PTCL way+POSS yield ?
   ‘Does it still yield well although the soil is infertile?’

H. Iyek puang, kamma+mi+njo bate+na na+pau mantari partaniang+a.
   yes sir true+PTCL+DCT way+POSS PSV+say officer agriculture+DCT
   ‘Yes, sir. According to the agricultural officer’.

**Data 3**

Dialogue between two brothers. A = Elder brother, B = Younger other (-P -D + K)

A: O .. andik niak erok kupawwangangko. (O (younger) brother, I want to tell you something.)
B: apa njo ka ’? (What is that (older) brother?)
A: erokka pala tolong, bicara ko rong sigang bapak (I want to ask for help, talk to Daddy)
B: apa erok nikana ka ’? ngapa ki kah? (what should I tell Dad, (older) brother? What is wrong with you?)
A: Kammane eroka pala doe ‘mingka malla’-malla’ tonga (well, I want to ask for money, but I am afraid to do so)
B: Malla ’apa ki? Eroki ka apao anjo doeka? (Why are scared? What is the money for?)

As can be seen from the two data above, the exchange shows a relatively consistent phenomenon of the politeness strategy employment of the participants. The superiors or the elder brother consistently use positive politeness strategy, that is the employment of a more casual speech variety such as honorific –ko, (you), andik (younger brother). In contrast, the inferiors, or the younger brothers consistently use a negative politeness strategy, namely the use of a more casual speech form such as honorific –ki, (you) ka’ (elder brother).

**Data 4 (Buginess language)**

Dialogue between two brothers. A = Elder Brother, B = Younger Brother (-P-D + K)

A. ndi.tegi lau emma? ( Younger brother, where’s Mom?).
B. Jokkai fasa’e daeng (Gone to the market, Elder brither ’)
A. Aga naola ndi ’? (How did she go?)
B. Mangojek i daeng (By Ojek, Elder Brother )

**Data 5. (Buginese Language)**
Dialogue between two friends, A = Slightly older than B (-P-D-K)

A: Pole tegako ces '?
(Where have you been mate? I haven’t seen you recently?)
B: Ri balla ma ‘, jarakka ta ita, ma’jama tona ‘makukkue.
(I’m just at home, you rarely see me because now I’m working)
A: Kega ko ma’jama?
(Where do you work?)
B: Ri bank Mandiri ka ‘ma’jama.
(I work in Mandiri Bank)
A: Tawwe, iga pattamako?
(amazing, who is your connection?)
B: Sapposisekku.
( My cousin )
A: Tabbuka empiga lowongangna?
(Is the application still open?)
B: Iye, ta’bukka empi.
(Yes, it is still open)

Data 6 (Buginese language)

Dialogue between two friends of the same age (-P-D-K)

A = Astaga ..., iko tu pale Amina? Pole tegako?
(Oh Dear, is it you Amina? Where have you been?)
B = Astaga ... Uli. Iko pale, kutokko demai sikola magi dek ku engka mitako?
(Gosh, is that you, Uli?, you also study here, don’t you? why have I never seen you?)
A = iye, kumaika massikola. Maega tugus lapangakkujadi dek ta engka sirunktuk
(Yes, I study here, I have got many assignments, so we never meet)
B = Oh pakua pale (oh, I see).

As can be seen from the three Buginese dialogues above, there is a very clear example supporting the vital role of ages as social variables governing the politeness strategy employment of the participants. The three exchanges show that the participants employ different politeness strategies. Both elder and younger brother in 4 employ negative politeness strategy, that is the use of a politer form such as ndik (younger brother) and daeng (elder brother). This phenomenon is more likely motivated by kinship relation than age variable. A in 5 consistently uses positive politeness, the employment of a more casual speech form such as honorific -mu, -ko (you) and ces (mate). In contrast, B consistently uses negative politeness, the employment of a more deferent form such as honorif ta- (you) and iye (yes). Such a different choice of politeness strategy is obviously governed by different ages of participants, A is slightly older than B. In 6, both A and B employed the same politeness strategy, i.e. positive politeness strategy, that is the employment of a more casual speech variety such as iko (you) and –ko (you). Such a similar choice of politeness strategy by the participants is of course motivated by the ages of the participants involved. They are at the same age so they feel free and as such without any hesitation using a more casual speech form which is mainly aimed at creating a more intimate situation in their interaction.
Conclusion

Politeness is a social phenomenon that plays a very significant role in social life of society. One of the main functions of politeness is to preserve and maintain positive social relationships between individuals in a society so as to create harmonization of social neighbor and community life.

The present study has clearly confirmed that in heritage languages of South Sulwesi, ages play a very crucial part to participants’ politeness strategy employment. Regardless participants’ social status, distance, and power, participants’ ages can be said to be the most powerful determinant factors governing participants’ choice of particular politeness strategy in a communication.

Why is it so? The cultural explanation of such an age domination is something to do with the endlessly homy education done by parents to their kids since the very beginning of kids’ childhood until they grown up as adult people. Parents of South Sulawesi ethnics keep teaching and reminding their kids to have a good behavior and morality to their children, including one of them is to teach their children to always respect to the older people.
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