

Discourse of Littering Prohibition in Indonesia

I Dewa Putu Wijana

Faculty of Cultural Sciences Gadjah Mada University

putu.wijana@ugm.ac.id

*) Corresponding Author
Email: putu.wijana@ugm.ac.id

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v5i1.1-20>

Submission Track:

Received: 05-09-2022

Final Revision: 28-10-2022

Available Online: 01-11-2022

Copyright © 20xx Authors



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This article deals with discourses of littering prohibition signs found in various places in Indonesia, focusing on three main issues, i.e., discourse structures, pragmatic strategies, and sociocultural factors which might influence that structure and strategy. Using data collected from websites and those found in the Special Region of Yogyakarta along with a sociopragmatic approach, the research finds that littering prohibition signs are constructed by various kinds of discourse types whose complexities are formed by the sentence types and the number of constructed sentences. Regarding the pragmatic strategies, the signs can be delivered using nonexplicit, direct, indirect, expressed, implied, literal and nonliteral strategies. Subsequently, those structures and strategies are influenced by sociocultural factors associated with the interlocutors, such as emotional condition, religious and cultural belief, education, the formality of interaction, place and time, ethnicity, age, medium of transmission, cultural entity, and political factors.

Keywords: *Discourse, prohibition, strategy, and sociopragmatics.*

INTRODUCTION

Household rubbish management constitutes one of the most severe problems, especially for people living in urban societies. The vast development due to the growing population leaves little land or space. This causes many problems for people handling family waste (Rahmawati et al. s., 2021, 1-2). Even though in the early stage, the tenants have tried to manage their refuse by disposing of it in terminal disposal areas, these wider and larger areas can no longer contain a large amount of waste from every area surrounding them (Sayuti, 2004). The much more limited number of disposal areas compared to the increasing house complex in urban areas directly caused the rise of expenses the residents have to bear.

As a result, initiated by those who cannot pay the monthly waste contribution, followed by others, search for empty spaces adjacent to their dwelling as places where they may dispose of their family refuse. The disposal place can be rivers, seas, water channels, barren lands, etc. (Gholami et al. 2020, 915-924). This action will surely get spontaneous responses from the community members or the owners of the empty land. One form of their response is the creation of various signs intending to prohibit careless littering on their land or territory. The prohibition signs vary from simple to complicated and from the politest to the least polite.

The varieties are fascinating to study from a sociopragmatic viewpoint, and these issues, as far as Indonesian is concerned, have not been studied seriously by linguists. Studies done by Kumala Dewi (2019), Gustiasari and Septiningrum (2021, 39-46), Saputra et al. s. (2021), and Kurniawati (2021, 157-170) are still too superficial to reveal fundamental linguistic aspects of littering prohibition discourses. These facts indicate that at least three critical problems can be addressed by this research concerning the refuse prohibition signs. Those are the discourse structures, pragmatic strategies exploited by the sign senders in creating the littering prohibition discourses for people who want to throw garbage in various places, such as toilets, rivers, reservoirs, sea, etc., and extralinguistic

factors possibly influencing the prohibition discourse signs. Before going further, let us first consider the following (1) to (6) prohibition signs:

(1) *Jangan buang sampah di sini.* (DI Yogyakarta) 'Do not litter here'

(2) *Dilarang buang sampah di sini, kecuali ibliss/setaaan.* (DKI Jakarta)
 'It is prohibited disposing rubbish here, except devil/evil spirit'

(3) *Bila Anda tidak mampu membuang sampah pada tempatnya, maka telan makanan/miniman Anda beserta bungkusnya.* (Kabupaten Fakfak)
 'If you cannot dispose your rubbish in proper place, swallow your food and drink altogether with the packages'

(4) *Jangan buang sampah di sini. Denda 1 juta & arak masa* (Palembang)
 'Do not litter here' One million fine' and mass parade'

(5) *Ya Allah, kami sudah cape kasih peringatan, maka kami berdoa. Matikanlah dengan tragis bagi yang masuk ke sini untuk buang sampah dan mereka yang menghambur sampah. Semoga mereka keluar dari sini mati tabrakan. Bagi mereka yang engkau takdirkan berumur panjang, berikanlah kehidupan yang berantakan, serta miskinilah mereka sampai tujuh turunan.* (Surabaya)
 Oh God, we have already tired of warning them, So, we pray. Kill tragically whoever coming here just for disposing of refuse, and those who scatter rubbish. Hopefully, they will die in collision soon after getting out of here. For those You predestined a long life, give them disordered life, and impoverish them up to their seventh descendants.

