

Cooperative Principle and Politeness in Children's Conversation in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten School Environment, Bengkulu Province)

Prinsip Kerjasama dan Kesantunan dalam Percakapan Anak-Anak di Lingkungan Sekolah TK Dharmawanita

Gumono

FKIP Universitas Bengkulu

Jl. W.R. Supratman Kandang Limun, Bengkulu 38371

Email: gumono@unib.ac.id

Submitted: 2021-12-30

Accepted: 2022-04-07

Published: 2022-04-11

DOI: 10.24036/humanus.v21i1.115831

Abstract

Language is a species-specific human capacity. Language is acquired gradually and simultaneously from birth. The purpose of this study was to find out a comprehensive description of forms and factors that influence the expression of acceptance and rejection of children's conversations in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school, Bengkulu Province. A descriptive qualitative approach and ethnographic design were used in this study. The subjects of this study were children in the Dharma Wanita Kindergarten, Bengkulu Province. The researchers themselves are the key instrument. Data analysis shows that children in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school can express personal attitudes in communicating. However, they have not fully applied the communicative principles (cooperative and politeness principle) in conversation, and any external factors influence their conversation.

Keywords: *cooperative principle, politeness principle, children's conversation, ethnography of communication.*

Abstrak

Bahasa adalah kapasitas manusia yang spesifik spesies. Bahasa diperoleh secara bertahap dan bersamaan sejak lahir. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui gambaran secara komprehensif tentang bentuk dan faktor yang mempengaruhi ekspresi penerimaan dan penolakan percakapan anak di TK Dharma Wanita Provinsi Bengkulu. Pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif dan desain etnografi digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Subyek penelitian ini adalah anak-anak di TK Dharma Wanita Provinsi Bengkulu. Para peneliti sendiri adalah instrumen kuncinya. Analisis data menunjukkan bahwa anak-anak di TK Dharma Wanita dapat mengekspresikan sikap pribadi dalam berkomunikasi. Namun, mereka belum sepenuhnya menerapkan prinsip komunikatif (prinsip kooperatif dan kesantunan) dalam percakapan, dan banyak faktor eksternal yang mempengaruhi percakapan mereka.

Kata kunci: *prinsip kerjasama, prinsip kesantunan, percakapan anak, etnografi komunikasi.*

Introduction

Experts have confirmed that a language is a communication tool that is genetically only possessed by humans. Language is a species-specific human capacity (Chomsky, 2006). Only humans can acquire language, while animals only have instinctive means of communication. For example, a chimpanzee expresses pleasure by pounding its fist against its chest; while the bees make rounds while flying several times to communicate that at a certain distance there is honey (Jassin, 2008) (Gumono, 2011). In line with that, Prof. Soenjono Dardjowidjojo emphasized that "Only humans are destined to be able to speak. God specifically created a mechanism so that humans can speak" (Dardjowidjojo, 2003).

Language skills are mastered by humans gradually. The stages of mastery of language skills, as stated by Lenneberg (1967), are in line with the biological (Bialystok, 1994, p. 162) and neurological development of children (Segalowitz & Gruber, 1977). Lenneberg emphasized that children's language development must follow a biological schedule. A child cannot be forced or encouraged to be able to say something if the biological ability is not yet possible. Biological readiness in question is the maturity of the speech apparatus, namely: lips, teeth, gums, tongue, nasal cavity, vocal cords, hard/soft palate, pharynx, epiglottis, and larynx (Hanna & Harrison, 2004).

Meanwhile, the influence of neurological factors on language development is also undeniable. Research by neurologists can be used as strong evidence that brain development greatly determines the mastery of human language skills. Findings that generally become references in research on the relationship of the brain to language are the findings of Broca and Wernicke's research in 1860 (Dardjowidjojo, 2003: 209).

