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ABSTRACT

This article has explored use of the Indonesian language pragmatically within its related theories, and formulated the so-called character language for the national harmony. This descriptive qualitative research employed three main methods, i.e. observation, literature review, and auto-expert judgments and applied two types of assumptions in the development of a new theory, i.e. the empirically logical assumptions and the theoretically critical assumptions. The results of actual and potential data under researchers’ observation and the related theories were then analyzed through a coding technique, which consisted of three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding to come to and present a structured form of the project, the distant and the close Indonesian languages as the main aspects of the character language. The project for the national harmony was then visualized and accounted for towards its predicted efficacy or eligible application through a six-phase projection, namely (1) in-family interaction phase, (2) in-classroom teaching-learning process phase, (3) in-school evaluation phase, (4) in-school re-evaluation phase, (5) in-public verification phase, and (6) in-society selection phase. Each phase with all the parties or the agents involved in this social verbal project was described and justified for its efficacy to contribute to the national harmony. Theoretically, this research develops the application of politeness or face-saving paradigm in pragmatics, while empirically, this research aims to encourage safe verbal interactions towards the national harmony, or international harmony to some extent.

Objective: The objective of this study is to investigate the Indonesian language pragmatically within its related theories, and to formulate the so-called character language for the national harmony.

Theoretical Framework: In this pragmatic social verbal project, the Indonesian language is pragmatically formulated into Distant Indonesian Language (DIL) and Close Indonesian Language (CIL). DIL is spoken to superiors or used in the formal setting, while CIL is spoken to close people or used in the informal setting. The formulation of DIL and CIL is based on the theories of negative and positive face, negative and positive politeness strategies, respect and solidarity politeness, and politeness and camaraderie. Meanwhile, the formulation of superiors (and strangers) and close people is based on the theories of types of hearer with the aspects of power and solidarity.

Method: This descriptive qualitative research employed three main methods, i.e. observation, literature review, and auto-expert judgments and applied two types of assumptions in the development of a new theory, i.e. the empirically logical assumptions and the theoretically critical assumptions. The results of actual and potential data
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Results and Discussion: The project for the national harmony was then visualized and accounted for towards its predicted efficacy or eligible application through a six-phase projection, namely (1) in-family interaction phase, (2) in-classroom teaching-learning process phase, (3) in-school evaluation phase, (4) in-school re-evaluation phase, (5) in-public verification phase, and (6) in-society selection phase. Each phase with all the parties or the agents involved in this social verbal project was described and justified for its efficacy to contribute to the national harmony.

Research Implications: Theoretically, this research develops the application of politeness or face-saving paradigm in pragmatics, while empirically, this research aims to encourage safe verbal interactions towards the national harmony, or international harmony to some extent.

Originality/Value: This character language project proposition has potential contributions for the (international) harmony, among others, as pragmatic behaviors or good manners against hate speech and hoaxes, for a guideline for text interactions in the virtual world, and metaphorically as the clothes that we wear in public or in private, within formal or informal situations.
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UM PROJETO SOCIAL VERBAL PRAGMÁTICO: LINGUAGEM DE CARÁTER PARA A HARMONIA NACIONAL

RESUMO

Este artigo explorou o uso da língua indonésia de forma pragmática dentro das teorias relacionadas e formulou a chamada linguagem de caráter para a harmonia nacional. Esta pesquisa qualitativa descriptiva empregou três métodos principais, ou seja, observação, revisão da literatura e julgamentos de auto-especialistas, e aplicou dois tipos de pressupostos no desenvolvimento de uma nova teoria, ou seja, os pressupostos empiricamente lógicos e os pressupostos teoricamente críticos. Os resultados dos dados reais e potenciais sob observação dos pesquisadores e as teorias relacionadas foram então analisados através de uma técnica de codificação que consistiu em três etapas: codificação aberta, codificação axial e codificação seletiva para chegar e apresentar uma forma estruturada do projeto as línguas indonésias distantes e próximas como os principais aspectos da linguagem dos caracteres. O projeto para a harmonia nacional foi então visualizado e contabilizado relativamente à sua eficácia prevista ou aplicação elegível através de uma projeção de seis fases, nomeadamente (1) fase de interação familiar, (2) fase do processo de ensino-aprendizagem em sala de aula, (3) fase de avaliação na escola, (4) fase de reavaliação na escola, (5) fase de verificação pública e (6) fase de seleção na sociedade. Cada fase com todas as partes ou agentes envolvidos neste projeto verbal foi descrita e justificada pela sua eficácia em contribuir para a harmonia nacional. Teoricamente, esta pesquisa desenvolve a aplicação do paradigma da polidez ou da preservação da aparência na pragmática, enquanto empiricamente, esta pesquisa visa encorajar interações verbais seguras em direção à harmonia nacional, ou harmonia internacional, até certo ponto.

Objetivo: O objetivo deste estudo é investigar pragmaticamente a língua indonésia dentro de suas teorias relacionadas e formular a chamada linguagem de caráter para a harmonia nacional.