(6) *Ya Allah, semoga orang yang buang sampah di sini kau berikan tempat terbaik di sisimu secepatnya. Amin.* (DI Yogyakarta)
 "Oh my God, hopefully, You give anyone throwing garbage here the best place beside You quickly, Ameen'

Structurally, Discourse (1) is a simple sentence consisting of a single clause with an adverbial expressing place or location *di sini* 'here'; Discourse (2) is also a simple sentence consisting of single clause, with an adverbial expressing location *di sini* 'here' and exception *kecuali* in (...) *kecuali ibliss/setaaan* 'except devil/evil spirit'. (3) is a complex sentence consisting of two clauses, one expressing command *telan makanan dan minuman anda* 'swallow your food and drink' and the other expressing condition *Bila Anda tidak mampu membuang sampah pada tempatnya* 'If you cannot dispose your rubbish in a proper place'. (4) is a discourse consisting of two sentences, the first sentence expresses

command *Jangan buang sampah di sini* 'Do not litter here' and the seconds do threats *Denda 1 juta & arak masa* 'One million fine' and mass parade'. (5) is a discourse consisting of four sentences. Each of which respectively expresses statement *Ya Allah, kami sudah cape kasih peringatan maka kami berdoa* 'Oh God, we have already got tired of warning them, So, we pray', request *Matikanlah dengan tragis bagi yang masuk ke sini untuk buang sampah dan mereka yang menghambur sampah* 'Kill tragically whoever coming here just for disposing refuse', expectation *Semoga mereka keluar dari sini mati tabrakan* 'Hopefully, they will die in collision soon after getting out of here', and request *Bagi mereka yang engkau takdirkan berumur panjang, berikanlah kehidupan yang berantakan, serta miskinilah mereka sampai tujuh turunan* 'For those You predestined a long life, give them disordered life, and impoverish them up to their seventh descendants.

Discourse (6) consists of two sentences. The first contains an addressing element to Allah 'God' and a prayer-bearing request for a peaceful place for the waste hurler, and the other is a sentence consisting of a single word *Amin* 'amen'. Pragmatically, Discourse (1) uses direct strategies in which the directive is expressed by imperative sentence marker by *Jangan* 'don't'. Discourse (2) uses indirect strategies because the directive is expressed declarative passive sentence with subject permutation from *Buang sampah dilarang di sini* (...) 'throwing rubbish is not allowed here'. Discourse (3) uses direct strategies with sarcastic style, asking the interlocutors to swallow the refuse and the packages (...) *Telan makanan/minuman Anda beserta bungkusnya* 'swallow your food/drink with the packages'. Discourse (4) uses both direct and indirect strategies. The direct speech act is expressed by imperative bearing the prohibition *Jangan buang sampah di sini* 'Do not litter here', and the indirect is done by incomplete declarative bearing threats or penalties *Denda 1 juta & arak masa* 'One million fine' and mass parade'.

Discourse (5) uses both indirect and direct strategies. The indirect strategy expressed by the first sentence bearing expressive complaint *Ya Allah, kami sudah cape kasih peringatan maka kami berdoa* 'Oh God, we have already got tired of warning them.

Meanwhile, the other three sentences constitute the land owner's bad prayer expressed indirect speech acts for delivering command *Matikanlah dengan tragis bagi yang masuk ke sini untuk buang sampah dan mereka yang menghambur sampah* 'Kill tragically whoever coming here just for disposing refuse', *expectation Semoga mereka keluar dari sini mati tabrakan* 'Hopefully, they will die in collision soon after getting out of here', and request *berikanlah kehidupan yang berantakan, serta miskinilah mereka sampai tujuh turunan* 'give them disordered life, and impoverish them up to their seventh descendants'.

Discourse (6) uses an indirect non literal strategy in which the land owner expects God to give them a nice place instead of sending to hell *Ya Allah, semoga orang yang buang sampah di sini kau berikan tempat terbaik di sisimu secepatnya. Amin* ' Oh my God, hopefully, You give anyone throwing garbage here the best place beside You quickly, Amen'. Even though all six discourses are intended to prohibit careless littering, every Discourse pragmatically exploits different strategies in communicating with the interlocutors. The differences are underlain by various sociocultural factors which seem closely related to the landowners' emotional conditions, the religious and cultural beliefs of the interlocutors, etc.