An increasing age does not go hand in hand with the process of language acquisition. Some experts, using some supporting evidence, identify a "sensitive period" in language acquisition. The sensitive period hypothesis states that there is a period in the learner's self when language acquisition takes place naturally and without experiencing difficulties. Dijk et al. argue that the peak age for language acquisition falls into the first ten years of human life (Ellis, 2015, p. 123). During this period, the brain is in a plastic state, but at the onset of puberty, this plasticity is not apparent. They claim that this is due to the aberration of language functions to the left hemisphere of the brain. That is, the neurological capacity to understand and produce language, which initially includes both hemispheres, is gradually concentrated in the left hemisphere of most humans.

Early childhood education is carried out through school education and out-of-school education. Preschool education in the school education path includes Kindergarten and Raudhatul Athfal (RA) education units. While the types of preschool education held outside the school include a childcare center, playgroups, child care, or family education (BAPPENAS, 2015; Kemendikbud, 2016).

The content of the preschool education learning activity program, one of which is language skills, in addition to developing Pancasila morals, religion, discipline, thinking power, creativity, feelings/emotions, social skills, skills, and physical education (KEMENDIKBUDRISTEKDIKTI, 2020, p. 13). 'Language skills' get a larger portion of presentation than other program materials, because besides being studied, 'language' is also a 'media' for learning other materials. The presentation of 'language skills' is directed at equipping children with communicative competence which will later be needed to communicate with the surrounding community.

Developing communicative competence in children who are in the process of learning a language is a complicated process. The role of the environment is very influential in this process. Halliday (2016, p. 28) asserts that:

Communicative competencies come to life only when functioning in some environment. (The child does) not experience language in isolation... but always about a scenario, some background of the person, and actions and events from which the things are said to derive their meaning.

Communicative competence is obtained by children if they act in language with their surrounding environment. Children can't be fluent in a language if they are isolated from the surrounding community.

The main difficulty of children in acquiring communication skills is to distinguish the form and function of grammatical units (Coulthard & Condlin, 2014). The complexity will be more complex when communication is also associated with the character. Children who are learning a language, by the community in their environment are also directed to consider the appropriateness and suitability of speech acts (the proper conduct of language use). Included in these elements is the principle of politeness which includes how to realize speech and how to 'save the addresser's face' when communicating.

Considering the description above, the focus of research in this study is as follows:

1. What are the forms of application of cooperative principle and politeness principle in children's conversation in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school environment, Bengkulu Province?
2. What are the factors that influence the application of cooperative principle and politeness principle in children's conversation in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school environment, Bengkulu Province?

METHOD

This study is intended to describe, analyze, and explain (explanation) the realization of the cooperative principle and the politeness principle used in children's conversation in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school in communicating. To achieve this goal, the research was carried out with a qualitative approach and a descriptive research design, because it aims to describe (explain) the basic things that happened. Exposure is presented systematically and emphasizes factual data rather than conclusions. As a descriptive study, this research only involves one variable and is not intended to reveal the relationship between variables.

Samarin (1967) suggested that the subjects for field language research amounted to more than one person and met the requirements of a good informant, so that the utterance he produced, is a good corpus. Stubbs (1983, p. 28) further suggests that for this kind of research there is no definite provision on the number of subjects studied. Determination of the subject's number is strongly influenced by the research variables to be studied. Considering the thing above and to obtain the good research data, the researcher determined that the subjects involved in the study were students of Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school Bengkulu Province.

The data needed for this research is conversational data generated by students of TK Dharma Wanita Bengkulu Province in the school environment. The research data refers to the formulation proposed by Sudaryanto (1988), namely the research material which is a combination of the research object (gegenstand) along with the context.

The data was taken on on Juni 2015. The conversational data taken is then selected to be selected data (corpus). The selection of data is grouped according to the research

focus. For this reason, the selected data will be grouped into three broad categories, namely data on the forms of acceptance and rejection expressions, data on the functions of accepting and rejecting expressions, and data on factors that affect the realization of acceptance and rejection expressions. Each category of data has been grouped then detailed again according to research interests. To support the process of collecting various types of data needed by research, several research instruments are used.