Referencial Teórico: Neste projeto verbal social pragmático, a língua indonésia é pragmaticamente formulada em Língua Indonésia Distante (DIL) e Língua Indonésia Fechada (CIL). DIL é falado com superiores ou usado em ambiente formal, enquanto CIL é falado com pessoas próximas ou usado em ambiente informal. A formulação de DIL e CIL é baseada nas teorias de face negativa e positiva, estratégias de polidez negativa e positiva, polidez de respeito e solidariedade e polidez e camaradagem. Enquanto isso, a formulação de superiores (e estranhos) e pessoas próximas baseia-se nas teorias dos tipos de ouvinte com os aspectos de poder e solidariedade.

Método: Esta pesquisa qualitativa descriptiva empregou três métodos principais, ou seja, observação, revisão da literatura e julgamentos de auto-especialistas, e aplicou dois tipos de pressupostos no desenvolvimento de uma nova teoria, ou seja, os pressupostos empiricamente lógicos e os pressupostos teoricamente críticos. Os resultados dos dados reais e potenciais sob observação dos pesquisadores e as teorias relacionadas foram então analisados através de uma técnica de codificação que consistiu em três etapas: codificação aberta, codificação axial e
codificación seletiva para chegar e apresentar uma forma estruturada do projeto as línguas indonésias distantes e próximas como os principais aspectos da linguagem dos caracteres.

**Resultados e Discussão:** O projeto para a harmonia nacional foi então visualizado e contabilizado relativamente à sua eficácia prevista ou aplicação elegível através de uma projeção de seis fases, nomeadamente (1) fase de interacção familiar, (2) fase do processo de ensino-aprendizagem em sala de aula, (3) fase de avaliação na escola, (4) fase de reavaliação na escola, (5) fase de verificação pública e (6) fase de seleção na sociedade. Cada fase com todas as partes ou agentes envolvidos neste projeto social verbal foi descrita e justificada pela sua eficácia em contribuir para a harmonia nacional.

**Implicações da Pesquisa:** Teoricamente, esta pesquisa desenvolve a aplicação do paradigma da polidez ou da preservação da aparência na pragmática, enquanto empiricamente, esta pesquisa visa encorajar interações verbais seguras em direção à harmonia nacional, ou harmonia internacional, até certo ponto.

**Originalidade/Valor:** Esta proposta de projeto de linguagem de personagens tem contribuições potenciais para a harmonia (inter)nacional, entre outras, como comportamentos pragmáticos ou boas maneiras contra discursos de ódio e boatos, para uma diretriz para interações textuais no mundo virtual, e metaforicamente como as roupas que vestimos em público ou em privado, em situações formais ou informais.

**Palavras-chave:** Pragmática, Projeto Pragmático, (Im)Polidez, Língua Indonésia, Harmonia Internacional.

**UN PROYECTO VERBAL SOCIAL PRAGMATICO: LENGUAJE DE CARÁCTER PARA LA ARMONÍA NACIONAL**

**RESUMEN**

Este artículo ha explorado el uso pragmático del idioma indonesio dentro de sus teorías relacionadas y ha formulado el llamado lenguaje de carácter para la armonía nacional. Esta investigación cualitativa descriptiva empleó tres métodos principales, es decir, observación, revisión de la literatura y juicios de autoexpertos, y aplicó dos tipos de supuestos en el desarrollo de una nueva teoría, es decir, los supuestos empíricamente lógicos y los supuestos teóricamente críticos. Los resultados de los datos reales y potenciales bajo la observación de los investigadores y las teorías relacionadas se analizaron mediante una técnica de codificación, que constaba de tres pasos: codificación abierta, codificación axial y codificación selectiva para llegar y presentar una forma estructurada del proyecto. las lenguas indonesias lejanas y cercanas como aspectos principales del lenguaje de los caracteres. Luego, el proyecto para la armonía nacional fue visualizado y contabilizado para su eficacia prevista o aplicación elegible a través de una proyección de seis fases, a saber (1) fase de interacción en familia, (2) fase del proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje en el aula, (3) fase de evaluación en la escuela, (4) fase de reevaluación en la escuela, (5) fase de verificación en público y (6) fase de selección en la sociedad. Cada fase con todas las partes o agentes involucrados en este proyecto verbal social fue descrita y justificada por su eficacia para contribuir a la concordia nacional. Teoricamente, esta investigación desarrolla la aplicación del paradigma de la cortesía o de dar y recibir las ariparias en la pragmática, mientras que empíricamente, esta investigación tiene como objetivo fomentar interacciones verbales seguras hacia la armonía nacional, o la armonia internacional hasta cierto punto.

**Objetivo:** El objetivo de este estudio es investigar pragmáticamente la lengua indonesio dentro de sus teorías relacionadas y formular la llamada lengua de carácter para la armonía nacional.

**Marco Teórico:** En este proyecto verbal social pragmático, la lengua indonesio se formula pragmáticamente en lengua indonesio distante (DIL) y lengua indonesio cercana (CIL). DIL se habla con superiores o se usa en un entorno formal, mientras que CIL se habla con personas cercanas o se usa en un entorno informal. La formulación de DIL y CIL se basa en las teorías del rostro negativo y positivo, estrategias de cortesía negativa y positiva, cortesía de respeto y solidaridad, y cortesía y camaradería. Mientras tanto, la formulación de superiores (y extraños) y personas cercanas se basa en las teorías de tipos de oyentes con aspectos de poder y solidaridad.