Based on everything that has been described above, this paper will try to focus its attention on three main problems, i.e., the structure of littering prohibition discourses starting from the simplest to the most complex one, the pragmatic strategies exploited by sign senders in creating the prohibitions. These sociocultural factors may influence the variations of the littering prohibition discourses, which include prohibition found in many places, such as families, hotels, rivers, reservoirs, irrigation channels, seas, etc.

Most studies concerning commanding, inviting, requesting, asking for someone to do or not to do something, and the like in Indonesian have been carried out using formal or structural approaches. Accordingly, characterized mainly by their intonation, syntactic structure, the use of particles and verbal form, etc., all expressions intended to execute such actions are considered to belong to one syntactic mode, i.e., imperative, and followed by its

classification into usual command, polite command, request, invitation, and prohibition, permission, etc., such as done by Ramlan (2005, 39-43), Alwi, et al. (2010, 343-374), and Keraf, 1991, 206-209. These structural approaches will certainly be inadequate to analyze various types of littering prohibition discourse as the prohibition discourses might be expressed using multiple strategies represented by many kinds of sentence types, declarative, interrogative, and imperative. Although still using the imperative term, a work done by Rahardi (2000) is actually a pragmatic approach toward various strategies and their degree of politeness found in Indonesian. However, Rahardi's study explicitly concerns the use of directive in general instead of directives found in a certain genre of Discourse. The same as study was conducted by Revita (2014) concerning speech acts of request found across languages. Kumala Dewi (2019), in her master thesis, studies all kinds of prohibition signs found in Sidoardjo Regency, East Java in framework of ethnolinguistics. She only focuses her analysis on Discourse's information structures.

More specific studies about littering prohibition have been carried out by several scholars. Saputra et al.. (2021) have done research on prohibition and announcement boards found in Bangka Belitung Province. Without realizing the difficulties of ordering the informal use of language, they try to give persuasive and prescriptive recommendations to the government or authoritative parties for ordering the use of indecent and impolite expressions, spelling violations, and other grammatical mistakes of the prohibitions because their existence is not in line with the concept of the smart city. Without any clear, pragmatic theoretical basis, work done by Gustiasari and Septiningrum (2021, 39-46) only tries to find the Pamulang's community members to understand the various meanings *larangan* 'prohibition', and finds out three types of prohibition, i.e. *larangan* 'prohibition', *himbauan* 'suggestion', and *perintah* 'command'. They do not try to correlate their findings with the sociopragmatic factors which underlay those prohibition differences. Kurniawati (2021, 157-170) stresses her investigation of the involvement of God in the littering prohibition discourses; she does not begin her study on the linguistic forms of the Discourse but directly analyzes the pragmatic strategies the sign creators exploited in

creating their copy writes. She has not also described in detail all the social factors that influence the prohibitions. These facts compel me to analyze the littering bans using a descriptive sociopragmatic approach without any endeavor to order their forms to be more standard because from sociolinguistic perspective, standardizing efforts deny the facts that the signs heterogenities of extralinguistic factors underlie creations.

Meanwhile, the study carried out by Pham (2021, 14-36) tries to compare Vietnamese-English public signs and American-English public signs in the development and welcome of Vietnam to visitors around the world. This research finds that both American English and Vietnamese exploit the same speech acts represented in public signs. However, they differ considerably in the pragmemes related to territory, indication, restriction, reminding, warning, warning, command, and prohibition. The other studies are nonlinguistic in characteristics. They are concerned about the dangerous effects of littering in protected tourism areas (Rodriguez, 2015, 1011-1024). Reiter and Samuel (2006, 45-55), using the psychological approach, investigate the correlation between types of signs and the effect on littering behavior. They found that people tend to throw their garbage in littered areas compared to unlittered ones.

The prohibition with threatening signs will cause more reactions and be less effective than the more cooperative ones. Reiter and Samuel's research seems to have similarities with one conducted by Keiser et al. (2011), which finds that signs of (dis)respect of others for norms serve as norm-support mechanism cues that can weaken or strengthen the norm. Luan Ong & Sovacool (2012, 35-42) conducted a comparative study of littering and waste in Singapore and Japan. They found that littering is increasing in Singapore, yet in Yokohama, have dropped precipitously. The Institution organizations and public norms shape an environment in Singapore where cleaning is shunned, and millions of dollars are spent each year on litter removal. This contrasts with an environment in Japan where waste is valued, cleaning is viewed as productive and honorable, and little money is spent due to a large number of volunteers.