Result and Discussion

Application of Cooperative principle and Courtesy Principle

A child masters language competence through the process of acquisition. Children absorb language data input from the community. The inputs are processed by the children using the language acquisition tools they have. Language data processing is done by forming hypotheses. The hypothesis is then tested in the act of communication. If the surrounding community does not give a negative reaction (opposition), then the hypothesis turns into a rule. Meanwhile, if there is counter-evidence, the hypothesis is revised until no more refuting evidence is found (Dardjowidjojo, 2003, pp. 19–20). This process continues even until an individual matures and masters the competence of speech acts well.

The linguistic rules that are mastered by children through a series of processing processes as mentioned in the paragraph above are essentially a set of principles that are formulated and used by the community to regulate their speech when interacting with one another. Leech (1993) explains that these principles consist of the cooperative principle, as stated by Grice (1975), and the politeness principle. The cooperative principle consists of four conversational maxims, namely: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relationship, and the maxim of manner. Meanwhile, the politeness principle consists of six maxims, namely the maxim of wisdom, the maxim of generosity, the maxim of modesty, the maxim of approbation, the maxim of agreement, and the maxim of sympathy.

The cooperative principle has generally been applied in children's conversations in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school, Bengkulu Province. The following quote [22] is an example of a conversation that has applied the cooperative principle.

- | | | | |
|------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| [22] | Rendi | <i>Yud, ambo kelak pinjem pedang-pedangan nyo yo.</i>
Yup, I'll borrow your swords later. | (45) |
| | Yudha | <i>Yo. Kita main serempak kelak yo.</i>
Yes. We'll play together later. | (46) |
| | Rendi | <i>Ho-oh, habis menyanyi kelak ya.</i>
Ho-oh, after we sing later. | (47) |

The conversation [22] occurred on June 30, 2015. It has fulfilled the maxim of quantity because each participant's conversation has carried out his duties and obligations. The utterer submits a request to borrow the swords (*pedang-pedangan*) in

conversation (45) with sufficient and not excessive information. The speaker responds to the request with sufficient conversation in (46), according to the demands of the opening sentence. The maxim of quality has also been applied in discourse [22]. In the discourse, each conversation participant informs and responds to information correctly. There is no 'lie' in his conversations.

Meanwhile, the maxim of relationship has also been applied in the discourse [22]. Formally, it can be seen that there is a correlation between the conversations (45) and (46), namely the words "swords (*pedang-pedangan*)" and "play (*main*)". While speech (47) connects speech (46) with an emphasis on the element of time. The pattern of relationships between conversations in utterance [22] is simple, the indicator of the relationship between the closest pairs (adjacency pairs) is marked by a formal and logical (semantic) structure that is easy to see.

Viewed from the way of expressing information, conversation [22] also shows that the child has applied the maxim of manner well. Children have consciously conveyed the conversation as it should. For example, speech (45) limits the conversation participant who is the target of the conversation through the vocative (call) "Yud". This kind of restriction is needed in classical conversation, where apart from the speakers and speakers, other children have the potential to become conversation participants.

Still, in conversation (45), clear restrictions are also made on the tense (later), verbs (borrowed), and nouns or substances that become objects of predication (swords). These restrictions take into account the context of the conversation in which the interaction takes place. The limitation of the "later (*nanti*)" time, for example, is because the child realizes that the actions contained in the verb cannot be carried out while speaking because at that time teaching and learning activities are taking place. The limitation of the verb "borrow (*pinjem*)" shows that the children in TK Dharma Wanita Bengkulu Province have realized the status of ownership of objects, they have been able to distinguish the concepts of "borrow (*meminjam*)" and "ask (*meminta*)". The limitation of the noun object "swords (*pedang-pedangan*)" also makes it easier for the speaker to understand the illocutionary power of the verb spoken by the speaker.