**Método:** Esta investigación cualitativa descriptiva empleó tres métodos principales, es decir, observación, revisión de la literatura y juicios de autoexpertos, y aplicó dos tipos de supuestos en el desarrollo de una nueva teoría, es decir, los supuestos empíricamente lógicos y los supuestos teóricamente críticos. Los resultados de los datos reales y potenciales bajo la observación de los investigadores y las teorías relacionadas se analizaron mediante una técnica de codificación, que constaba de tres pasos: codificación abierta, codificación axial y codificación selectiva para llegar y presentar una forma estructurada del proyecto. las lenguas indonesias lejanas y cercanas como aspectos principales del lenguaje de los caracteres.
**Resultados y Discusión:** Luego, el proyecto para la armonía nacional fue visualizado y contabilizado para su eficacia prevista o aplicación elegible a través de una proyección de seis fases, a saber (1) fase de interacción en familia, (2) fase del proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje en el aula, (3) fase de evaluación en la escuela, (4) fase de reevaluación en la escuela, (5) fase de verificación en público y (6) fase de selección en la sociedad. Cada fase con todas las partes o agentes involucrados en este proyecto verbal social fue descrita y justificada por su eficacia para contribuir a la concordia nacional.

**Implicaciones de la investigación:** Teóricamente, esta investigación desarrolla la aplicación del paradigma de la cortesía o de salvar las apariencias en la pragmática, mientras que empíricamente, esta investigación tiene como objetivo fomentar interacciones verbales seguras hacia la armonía nacional, o la armonía internacional hasta cierto punto.

**Originalidad/Valor:** Esta propuesta de proyecto de lenguaje de personajes tiene potenciales contribuciones para la armonía (inter)nacional, entre otras, como comportamientos pragmáticos o buenos modales contra el discurso de odio y los engaños, como guía para las interacciones textuales en el mundo virtual y, metafóricamente, como la ropa que usamos en público o en privado, dentro de situaciones formales o informales.

**Palabras clave:** Pragmática, Proyecto Pragmático, (In)Cortesía, Idioma Indonesio, Armonía Internacional.

RGSa adota a Licença de Atribuição CC BY do Creative Commons ([https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)).

**1 INTRODUCTION**

As conveying messages is a matter of choices for speakers in using utterances, language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014a, 2014b, 2017). So is within the Indonesian language use today. Peoples of Indonesia use language in their everyday life through verbal interactions on the street, at workplaces, in the mass-media, or even in the virtual world. However, cases on hate speech and hoax happen due to their ignorance or probably under knowledge on what is appropriate to say or what is not in public or in private. These cases are rampant and are endangering the social harmony in various aspects of life: socio-cultural, political, religious, or even military. The Indonesian language use today is probably still out of good control, with the expense of threatening or spoiling the interpersonal face or the social face. The so-called informality is everywhere, uncontrolled, and, it is sometimes not carefully reckoned for its danger in public spaces, both in the real world and in the virtual world.

Informality is side by side with formality. While informality is probably more free or tends to be uncontrolled, formality is something serious. Formality is when something or someone is serious and correct (CALD, 2008), or, another previous definition, formality refers to high or strict attention to rules, forms, and convention (Hornby, 1987), or just attention to rules (OLPD, 1983). Hence, formality suggests three aspects, namely seriousness, correctness, and strict attention to rules, forms, and convention. Formality is distinguished from informality.
Formality refers to report-talk, while informality is of rapport-talk, and both show the stylistic differences between men and women. It is further explained that report-talk functions to present objective information to public, while rapport-talk is private speaking and involves conversations among couples or small, intimate groups (Tannen, 1992). In addition to this, a formal style will be characterized by detachment, precision, and objectivity, but also rigidity and cognitive load; an informal style will be much lighter in form, more flexible, direct, and involved, but correspondingly more subjective, less accurate and less informative (Heylighen and Dewaele, 1999).

Politeness is something else serious. The word has derived from polite, i.e. (1) behaving in a way that is socially correct and shows understanding of and care for other people’s feelings, (2) socially correct rather than friendly (CALD, 2008). From this source of definition, politeness suggests socially correct behaviors to show understanding of and care for other people’s feelings. However, other people to consider here may fall into two categories, e.g. not close people and close people, or superiors and subordinates, as the theory of power and solidarity (Brown&Gilman, 1968) suggests. Issues on formality and politeness are interesting to bring up together, and that is why linguists and researchers around the world have made accounts on this relationship. Formality and politeness have been frequently treated as equivalent; however, formality is a multidimensional phenomenon and hard to define, largely because it subsumes many factors including familiarity, seriousness, and politeness (Sifianou, 2013).