Unlike the structural or formal approach, the pragmatics or functional approach regards that one form of utterance can be used to express various kinds of intentions. Conversely, one intention can be delivered by multiple types of utterances. Kaswanti Purwo (1990, 12-13) exemplifies that the utterances *Bisa mengantarkan surat ini* 'could you deliver this letter' and *Antarkan surat ini* 'Deliver this letter', which are structured differently, one using interrogative sentence and the other operating imperative sentence, is functioned to bear the same intention, i.e., to ask someone delivering a letter. This difference is obviously motivated by various complicated sociopragmatic factors, which is commonly called as the context of the utterance, although with different perspectives (See Hymes, 53-65; Leech, 1983, 13-14; Halliday & Hasan, 1992, 16-17; Sperber & Wilson, 1986, 15-16).

Meanwhile, the different modes of utterance or Discourse used to express is called strategy. So, pragmatics is essentially a study concerning communicative strategies exploited by speakers to enable their addressee to comprehend the intended message effectively. Based on this assumption, the intention of forbidding anyone to litter or throw garbage in certain places can be expressed in various types of discourses formally as well as strategically. Various extralinguistic factors strongly influence multiple forms and strategies used by the speakers in constructing littering prohibition. This paper describes the structure of littering prohibition discourses, their communicative strategies, and extralinguistic factors influencing their existence.

RESEARCH METHOD

There are no less than 300 data used for carrying out this research. Most of them are collected from websites; some of them are www.liputan6.com, www.bombastis.com, www.bukalapak.com, www.brilio.net, and jogjasuara.com. These data are added with ones found in various places in Yogyakarta. All the collected data are numbered and completed with notes informing where they are found. In line with the discussion issues, they are further classified based on their structures, whether they belong to Discourse consisting of

a simple sentence, compound sentence, or multi-sentence Discourse; communicative strategies, whether the senders delivered the Discourse using explicit or implicit, direct and indirect, expressed or implied, and literal or nonliteral strategy. This paper ends with the identification of extralinguistic factors which may influence discourse structures and their communicative strategies.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The following descriptions are my research findings concerning the structure, pragmatic strategy, and sociopragmatic factors of littering prohibition signs in Indonesian.

Structure of Littering Prohibition Discourse

Littering prohibition discourses structurally can be classified into two categories. Those are single-sentence Discourse and multi-sentence discourse. The first can be in the forms of simple sentences (7) and (8) and complex sentences (9) and (10):

(7) *Dilarang buang sampah sembarangan.* (Lampung)
'It is prohibited to dispose of litter carelessly'.

(8) *Dilarang buang sampah di (sekitar) sini.* (Palembang)
'It is prohibited to throw rubbish (surround) here.'

(9) *Ya Allah, /Cabutlah nyawa orang yang suka membuang sampah.* (Aceh)
'Oh God, yank out a person's soul throwing garbage here!'

(10) *Bila kamu berpendidikan, /jangan buang sampah di sini!* (DI Yogyakarta).
'If you are an educated people, don't throw rubbish here.'

Meanwhile, the multi-sentenced discourses are primarily constructed in the form of monologs consisting of two sentences, such as (11) and (12) or more (13), and only one datum shows in the form of dialog (14):

(11) *Jagalah kebersihan. // Buang sampah pada tempatnya.* (DI Yogyakarta).
 'Keep clean. Throw garbage in the proper place'

(12) *Dilarang membuang sampah/tissue/pembalut ke toilet/saluran air. //*
Buang pada tempat sampah yang tersedia. (DKI Jakarta).
 'Throwing garbage/tissue/sanitary napkin to toilet/gutter. Throw them in the
 available place'

(13) *Dilarang membuang sampah di sini.// Tempat ini dalam*
pengawasan.//Barang siapa ketahuan membuang sampah di sini dedenda
Rp. 1.000.000 bonus dihajar massa ngantek klenger. Tertanda Warga RT
8, Kampung Maron Waru Genteng Kulon. (Banyuwangi)

'Throwing garbage here is prohibited. This place is under surveillance. Whoever is
 found out littering here will be fined Rp. 1000.000 plus mass thrashing until
 unconscious in a faint. Signed residents of RT 8, Maron Waru Village, Genteng Kulon'

(14) *Kakek ini malas pulang ke laut yang penuh merkuri.* (DKI Jakarta)
 'This grand father feels lazy going back to the sea that is full of mercury'
Eh Nyet, bikinin gua pisang goreng.
 Hey monkey, make fried banana for me'