The speaker's response in conversation (46) has also shown the ability to apply the maxim of manner appropriately. The expression "yes (*yo*)" at the beginning of the speech becomes an expression of acceptance which marks the speaker's approval of the speaker's illocutionary verb with object restrictions and tenses as seen in the conversation (45). The expression of acceptance in (46) is also followed by an invitation from the speaker to perform activities related to illocutionary verbs (45) with the speaker. The use of the pronoun "we (*kito*)" further strengthens the acceptance of the addressee, with a logical (semantic) explanation that the pronoun "we (*kito*)" shows the speaker's willingness to "bind" in a more intense intimate relationship with the addressee. The choice of 'how' to express ideas as in this discourse [22], generally shows that children have been able to apply maxims of ways when communicating.

Meanwhile, the politeness principle has also been seen in children's conversations in students of Kindergarten school, Bengkulu Province. We can consider an example of a conversation from the following conversation.

- | | | | |
|------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------|------|
| [24] | Salma | <i>Excell, aku pinjem setip (PENGHAPUS PENSIL) nya.</i> | |
| | | Excell, I borrow your rubber (pencil eraser) | (57) |
| | Excell | <i>He-eh.</i> | |
| | | Yes | (58) |

Salma	(Setelah selesai) Ini setipnya, makasih ya. (After finishing) This is the eraser, thank you.	(59)
Excel	Iya. Yes	(60)

The opening element of the discourse [24] is an conversation containing a request to borrow a pencil eraser spoken by Salma (57). The opening element was responded with the expression of acceptance "yes (*he-eh*)" (58). The expression of acceptance which is realized with "yes (*he-eh*)" in the example shows that the child has applied the maxim of generosity, part of the politeness principle in conversation. The maxim of generosity generally appears as a response to initiation (stimulus) which contains a positive illocutionary verb. Imposition illocutionary category is proposed by Leech (1993: 164) to refer to the competitive illocutionary types in the directive category.

The maxim of generosity reads: make your profit as small as possible and make your loss as big as possible. In discourse [24] it can be seen that the addressee (Excell) respects the speaker (Salma) by agreeing to the request of the addressee to "borrow (*pinjem*)" the subject matter. In this section, the speaker has made herself "loss" and "profit" to her partner.

After finishing her activities, Salma returned the pencil eraser that she borrowed to Excell. Because she has got the "profit", Salma, while returning the conversation, appreciates the addressee by expressing "thank you (*makasih ya*)" (59) which has expressive illocutionary power. Expressive illocutionary is the disclosure of the psychological attitude of the speaker to the situation implied in the illocutionary. The speaker's appreciation with the expression of his attitude in "thank you (*makasih ya*)" is received by the speaker with the expression "Yes".

The discourse [26] contains the interaction between the child and her mother which shows the child's conversation activity in making choices before accepting the main substance of the speech conversation. How is the realization of the communication that occurs, we consider again the conversation [26].

[26]	Mother (Trien Hariyati).	: Zesha ...! Ini berhenti dulu. (Zesha masih berlari berkejaran dengan teman-temannya). Zesha ...! Ini disuap dulu, baru nanti main lagi. Zesha...! You have to stop first. (Zesha is still chasing her friends). Zesha...! You have to be fed first, then play again later.	(67)
	Zesha	: Udah ma! Already, mom!	(68)
	Mother	: Wong baru segini kok udah. Ayo sesuap lagi. It's just a little bit like this. Come on another bite.	(69)