Concerning informality, we need to give special account on this. This concept is not easy to define in linguistics. A borrowing from the economy context, the term informal was coined by Keith Hart in his article on informal income opportunities in Ghana, while the 1972 ILO report on employment and poverty in Kenya was the starting point of the subsequent notoriety of the informal sector (Bangasser, 2000). In previous accounts, the concept of informality may refer to heterogeneity and inconsistencies, which is realized in terms of: non-observed, irregular, unofficial, second, hidden, shadow, parallel, subterranean, informal, cash economy, black market, unmeasured, unrecorded, untaxed, non-structured, petty production, and unorganized (Sindzingre, 2006). In line with this concept, it is asserted that informality is a term that has the dubious distinction of combining maximum policy importance and political salience with minimal conceptual clarity and coherence in the analytical literature. It is furthermore added that the informality literature is vast and its multifaceted nature was present at the creation (Kanbur, 2009). There is also another confirmation on this issue of informality
Informality features prominently in development discourse, accompanied with a vast and growing literature; and in tandem with this, there are growing inconsistencies in the way it is conceptualized and measured. There is no single approach to defining informality and the definitions used in theoretical and empirical research often lack consistency from one study to the next (Heintz, 2012). Hence, however, from these few accounts, we would like to close that formality and informality exist in aspects of life, including aspects of language use.

Formulating as well as educating the Indonesian language based on theories of politeness is important. The theory of *face* is a center in politeness theories. *Face* refers to the want or the will and every possible affiliation of it in the self of every person (Goffman, 1959). Interpersonal face exists between two people in interaction, and the social face exists and belongs to an ethnic group of people. The interpersonal face as well as the social face in interactions should always be managed in such a way that politeness is maintained and interpersonal as well as social harmony instills.

In this pragmatic social verbal project the Indonesian language is pragmatically formulated into *Distant Indonesian Language* (DIL) and *Close Indonesian Language* (CIL). DIL is spoken to superiors or used in the formal setting, while CIL is spoken to close people or used in the informal setting. The formulation of DIL and CIL is based on the theories of *negative and positive face* (Goffman, 1959), *negative and positive politeness strategies* (Brown & Levinson, 1987), *respect and solidarity politeness* (Renkema, 1993), and *politeness and camaraderie* (Jumanto, 2014a). Meanwhile, the formulation of *superiors* and *close people* is based on the theories of types of hearer with the aspects of *power* and *solidarity* (Brown & Gilman, 1968).

After the formulation of DIL and CIL is done, dissemination of that formula needs to be carried out. Here comes the educating process. Educating the Indonesian language through the so-called character language is a pragmatic social verbal project in this paper. The project is *social* as it involves social parties or agents: family, school, community, public, society, and the governments, while it is also *verbal* as it involves language, in this sense the Indonesian language, i.e. potential utterances in Indonesian daily-life activities.

This explorative study proposes a pragmatic social verbal project for the national harmony. The national harmony here refers to a pleasing combination of different Indonesian peoples talking to, behaving toward, and dealing with one another in verbal interactions. This project advocates and develops the six phases for educating the Indonesian language to Indonesian native learners, i.e. (1) in-family interaction phase, (2) in-classroom teaching-learning process phase, (3) in-school evaluation phase, (4) in-school re-evaluation phase, (5)
in-public verification phase, and (6) in-society selection phase (Jumanto, 2014b). The verbal social project involves DIL and CIL elaboration with different ratios of probabilities in language use. Upon completion of the verbal social project, competent Indonesian speakers are expectedly able to reduce or to avoid rude situations or awkward situations, as they are aware of what is appropriate to say and what is not to maintain politeness in public space or private space, hence promoting the national harmony.

2 OBJECTIVES

This study has the purposes as follows: (1) investigating the Indonesian language pragmatically within its related theories, (2) formulating the so-called character language in the Indonesian language or Bahasa Indonesia, and (3) projecting the potential contributions for the (inter)national harmony.

3 METHOD

This descriptive qualitative research employed three main methods, i.e. observation, literature review, and auto-expert judgments. The observation method was done in actual context and potential context of the Indonesian language use. As Indonesian native speakers, the researchers observed the real-life practices of the Indonesian language as well as the actual use of it in the virtual world, while the potential use of the Indonesian language was within the auto-ethnography of the researchers. Along with this observation method, the empirically logical assumptions were applied. Meanwhile, the literature review that requires different kinds of activities and ways of thinking (Baker, 2000) was also applied, to create a firm foundation for advancing knowledge, facilitate theory development, close areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncover areas where research is needed (Webster & Watson, 2002). In this review, new ideas from others’ work are extracted by synthesizing and summarizing previous sources so that new theories and directions for future research can be built and suggested based on the evidence (Bolderston, 2008). The literature review in this research was done through interpretive techniques, through which the researchers examined the theories and interpreted them through forming an impression and reporting it in a structured form. Within this literature review method, the theoretically critical assumptions were applied. The results of actual and potential data under researchers’ observation and the theories under researchers’ literature review were then analyzed through a coding technique, which consisted of three steps: open
coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; Saldana, 2012) to come to and present a structured form of the project. In the open coding, the data were separated and conceptualized. The separated data were then reunited in the axial coding to come to major categories. The selective coding then discovered the main phenomena, i.e. a story line built by relating the major categories from the axial coding. The project was then visualized and accounted for its predicted efficacy or eligible application within the national harmony.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 THE ROAD MAP OF THE PROJECT: FROM PHATIC COMMUNICATION THROUGH CHARACTER LANGUAGE