Various Strategies of Prohibition

To achieve effective prohibition signs, the senders should create their signs
 using various strategies depending on speech situations or extralinguistic factors of
 the locution. Among multiple strategies outlined by Parker & Riley (2014, 35-43),
 due to informal speech style, there is only one strategy not to be used for creating
 prohibition, i.e., explicit strategy using overt performative verbs. The other
 strategies, nonexplicit strategies (15) and (16), direct and indirect strategies (17)
 and (18), expressed and implied (19) and (20), literal and nonliteral strategies (22)
 and (23) are exploited by the copywriters:

(15) *Dilarang membuang sampah di sembarang tempat.* (DI Yogyakarta)
 'It is not allowed to litter in anywhere you feel like it'

(16) *Hanya orang sembarangan membuang sampah sembarangan.* (DI
 Yogyakarta). 'It is just anyone will throw garbage as they wish'

(17) *Jaga(lah) kebersihan.* (Magelang) 'Keep clean'

(18) *Dilarang membuang sampah di sungai/kali/kanal/waduk/saluran air limbah, jalan, taman dan tempat umum.* (Bekasi)

'It is prohibited to litter in the river/water channel/reservoir/sewage/road, park, and public places.

(19) *Perhatian...! Jangan buang sampah di sini.* (Magelang)
'Attention...! Do not throw garbage here!'

(20) *Sungai adalah sarang ikan bukan sarang sampah.* (Purwokerto)
'River is fish breeding place, instead of place of diapers'

(21) *Jangan buang sampah sembarangan.* (Sukoharjo)
'Do not litter in any place you feel like it'

(22) *Ya Allah, semoga orang yang buang sampah di sini kau berikan tempat terbaik di sisimu secepatnya. Amin.* (DI Yogyakarta)
'Oh my God, hopefully, You give anyone throwing garbage here the best place beside You quickly; Amen'.

Sociocultural Factors Influencing Littering Prohibition Signs in Indonesian

Theoretically, the kinds of language the speakers use tend to be influenced by various interconnected extralinguistic factors. Consequently, one is challenging to differentiate from another. It certainly cannot be denied that the speaker and addressee are the most critical factors which influence any language use (see Holmes, 1992, 245-283), for no discourse exists without involving sender(s) and receiver(s). These two factors are too general and must be attached to various more specific social factors/dimensions.

This section will try to identify these sociocultural factors which may significantly influence the various forms of littering prohibition signs found in multiple places in Indonesia. A careful investigation of the data collection shows that several factors that exert a strong influence on the creation of the littering

prohibition signs are: emotional condition (23) and (24), religious and cultural belief (25) and (26), education (27) and (28), the formality of interaction (29) and (30), place and time (31) and (32), ethnicity (33) and (34), age (35) and (36), medium of transmission (37) and (38), cultural entity (39) and (40), and political factor (41) and (42).

(23) *Buang Sampah di sini mati dibacok.* (Cimahi).
 'Littering here, will die to be gashed'

(24) *Dilarang membuang sampah. Yang melanggar dihajar massa.* (Bekasi)
 'Littering is prohibited. The offenders will be beaten up by the community'

(25) *Ya Allah hanya orang kapir saja yang membuang sampah di sini.*
 (Banjarmasin). 'Oh God, only unbelievers throwing garbage here'

(26) *Yang membuang sampah di sini mudah-mudahan pulangnya ketabrak mobil.*
 (Klaten).
 'Anyone throwing garbage here, hopefully, to be struck by a car on their way home'

(27) *Bila kamu berpendidikan, jangan buang di sini.* (DI Yogyakarta)
 'If you are an educated person, do not throw here'

(28) *SD 6 th, SMP 3 th, SMA 3 th, Kuliah 5 th. Udah kerja pula, tapi masih buang sampah sembarangan di sini. Otaknya ke mana?* (DKI Jakarta)
 'Finishing your study at Elementary school for six years, junior for high three years, senior high for three years, tertiary education for five years, and already got a job. But you still throw garbage carelessly here. Where does your brain/mind go'.