- Zesha : (*Berhenti dan menghampiri mamanya, kemudian mengamati sendok berisi nasi yang akan disuapkan. Aku nggak mau pakai ini ma, (menunjuk sayur kacang panjang yang terdapat dalam nasi di sendok), aku mau pakai dagingnya aja.*) (70)
 (She stopped and walked over to her mother, then looked at the spoon filled with rice that was about to be fed to her). I don't want to eat this mom, (pointing to the long bean vegetables in the rice on the spoon), I just want to eat the meat.
- Mother : *Iya, ini juga ada dagingnya, ayoo.* (71)
 Yes, this one also has the meat, come on.
- Zesha : I don't want to eat that (while avoiding being fed). (72)
Nggak mau itunya (sambil menghindar untuk disuapi).
- Mother : (Replacing the string beans) That's it. (73)
(Mengganti kacang panjang) Ya sudah ini.
- Zesha : (*Mau disuap dan kembali bermain bersama temannya*). (She finally wants to fed up and goes back to play with her friends). (74)
- Mother : *Ayo nak, ini sesuap lagi.* (75)
 Come on kid, it's another bite.
- Zesha : *Sudah.* (76)
 No, done
- Mother : *Ini sekaliii...lagi.* (77)
 This is once... again.
- Zesha : *Tapi satu aja ya.* (78)
 But one more.
- Mother : *Iya satu lagi ini aja.* (79)
 Yes, this is one more.
- Zesha : (She goes to her mother and is fed up rice again). (80)
(menghampiri ibunya dan disuapi nasi).

Conversation [26] is a typical type of conversation between speech participants with high intimacy. The means of speech used are also typical of oral speech which maximizes the use of non-verbal codes to support the understanding of syntactically incomplete sentences. The conversation starter (67) reads "Zesha...! You have to stop first. (Zesha is still chasing her friends). Zesha...! You have to be bribed first, then play again later. (*Zesha...! Ini berhenti dulu. Zesha...! Ini disuap dulu, Baru nanti main lagi*)", said the mother with the illocutionary directive "ordering" the addressee (child) to stop her activities and be bribed with rice. The conversation initiation (67) was responded by the speaker with the conversation (68) "*udah ma!*" Quantitatively, the speaker's conversation has deviated from the principle of conversational cooperation, because the predicate of speech (67) (clause one "stop (*berhenti*)" and clause two "fed up (*disuap*)" is in the form of an illocutionary verb in a directive category that requires the speaker to perform certain activities (which are mentioned by the predicate). However, the response of the speaker (68) did not meet these demands (performing activities

mandated by speech predication (67)). The speaker expresses her attitude with the adjective "already (*udah*)" which formally means 'not related' to the verb in the next sentence. In normal communication, the illocutionary verb in the predicate of the opening conversation will be responded to with the desired action (contained in the verb). The violation of maxims committed by the speaker in this case is the failure of conversation maxims, namely the reluctance (opt out) of the speaker to continue interacting with the speaker.

Violation of the maxim of quantity in discourse [26] does not mean that the conversation is not communicative. This happens because it is helped by other maxims of conversation. In quality, the conversations in the conversation [26] have met the requirements of the conversation. Each participant said what should be said. For example, returning to the examples of conversation interactions (67) and (68), the speaker has conveyed the correct information (according to her) that she is not willing to continue the interaction, because (it is known from the next conversation of discourse [26]) she does not like "long beans" incorrectly. one element of the food to be fed. The speaker has made her own choice, which is not the same as the material she is ordered to eat (bribed).

From the relevance's point of view, by adhering to Leech's (Graves, 2000) opinion that "a T conversation is related to a speech situation if T is considered to contribute to the purposes of conversation between the speaker and the addressee", discourse [26] has applied the principle of cooperation well, especially relationship maxim. The speaker's conversations which partially violate the maxim of quantity, an example of which has been discussed above, generally do not violate the maxim of relation. The speaker's conversations all contribute to the achievement of the purpose of the conversation.

Meanwhile, the way of expressing information by the speaker in the conversations [26] has also fulfilled the principle of conversation. The indicators are that there are no vague expressions, there are no words with multiple meanings, there are no discursive conversations (exaggerated), and the children's speech is delivered regularly so that it is easy for the interlocutor to understand.