Research on phatic communication among English native speakers (Jumanto, 2006) has probably developed into the so-called character language (Jumanto, 2011, 2012, 2014a, 2014b, 2021), as it has also advocated and elaborated stances on Goffman’s negative and positive face (1959), Brown and Levinson’s negative and positive politeness strategies (1987), Renkema’s respect and solidarity politeness (1993), and Jumanto’s politeness and friendship within the phatic communication (2006). This initial raw concept has then developed into Jumanto’s theory on politeness and camaraderie within the so-called character language (Jumanto, 2011, 2012, 2014a, 2014b). Jumanto’s theory on politeness and camaraderie has been based on the proposal that language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014a, 2014b, 2017; developing Leech’s previous stance (1983) that linguistics is deterministic and pragmatics is probabilistic). The proposal has also been based on and has elaborated the aspects of power and solidarity in the part of hearer in Brown and Gilman’s theory (1968). Within his theory of character language, Jumanto has proposed notions to consider in language use, i.e. politeness and camaraderie, politeness, impoliteness, rude situation, awkward situation, distant language, and close language. The dyadic terms distant language and close language have been elaborated based on the previous concepts of social distance and distancing politeness/closeness politeness. The distant language has utterances that are formal, indirect, and nonliteral, while the close language has the utterances that are informal, direct, and literal. The distant language

7Social distance is a concept of relative relationship of physical as well as psychological distance between a speaker and a hearer. The social distance is regarded as not existing or zero when a speaker is talking to themselves.
covers limited topics that are relatively common and safe, while the close language covers relatively free and all topics. The distant language for politeness is used between not close people including strangers, and the close language for camaraderie is used between close people including siblings. Impoliteness, either rude situations or awkward situations, happens due to ignorance or incompetency of the distant language and close language with the wrong or different hearers. This pragmatic elaboration is the core aspects of the proposed character language project (Jumanto, 2011; 2012; 2014a, 2014b, 2021).

Jumanto’s theory of distant language and close language or politeness and camaraderie has developed Brown and Levinson’s theory (1987) and their advocates on face-saving phenomenon in pragmatics, and Culpeper’s theory (1996) and his advocates on face-threat phenomenon in pragmatics. Based on the concept that language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014a, 2014b, 2017; Leech, 1983), due to incompetence, inobservance, or ignorance of this politeness and camaraderie theory, a speaker may do the face-threat to a hearer with their inappropriate utterances. They may use the distant language to a close hearer so that an awkward situation happens, or they may use the close language to a not close hearer so that a rude situation happens. This face-threat phenomenon as use of language to cause offense has been concerns of the previous research by Pérez de Ayala (2001), Harris (2001), O'Driscoll (2007), Bousfield (2008), Bousfield dan Locher (2008), Culpeper (1996; 2005; 2011), dan Kienpointner (1997). Jumanto’s theory of distant language and close language or politeness and camaraderie may have also explained a situation that may happen due to aspects of power and solidarity in the part of hearer. When the solidarity aspect is taken into accounts between close people, the harmony and solidarity as part of the close language play the main role in the verbal interactions. This may have been in concord with the previous concepts of face-boosting (Daly, Holmes, Newton, and Stubbe, 2004; Mills, 2005), banter (Leech, 1983; Kienpointner, 2008), jocular mockery (Haugh, 2010a), mock impoliteness (Bousfield, 2008; Culpeper, 1996; 2011), harmonious face threatening acts (Su and Hwang, 2002), and face-supportive or affiliative utterances (Su and Hwang, 2002; Bousfield, 2008; Haugh, 2010). However, when the solidarity aspect is used between not close people, the disharmony and face-threat may happen, as the distant language is not observed. This may have been in line with previous research on expressions of affection (Ebert and Floyd, 2004), or compliments (Spencer-Oatey, 2000) as a face-threat phenomenon.

Meanwhile, Jumanto’s theory of distant language and close language or politeness and camaraderie that elaborates the power and solidarity in the part of hearer, as Brown and Gilman’s theory (1968) suggests, may also have been in line with Arundale’s face constituting
theory (1999; 2006; 2010), in which the concept of our face or contextual face is the core of interaction. Here the distant language may refer to Arundale’s politeness-driven interactions and the close language may refer to Arundale’s camaraderie-driven interaction. Within this framework, other verbal interactions between close people or between not close people may also happen. Jumanto’s theory of politeness and camaraderie take into accounts that face-threatening utterances between close people may show positive feelings to instill their mutual solidarity, while polite utterances, i.e. formal, indirect, and nonliteral, may be used to imply wrongdoings or criticisms between not close people. The former indicates a strategic banter, while the former indicates a strategic irony. Both face-threatening utterances and polite utterances are fake or not genuine in verbal interactions, thus indicating strategic or politic utterances with a particular purpose or intention, elaborating Watts’s theory of politic politeness (1989, 2003). This may be illustrated in an utterance such as “You really came on time! We have just finished the meeting.” between not close people, thus a strategic irony to imply a criticism or annoyance. Or, a superior that encourages their colleagues or subordinates by using embarrassing utterances, the so-called strategic embarrassment by Chang and Haugh (2021).

In short, the pragmatics road-map of the character language project can be seen in Figure 1.