(29) *Dilarang membuang: sampah, sangkrah/tebangan pohon di sepanjang jalan ini. Buanglah 1. Sampah ke depo sampah Jl. Wortel (samping Kelurahan Penarung). 2. Sangkrah/tebangan pohon ke TPA Jl. Cilik Riwut KM 14. Perda No. 1 Th. 2017. Dinas Lingkungan Hidup Kota Palangka Raya.* (Palangka Raya)
 'It is prohibited to throw: garbage, felled tree along this road. Throw 1. Garbage to the garbage storehouse at Wortel Street (next to Penarung Village). 2. Felled tree to terminal disposal place, at Cilik Riwut Street Kilometre 14th. Local Regulation No. 1. Environment Service, (Palangka Raya City).

(30) *Pemerintah Kota Manado. Dilarang membuang sampah sembarangan! Mari jaga kebersihan kota kita. Warga cerdas membuang sampah pada tempatnya.* (Manado)

'Government of Manado City. It is prohibited to litter in any place. Let us keep our city clean. Smart citizens throw garbage in proper places.'

(31) *Sungai bukan tempat sampah.* (Kudus). 'River is not garbage place'

(32) *Buanglah sampah dari pukul 19.00 s.d. 0.5.00 (pagi).* (DKI Jakarta)
 'Throw your garbage from 19.00 PM to 0,5,00 AM'

(33) *Selain kirik dilarang buang sampah di sini.* (DI Yogyakarta)
 'It is prohibited littering here, except for dog'

(34) *Moh kito jago lingkungan kito dari saghok. Jangan buang saghok di dalam banda dan sekitar ee! Ttd. Urang tuo kampuang. Cadiak Jo pandai.* (Padang)
 'Let us keep our environment from the garbage. Do not throw garbage into the gutter and its surround. Signed: Village old residents. Smart and clever.'

(35) *Lebih susah buang sampah daripada buang mantan.* (DI Yogyakarta)
 'It is more difficult to throw rubbish than your ex-boy/girl friend'

(36) *Buang sampah di hutan, jomblo seumur hidup.* (Linggar Jati)
 'Littering in the forrest, will be single/unmarried forever'

(37) *Nggak malu sama asu.* (Klaten). 'Don't you feel ashamed with a dog?'

(38) *Membuang sampah di sungai/kolam* (Palembang)
 'Throwing garbage to the river/pond'

(39) *Jangan ada sampah di antara kita* (DKI Jakarta).
 Do not be rubbish between us.'

(40) *Orang pintar tidak membuang sampah di lokasi ini.* (Kepulauan Seribu)
 'Smart people do not throw garbage in this location'

(41) *Dilarang buang sampah di sini, kecuali Haji Lulung.* (DKI Jakarta)
 'It is prohibited littering here, except Haji Lulung'

(42) *Yang buang sampah di sini Yahudi.* (DKI Jakarta)
 'Anyone hurling garbage here is a Jewish'

Concerning the linguistic forms, discourses of littering prohibition can be expressed by various short or long discourse types. The most straightforward form consists of a single clause, while the most extended form consists of more than one

sentence. Most of the prohibitions are monologues, and copywriters rarely create dialog discourses. The length of the Discourse seems strongly influenced by the context situation's formality. Accordingly, the prohibition signs issued by formal institutions or local governments usually are much longer than ones created by individuals. The formal signs sometimes contain more information, such as the regulations or decrees underlying the prohibitions, the sum of money that the offenders should pay, the institutions issuing the prohibitions, etc.

Meanwhile, the shorter individual prohibition signs mostly only contain the prohibition, and only a few signs bear other information. Individual signs are less polite than formal signs. Personal prohibitions are often crowded by inappropriate words, such as *iblis* 'devil', *setan* 'evil spirit', *kirik* 'dog', *asu* 'dog', etc., bad prayers, such as *Yang membuang sampah di sini mudah-mudahan pulangnya ketabrak mobil* 'Anyone throwing garbage here, hopefully to be struck by car on their way home', and threats for the target people, such as *Yang melanggar dihajar massa* 'The offenders will be beaten up by the community'.

Any language can serve human life as a weapon and shield (Allan & Burridge, 1991, 3). As a weapon, the language speakers can exploit the language they use to communicate to attack anyone whose behavior they do not like. On the other hand, as a shield, the language can be used to protect themselves from many unpleasant matters from the sign receivers. These two opposite sides of language functions can be seen in littering prohibition discourses. As such, there are various kinds of strategies used by the language speakers or the copywriters in creating signs whose differences are in line with the degree of politeness or anger they want to express. Even though the explicit strategies that overtly use performative verbs are not found, the more polite the speakers want to communicate with the interlocutors, the more indirect, implicit, implied, and nonliteral the speech act strategies, the speakers' choices.