Judging from the application of politeness principle, there are several interesting things in the discourse [26]. The conversations spoken by Zesha (child/speaker) in the discourse all contain direct illocutionary speech. Direct/indirect is the politeness scale proposed by Leech (Leech, 1983). The more indirect an illocutionary, the freedom of the conversation partner to behave according to the demands of the illocutionary is greater, and the degree of politeness is higher. For example, the expressive illocutionary conversation (68) that Zesha uses to respond to her mother's initiation in sentence (67) is conveyed in a direct form, which means "I don't like long beans, mom, don't continue to feed me with rice with long beans". The illocutionary contained in the conversation (67) limits the freedom of the speaker (mother) to carry out activities related to interaction, the mother "must" stop bribery (bribing). The degree of freedom of the mother (speaker) to carry out activities will be different if the child (speaker) chooses another form of speech to replace the speech (68), for example "I don't want to eat this mom (*aku kan nggak suka kacang panjang bu!*)". If this form is chosen, the mother's freedom of activity is somewhat open, because she can replace "long beans (*kacang panjang*)" with other ones.

The examples of conversations (68) and the conversations of other speakers in discourse [26] show that the child's wisdom chooses the form of words to express her ideas has a low degree of politeness. Or in other words, the child in conversation [26] with her parents tend to be impolite.

Factors that Affecting the Application of Cooperation and Politeness Principle

The extra-language factors that were stated by Hymes (Duranti, 2009, pp. 285–286), have not fully influenced the expressions of acceptance and rejection produced by children in Kindergarten, Bengkulu Province. There are some factors that are still ignored by children, but there are also factors whose influence is clearly visible.

One of the factors outside of language that Dharma Wanita Kindergarten students have not paid attention to when having conversations is the background factor, both setting and scene. The reason why the children did not take-into-account the background factor was probably because the background of this study has been limited, namely in the Dharma Wanita Kindergarten, Bengkulu Province. Thus, the range of places/locations (spatial range) for conversation interactions to occur is relatively narrow, only covering: school gates, school grounds, waiting areas, kindergarten 1 classrooms, school office spaces, dining (study) rooms, and multipurpose rooms (places for learning). study music). The atmosphere of the conversation is relatively homogeneous, namely pedagogical interactions that are full of educational and learning atmosphere.

The conversation participants by Hymes are distinguished into speaker (sender and addressor) and addressee (hearer, receiver, audience, addressee) (Duranti, 2009). In this study, the focus of the study is directed at the expressions of acceptance and rejection produced by children in TK Dharma Wanita Bengkulu Province, both when they are in the speaker's position and when they are in the speaker's position in an interaction structure. Regarding the speech participants, the factors that influence the choice of expression are determined by the vertical dimension and the horizontal dimension. The vertical dimension relates to age, social status, position, and power. While the horizontal dimension is related to the level of intimacy between speech participants.

From the results of the analysis, it is known that the speech participant factor affects the children when they have a conversation. The discussion of research data, especially those related to speech participants, shows a tendency that when expressing acceptance and rejection of children, a number of postulates apply, namely:

- a. The older the conversation partner involved in the interaction, the more polite the form of choice of expression used, and vice versa.
- b. The higher the social status of the interlocutor involved in the interaction, the more polite the form of choice of expression used, and vice versa.
- c. The higher the position of the conversation partner involved in the interaction, the more polite the form of choice of expression used, and vice versa.
- d. The higher the power of the conversation partner involved in the interaction, the more polite the form of choice of expression used, and vice versa.
- e. The less familiar the conversation partner involved in the interaction, the more polite the form of expression choice used, and vice versa.

One of the factors that have the potential to influence conversation is the purpose of the conversation (ends). The purpose of the conversation relates to the end result of the interaction expected by the participants of the conversation. The assumption that

language is a goal-oriented activity encourages the researcher to link linguistic forms with the social functions of language (social goals of language action).