**Figure 1**

The pragmatic road-map of the character language project
4.2 THE STRUCTURED FORMS OF THE CHARACTER LANGUAGE PROJECT: DISTANT INDONESIAN LANGUAGE (DIL) AND CLOSE INDONESIAN LANGUAGE (CIL)

From various theories of politeness discussed into considerable accounts (Eelen, 2001), the notion of face has come into important play in language use towards politeness and camaraderie. Based on this notion of face, a working definition has been stated that politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face (Jumanto, 2014a). Based on the working definition and the assertion that language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014b, 2016), a formulation of distant Indonesian language (DIL) and close Indonesian language (CIL) is then made. This assertion on language use as a matter of probabilities to formulate DIL and CIL is in line with the tendency of pragmatic viewpoints on negative and positive face (Goffman, 1959), negative and positive politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987), respect and solidarity politeness (Renkema, 1993), and politeness and camaraderie (Jumanto, 2014a). This idea is not alone.

Another assertion has raised the similar theme. Politeness theory has primarily been investigated in face-to-face situations, with some exceptions (Duthler, 2006). These exceptions, the author believes, are situation-based, e.g. in crowds in conference meeting breaks, when gossiping in public setting, in doctor-patient consultations, in personal consultations in newspapers or periodicals, or the most recent today, in computer-mediated communications. Some computer-mediated communications have been researched relevantly based on the hyperpersonal model (Walther, 1996). However, utterances in real face-to-face situations are best referred to here in this paper, as different forms of utterances can be created in such away that they will suggest either politeness or camaraderie.

A clear highlight on politeness as elaboration of face into the Indonesian language use has been taken into accounts (Jumanto, 2011, 2012, 2014a, 2014b), i.e. the presentation of DIL and CIL. DIL refers to distancing politeness to bring respect, while CIL refers to closeness politeness to instill solidarity. DIL is spoken to superiors for politeness, while CIL is spoken to close people for camaraderie. Within the Indonesian context, the structured form or the formula of character language in the Indonesian language can be seen in Table 1.
Table 1

*The structured form of character language in the Indonesian language (adopted from Jumanto, 2017: 217).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of character language</th>
<th>Trichotomous categories of utterances</th>
<th>Elaborated topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distant Indonesian language (DIL)</td>
<td>formal utterances, indirect utterances, non-literal utterances</td>
<td>careful, with safe and common topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Indonesian language (CIL)</td>
<td>informal utterances, direct utterances, literal utterances</td>
<td>free, with any topics, personal and private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIL is usually carefully elaborated and uses safe and common topics, while CIL involves contractions, slangs, reverse-ups, changes, taboos, swearing, f-words, and uses any topics, personal and private (Jumanto, 2014a). The account for DIL and CIL also explains that politeness is maintained when we use DIL and CIL eligibly, i.e. to superiors and close people respectively. In this case the so-called code-switching for politeness happens, i.e. whether to use DIL for politeness or CIL for camaraderie in a particular situation that may call (Jumanto, 2014a, 2016). Elaborated examples for these three trichotomous categories of utterances in the Indonesian language, i.e. formality-based utterances, directness-based utterances, and meaning-based utterances, can be seen respectively in Figures 1, 2, and 3.

Figure 2

*Examples of formality-based Indonesian utterances within DIL for politeness and CIL for camaraderie (adopted from Jumanto, 2014b, p. 339)*
Figure 3

Examples of directness-based Indonesian utterances within DIL for politeness and CIL for camaraderie (adopted from Jumanto, 2014b, p. 340)

Figure 4

Examples of meaning-based Indonesian utterances within DIL for politeness and CIL for camaraderie (adopted from Jumanto, 2014b, p. 341)

4.3 PHASES OF THE CHARACTER LANGUAGE PROJECT

The scheme of character language project has long been proposed in the writer’s previous publications (Jumanto, 2011, 2012, 2014a, 2014b, 2016). The pragmatic social verbal project has been termed character language, i.e. a language which is able to function as a
means of communication (*ability*), has qualities with which the language is different from the others (*quality*), and is effective in a correct formality (*validity*) (Jumanto, 2014b). The pragmatic social verbal project of character language is intended to produce character speakers, hence in the long term, character citizens. Many parties or agents are involved in this pragmatic social verbal project for educating the Indonesian language: parents in a family, teachers at school, communities in public, societies at large, and the authorities: the school managers, the local government, and the national government (Jumanto, 2014b). This project for educating the Indonesian language has a long-term objective that DIL and CIL is learned, internalized, personalized, and socialized or practiced in everyday life, so rude situations and awkward situations can be avoided. Educating the Indonesian language here is put in a context as if an Indonesian native speaker is trying to acquire their native language. The verbal social project consists of six phases, i.e. interaction phase, teaching- and-learning phase, evaluation phase, re-evaluation phase, verification phase, and selection phase (Jumanto, 2014b, 2017). Developing the scheme, the writer would like to propose further elaboration of the verbal social project in Figure 5.