Conversely, the less polite the speakers want to communicate with the interlocutors, the more direct, explicit, and literal the strategies the speakers choose. Accordingly, without regarding the offensive words constructing the utterances, the littering prohibition (15), (16), and (18) that use indirect strategies (declarative sentences) are more polite than their direct counterparts (17), (19), and (21) that use direct strategies (imperative sentence). Utterance (16), which constitutes literal speech acts, seems much ruder than (17), expressed non-literally, and prays goodness to the garbage hurlers. Utterances which are constructed expressed strategies are less polite than ones using implied strategies. Therefore, utterances (15), (18), (19), and (21) whose prohibitions overtly expressed are less polite than ones implicatively described, such as (17) and (20).

Theoretically, various types of prohibition signs are influenced by extra linguistic factors regarding the sign senders and the receiver, space and time, and other contextual situations. Several factors are emotional condition, religious and cultural belief, education, the formality of interaction, place and time, ethnicity, age, medium of transmission, cultural entity, and political factor. Anger and emotional conditions tend to make the sign creators use varieties of indecent expressions, curses, and bad prayers, as clearly seen in (23), (24), (25), and (26). This might be quantitatively different from region to region. Religious and cultural beliefs of the sign senders will also play a central role in emerging certain lexical items referring to god, state, other supernatural powers, such as *Allah* 'god', *kapir* 'unbeliever', *iblis* 'evil spirit', *setan* 'satan', etc., such as found in (2), (5), (6), (9), (22), and (25). Educated people should know that careless littering is strongly prohibited. The landowners use this matter as a strategy for creating signs for not littering on their lands, such as seen in (27), and (28). Signs issued by the local governments that should use certain strategies in communicating with their residents tend to be much longer, more formal, and more polite than ones created by individuals (29) and (30).

The location and place where the prohibitions are intended to also constitute important factors determining the message content of the signs. Examples (31) and (32) clearly indicate where and when the interlocutors are not allowed to throw their garbage. In (31) the creator prohibits the interlocutors from littering the river, and in (32) the interlocutors litter out of the indicating time because no employee will collect the garbage. The numerous local languages used in the archipelago made the use of large local language vocabularies unavoidable, such as the use of Javanese words *kirik* 'dog' (33), *asu* 'dog' (37), and Minangkabause *saghok* 'garbage' (34). This fact clearly shows the close relationship between language and ethnicity (Wijana, 2019, 64-78). The large number of younger residents who are always anxious to be *jomblo* 'living Single/unmarried without boy or girlfriend' can also potentially be used as targets of the prohibition message (35) and (36). Not all information contained by the prohibition boards is transmitted through a verbal medium. Still, in several cases, a part of the message is also possible to deliver through the visual medium. Accordingly, without seeing the boards directly, the prohibitions are very hard to comprehend (37) and (38). In (37), the board shows a picture of a dog carrying a broom and a rake, and in (38) the sign is completed by a stopping sign. Sometimes the signs copy texts which are very popular in the speech community. The text can be song lyrics, proverbs, slogans, commercial ads, etc.

Discourse (39) and (40) respectively exploit one line of a song lyric popularized by Indonesian singers: Dewi Yull and Broery Pesolima entitled "*Jangan Ada Dusta di antara Kita*" 'There must not be falsehood between us', and herbal medicine advertisement '*Tolak Angin*' (anti air sickness) that says *Orang pintar minum Tolak Angin* 'Clever people drink *Tolak Angin*'. Without knowing these hipograms, prohibitions (39) and (40) are also challenging.

Finally, Political affiliation of people together with their hated or disliked statements, opinions, and behaviors can motivate their political opponents to create prohibition signs showing their hostility to those political actors. Example (41) is a clear example in which the creators overtly attack a political leader.

(41) *Dilarang buang sampah di sini, kecuali Haji Lulung.* (DKI Jakarta)
'It is prohibited to litter here, except Haji Lulung'

The political issues can also be broader or more global, as shown by (42) as an expression of hostility toward the Jewish/Zionists and solidarity for the Palestinians:

(42) *Yang buang sampah di sini Yahudi.* (DKI Jakarta)
'Anyone hurling garbage here is a Jewish'

The last two discourses are difficult to grasp without fully understanding Indonesian political conditions and its alignment and position regarding Israel and Palestinian conflict.