The research findings show that children are not (yet) affected by the conversation objective factor in carrying out conversations. They tend to choose the form of expression that suits their own desires/interests. In this case, perhaps Piaget's identification that children's language tends to function egocentrically is correct. Piaget exemplifies a child utters phrases, he does not bother to know whom he is speaking nor whether he is being listened too (Piaget, 2011).

The results also show that the form of expression chosen by the children in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school has not been affected by the change in the subject matter. The main conversation (act sequences) refers to the content of the message being discussed (message content) and the form of the message being discussed (message form). The unaffected form of expression used by children by the factor of changing the subject of speech may be due to the fact that in this study, the setting in which the speech event took place was limited to the school environment. This limitation affects the data collected, namely conversations that tend to be homogeneous in variety. The main points of speech collected are generally related to the points discussed in the learning activities.

The conversation tones (keys) are manifested in the form of verbal and non-verbal expressions that can show seriousness, relaxedness, or humor of speech acts. Variations in speech tone, for example: joking, discussion, lectures, sermons, praying, buying and selling transactions, and so on. The limitation of the research causes the variety of speech tones from the data collected to be limited. The variety of speech tone of collected data is limited to serious interactions (especially those involving teacher-student conversation participants) and relaxed types (especially those involving conversation participants of children with children, or children with their parents/introducer). The conversation variations are also limited to forms of interaction that commonly appear in teaching and learning process, such as discussion, question and answer in the class. Other forms of conversation variations, such as sermons, prayers, transactions (buying and selling), declamations, or lectures were not found in this study.

The research findings show that speech tone affects the formal form of language units that children choose when they have conversation. When having formal conversation, for example in teaching and learning activities, children try to use Indonesian correctly to express acceptance or rejection. Meanwhile, when chatting casually with each other in the class, for example while playing while waiting for class to start, they use the informal variety of Indonesian mixed with Javanese. However, the results of data analysis also show that speech tone does not (yet) influence children to apply the principle of politeness when interacting. When having a conversation, whether the tone is official or informal (relaxed), children still ignore the maxims contained in the politeness principle.

Based on the opinion of Hoe et.al. (Hoey, Mahlberg, Stubbs, & Teubert, 2007) which states that the exchange structure can be used to see the coherence of discourse, it can be concluded that children in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten have been able to communicate in a coherent manner. They already have the skills needed to communicate effectively, as stated by Dore (1979) quoted by Mussen et. al. (1988: 184-185), namely knowledge of grammatical rules, knowledge of word meaning (semantics),

and the ability to use language pragmatically ('the ability to say the right thing at the right time and convey it to the right conversation partner and relate to the right subject').

The use of non-verbal conversation tools in children's conversation, in general, is not motivated by their limited ability to communicate verbally, but a conscious effort to choose to use non-verbal codes by considering various factors. These factors are for example: the similarity of the degree (status) of the participants involved, the level of intimacy between the conversation participants, the conversation atmosphere that does not allow using verbal codes, and so on.

This condition is in accordance with the findings of Ninio & Snow (2018, pp. 45–48) from their study on the language learning process of children who speak English as their mother tongue, which concludes that preverbal communication in children (except those with disorders/disorders) ends when they reach the age of approximately 3 years. In other words, children aged more than three years have been able to establish good communication using verbal coded speech. This is also supported by the mastery of vocabulary in children at that age, the number of which is quite large and the rate of increase from time to time is very fast. Regarding vocabulary mastery, Mussen (1956) who studied American children concluded that preschoolers (aged 4-6 years) had mastered a vocabulary of 8,000 – 12,000 words. Unfortunately, until now, the researcher has not found any literature on the vocabulary mastered by Indonesian children.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that children in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten in Bengkulu Province have been able to structure a coherent and coherent interaction structure when they communicate with the people around them. They have mastered communicative competence according to the process of language learning development. Communication competence mastered by children is reflected in their ability to form a conversational exchange structure. Children have been able to act as initiators of conversation by throwing initiations, responding to initiations expressed by speakers, and providing feedback to the speech partner's response. The three basic positions in the conversation structure can be played well by children, even in some recorded conversations they have also shown the ability to carry out a more complicated exchange structure.