**Figure 5**
The phases of pragmatic social verbal project of character language (adopted from Jumanto, 2017, pp. 2017-219)
4.3.1 In-Family Interaction Phase

This is the first and earlier phase a learner mainly interacts with their parents, siblings, and close communities, i.e. those most responsible for observing while encouraging this very early phase. Close communities are probably the learner’s close relatives, or other communities the learner is frequently involved in a social gathering with their parents or siblings. In this phase, elaboration of CIL is more important than elaboration of DIL. CIL strategies should also be more emphasized in the daily experience than DIL strategies to instill more solidarity than power. As the learner just starts educating themselves, DIL and CIL should be experienced in a 75-25 ratio of probabilities.

4.3.2 In-School Teaching-and-Learning Process Phase

In this further early phase, a learner mainly interacts with their teachers and schoolmates. This early phase is done at school. Teachers and schoolmates are most responsible for observing and encouraging this phase. The observing and encouraging by teachers is directly done, while the observing and encouraging by schoolmates is indirectly done, as schoolmates are also in the process of learning. DIL and CIL strategies should equally be experienced by the learner in a 50-50 ratio of probabilities.

4.3.3 In-School Evaluation Phase

This further phase is also done at school, i.e. the evaluation phase. A learner goes through a formal and structured evaluation processes: progress, mid-term, and final-term evaluations, designed by teachers and school authorities. The evaluations of DIL and CIL strategies are made relatively equal, i.e. a relative 50-50 ratio of probabilities on language use material having been learned. Written reports are given upon the evaluation processes. The agents most responsible for observing and encouraging this phase are teachers and all the school authorities.

4.3.4 In-School Re-Evaluation Phase

This further re-evaluation phase is also done at school. However, the re-evaluation phase here is an informal and unstructured evaluation atmosphere: in fun classrooms, in the
school doorways, in sudden encounters between teachers and the learner at school yard or at other school spaces, in relaxed situations. Teachers should observe and evaluate the learner’s verbal performance on their DIL and CIL in indirect and relaxed manners: whether their DIL and CIL is appropriately used or not yet. The ratio of probabilities is still maintained relatively 50-50. When doing so, teachers should minimize or avoid threats to the learner’s face. Compliments and discussions could be given upon the learner’s verbal performances, the DIL and CIL performances of the learner. The agents most responsible for observing and encouraging this phase are teachers and all the school authorities.

4.3.5 In-Public Verification Phase

This advanced verification phase is done everywhere. This phase is to strengthen the re-evaluation phase at school. This phase should be done everywhere by competent speakers upon the DIL and CIL performance of the learner. Good manners towards DIL and CIL performance is on the air, and every competent speaker is responsible for observing, verifying, and encouraging the learner’s verbal performance to its completion. Just like the re-evaluation phase, this phase is also done in an informal and unstructured atmosphere, but outside school boundaries, everywhere in the country, with a relative 50-50 ratio of probabilities. The observation and verification should also be done in indirect and relaxed manners. Compliments and discussions should also be given upon the learner’s DIL and CIL performance. All the agents are most responsible for observing and encouraging this phase.

4.3.6 In-Society Selection Phase

This final phase is for the learner to use and to experience using their DIL and CIL competence in a particular probable situation that may call. The learner is now smart enough to use DIL and CIL pragmatically, as they have equipped themselves with all the DIL and CIL strategies required for facing a diglossic situation. The learner is now a competent speaker who is able to select and use either DIL or CIL, i.e. DIL with formal utterances, indirect utterances, and non-literal utterances in the formal situations, or CIL with informal utterances, direct utterances, and literal utterances in the informal situations. DIL with safe and common topics is spoken to superiors for politeness, while CIL with any topics is spoken to close people for camaraderie or friendship or solidarity. The ratio of probabilities in language use is kept relatively 50-50. In this final phase of the verbal social project, all parties or agents as well as
members of the speech society are responsible for observing and encouraging one another to use and maintain DIL and CIL in verbal interactions for social harmony.

4.4 POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF CHARACTER LANGUAGE FOR THE NATIONAL HARMONY

The pragmatic social verbal project of educating the Indonesian language is basically trying to create a common nation-wide awareness that politeness should be maintained for the national harmony. In this research-based proposition, distant Indonesian language (DIL) and close Indonesian language (CIL) with their respective forms and topics, spoken either to superiors or to close people, are to maintain politeness. Ignorance or ineligible use of either type will probably lead to impoliteness, either rude situations between not close people or awkward situations between close people; either rude situations in the formal setting or awkward situations in the informal setting. The potential contributions of character language for the national harmony could be pictographically shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6
Potential contributions of character language to the national harmony

4.4.1 Character Language Against Hate Speech

Hate speech is speech which attacks a person or group on the basis of attributes such as gender, ethnic origin, religion, race, disability, or sexual orientation (Nockleby, 2000), or
speech expressing hatred of a particular group of people (Merriam-Webster, 2017). Hence, hate speech attacks and endangers interpersonal face or social face of others. Upon the acquired awareness of DIL and CIL of the character language in language use, a competent speaker is able to avoid threatening face of others, interpersonal or social, by considering their DIL and CIL performance, thus avoiding hate speech to spoil the interpersonal or social face. The adequate competence of DIL and CIL saves the common harmony, as a competent speaker has a control on their speech performance on what is appropriate to say and what is not when speaking to a particular hearer. Pragmatically, hate speech with touchy topics, i.e. gender, religion, race, etc., belongs to CIL, thus appropriate to be spoken to close people in the informal setting to instill camaraderie or solidarity, not to be used to superiors or in the formal setting for politeness.