The research findings show that children in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten in Bengkulu Province have not been able to apply the principle of conversation (cooperation and politeness principle) in a complete manner. Their inability to apply the principle of conversation is not a reflection of the failure of language learning process at Dharma Wanita Kindergarten in Bengkulu Province, but a reflection of their status which is still at the process of language acquisition and learning.

Factors outside the language also have not entirely influenced the expression of acceptance and rejection of children in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten school. Background factors, both the place and atmosphere setting have not influenced the conversation. Participant factors have influenced the conversation of children in Dharma Wanita Kindergarten in Bengkulu Province, with a tendency if: the older the speech partner, the higher the social status of the conversation partner, the higher the position of the conversation partner, the higher the power of the conversation partner, and the less intimate the speech partner, then the more polite the form of expression used. The

children are not (yet) affected by the speech objective factor in having a conversation. The main speech also has not affected the child's form of expression. Meanwhile, the tone of conversation has influenced the language units chosen by the children when they have a conversation.

REFERENCES

- BAPPENAS. (2015). Rencana Jangka Menengah Nasional 2015-2019 Agenda Pembangunan Bidang (The National Development Plan 2015-2019 Sectoral Development Agenda). Jakarta: Kementerian PPN/BAPPENAS.
- Bialystok, E. (1994). Analysis and Control in the Development of Second Language Proficiency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16(2), 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100012857>
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind* (3rd ed). Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulthard, M., & Conklin, C. N. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2003). *Psikolinguistik: Pengantar pemahaman bahasa manusia*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Duranti, A. (2009). *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition 2nd Edition-Oxford applied linguistics*. Oxford university press.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing Language Courses:A Guidefor Teachers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.
- Gumono, G. (2011). PENGARUH STIMULUS TERHADAP PEMEROLEHAN BAHASA. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Budaya*, 1(1), 1–13.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Webster, J. J. (2016). *Aspects of Language and Learning* (1st ed. 2016). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg : Imprint: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47821-9>
- Hanna, P., & Harrison, B. (2004). *Word and world: Practice and the foundations of language*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoey, M., Mahlberg, M., Stubbs, M., & Teubert, W. (2007). *Text , Discourse and Corpora Theory and Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Jassin, A. (2008). Arah kajian bahasa: Kaitannya dengan perkembangan iptek dan sosial-budaya. File://D: van Dijk/Arah Kajian Bahasa,(Online),(http://www. com. diakses 28
- Kemendikbud. (2016). Rencana strategis terpadu pendidikan dan kebudayaan 2015—2019 | Perpustakaan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Retrieved from [//pustaka.kemendikbud.go.id%2Flibdikbud%2F%2Findex.php%3Fp%3Dshow_detail%26id%3D38212](http://pustaka.kemendikbud.go.id%2Flibdikbud%2F%2Findex.php%3Fp%3Dshow_detail%26id%3D38212)
- KEMENDIKBUDRISTEKDIKTI. (2020). *Rencana Strategis Direktorat Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini 2020-2024*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). The Biological Foundations of Language. *Hospital Practice*, 2(12), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21548331.1967.11707799>
- Mussen, P. H., & Conger, J. J. (1956). *Child development and personality*.
- Ninio, A., & Snow, C. E. (2018). *Pragmatic development*. Routledge.
- Piaget, J. (2011). *The language and thought of the child*. Read Books Ltd.

- Samarin, W. J. (1967). *Field linguistics: A guide to linguistic field work*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Segalowitz, S. J., & Gruber, F. A. (Eds.). (1977). *Language development and neurological theory*. New York: Academic Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sudaryanto. (1988). *Metode linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.