4.4.2 Character Language Against Hoax

Hoax can be a noun or a verb. As noun, it is a deliberately fabricated falsehood made to masquerade as the truth (MacDougall, 1958). As a verb, to hoax is to trick into believing or accepting as genuine something false and often preposterous (Merriam-Webster, 2017). Thus, a hoax or to hoax is threatening to interpersonal face or social face of others. A hoax is pragmatically also of touchy topics used to bully others whom a speaker is not close to. A hoax is dangerous, as it is insulting or threatening to others who are weaker, smaller, or in some way vulnerable (Merriam-Webster, 2017). A hoax conveyed to superiors or not close people in public or another conveyed to close people or in the informal setting is potentially also threatening a common harmony. A hoax between not close people may lead to rude situations, or else a hoax between close people may lead to awkward situations. Rude situations and awkward situations are thus disharmony, a friction in a social relationship. Knowledge and competence of DIL and CIL of the character language may prevent hoax-texting from happening, thus promoting a common harmony among members of a society or a nation.

4.4.3 Character Language for Text Interactions in the Virtual World

Interactions in the virtual world, including hate speech and hoax, with verbal or non-verbal texts, should also be reckoned not to lead to disharmony. A guideline for the text interactions in the virtual world should be obeyed, or else something will happen and a friction or disharmony between or among netizens entails. A recently-proposed guideline has been
provided (Jumanto, 2016), and DIL and CIL strategies of the character language are part of the guideline as efforts to guide verbal text interactions towards the world harmony. In line with distant Indonesian language (DIL) in the guideline (Jumanto, 2016), it is suggested that netizens consider the words and images they will have left unforgotten, and, probably, unforgiven, by (1) using the words of distant language: formal (e.g. *I am sorry*, instead of *sorry*); indirect (e.g. *I think it is better like this*, instead of *Sorry, I don’t agree with you*); non-literal (e.g. That is a gasbag, instead of That is talking nonsense); (2) using the words of common, safe, not personal and private topics (family, work, school, weather, sports, arts, etc.) and avoiding the words of touchy and dangerous topics (politics, religion, age, race, marital status, etc.); (3) not using dirty images and perform dirty actions (of profanity, pornography, sadism, or brutality); and (4) not posting any signs or uploading any videos and films of you alone, of others, and of you with others, which are suggesting dirty minds, dirty topics, and dangerous topics.

### 4.4.4 Character Language as the Clothes that we Wear

Character language could probably become our clothes in everyday interactions. It is metaphorically the clothes that we wear\(^8\). A competent speaker can adjust the language or the clothes to the way they speak or dress formally or informally, for politeness or camaraderie, either uttering, for instance, “I thank you very much” and “I am very sorry”, thus formal clothes for politeness, or “Thanks!” and “Sorry!”, thus informal clothes for camaraderie. Different topics, e.g. different ideologies, are probably also applied for and attached to the clothes that we wear.

### 5 CONCLUSION

The exploration of this paper is aimed at elaborating the character language for educating the Indonesian language as a pragmatics social verbal project for the national harmony. The character-language project’s proposition is formatted into *Distant Indonesian Language* (DIL) and *Close Indonesian Language* (CIL). Educating the Indonesian language within the character-language project here is put in a context as if an Indonesian native learner

---

\(^8\)An eligible intriguing analogy of the language that we speak to the clothes that we wear, first proposed by Prof. Asim Gunarwan, during the 2002-2006 Pragmatics classes at Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Indonesia.
is trying to acquire their native language, with elaborated DIL for superiors (and to some extent: strangers) in the formal setting and elaborated CIL for close people in the informal setting. The project’s proposition is important to avoid rude situations and awkward situations for a common harmony, or to the broadest extent, the national harmony. The pragmatic social verbal project for the national harmony in this paper comprises six phases with different ratios of probabilities in DIL and CIL use, i.e. (1) in-family interaction phase (25-75), (2) in-classroom teaching-learning process phase (50-50), (3) in-school evaluation phase (50-50), (4) in-school re-evaluation phase (50-50), (5) in-public verification phase (50-50), and (6) in-society selection phase (50-50). Each phase in this pragmatic social verbal project is observed and encouraged by different parties or agents for educating the Indonesian language. Equipped with the DIL and CIL competence of the character language, a competent Indonesian speaker is able to avoid threatening the interpersonal or the social face of others, hence reducing or eliminating rude situations or awkward situations, either to superiors (and strangers) or to close people; either in the formal setting or in the informal setting. The DIL and CIL competence upon the pragmatic social verbal project is probably effective for the competent speaker to avoid hate speech and hoaxes, to handle text interactions in the virtual world, and metaphorically to be the clothes they wear in public or in private, or within formal or informal situations. The DIL and CIL competence and performance of an Indonesian speaker upon the pragmatic social verbal project is, therefore, promoting the national harmony, and to some extent, the international harmony.
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