CONCLUSION

All littering prohibition discourses are intended to forbid their receivers from throwing garbage into various kinds of places, such as toilets, empty lands, rivers, seas, etc. These discourses are variably structured, and consequently, there are discourses relatively longer and much longer than the others, from the simplest forms, consisting of single clauses, up to the most complex ones, composed of three or more sentences. To achieve effective communication goals, the sign senders exploit various pragmatic strategies closely related to the degree of politeness of the utterances. Finally, both forms and strategy controlled by the sign senders are influenced by varieties of extralinguistic factors, such as emotional condition, religious and cultural belief, education, the formality of interaction, place and time, ethnicity, age, medium of transmission, cultural entity, and political factor. This paper has not been able to reveal which types of discourses have the most and the least effects on reducing littering in particular places in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Allan, K. & Burridge, K. (1991). *Euphemism & Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon*. Oxford University Press.
- Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., ; Lapoliwa, H., Moeliono, A.M, (2003). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* (Edisi Ketiga).
- Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Lapoliwa, H. & Moeliono, A. M. (2003). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Edisi Ketiga. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Gholami M, Torkashvand J, Rezaei Kalantari R, Godini K, Jonidi Jafari A, Farzadkia M. Study of littered wastes in different urban land-uses: An 6 environmental status assessment. *J Environ Health Sci Eng*. 2020 Aug 31;18(2):915-924. doi: 10.1007/s40201-020-00515-7. PMID: 33312612; PMCID: PMC7721764.
- Gustiasari, D.R & Septiningrum.D. W (2021). “Tindak Tutur Wacana Persuasif Larangan Membuang Sampah Di Kecamatan Pamulang Kota, Tangerang Selatan”. *Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. Vol. 12. No. 1. Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1992). *Bahasa, Konteks, dan Teks*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1992) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia; University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Purwo, B.K (1990). *Pragmatik dan Pengajaran Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Keizer, K., Lindenberg, S., & Steg, L. (2011). “The Reversal Effect of Prohibition Signs”. *Sage Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211398505>. Group Processes and intergroup Relations. Keizer, K, Lindenberg, S. & Steg,
- Keraf, G. (1991). *Tata Bahasa Rujukan Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Grasindo.

- Dewi, F.K (2019) Public Signs in Sidoarjo Regency: A Study on Ecolinguistics and Information Structure. Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University Master Thesis.
- Kurniawati, W. (2021). Pelibatan Tuhan dalam Wacana Larangan Membuang Sampah: Antara Doa dan Sumpah Serapah. *Al-Adabiya: Jurnal Kebudayaan Dan Keagamaan*, 16(2), 157-170. <https://doi.org/10.37680/adabiya.v16i2.1001>
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Group limited.
- Ong, I. B. L., & Sovacool, B. K. (2012). A comparative study of littering and waste in Singapore and Japan. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 61, 35-42.
- Pham, Linh. (2021). American English and Vietnamese Use in Public Signs: A Pragmatic Cultural Comparison and Translation. 1. 14-36.
- Parker, F. & Riley, K. (2014). *Linguistics for Non-linguist's* 5th Edition. Singapore: Pearson Education
- Rahardi, K. (2000). *Imperatif dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Cetakan ke-1. Yogyakarta. Duta Wacana University Press.
- Rahmawati, A. F., Amin, A., Rasminto, R., & Syamsu, F. D. (2021). Analisis Pengelolaan Sampah Berkelanjutan Pada Wilayah Perkotaan di Indonesia. Rahmawati, A. F., Amin, A., Rasminto, R., & Syamsu, F. D. (2021). Analisis Pengelolaan Sampah Berkelanjutan Pada Wilayah Perkotaan di Indonesia. *Bina Gogik: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 8(1), 8(1).
- Ramlan, M. (1981). *Sintaksis*. Cetakan ke-9. Yogyakarta: CV. Karyono.
- Reiter, S. M., & Samuel, W. (1980). Littering as a function of prior litter and the presence or absence of prohibitive signs 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 10(1), 45-55.
- Revita, I. (2014). *Pragmatik: Kajian Tindak Tutur Permintaan Lintas Bahasa*. Padang: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Andalas.
- Rodriguez, D. (2015). "Littering in Protected Areas: A Conservation and Management Challenge: A Case Study from The Autonomous Region of

- Madrid, Spain". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 20: 7. London: Routledge. pp. 1011-1024.
- Saputra, P. P., Wijayanti, N., & Wilujeng, P. R. (2020). Discourse Analysis on Announcement and Prohibition Board in the Province of Bangka Belitung Archipelago: The Study of Smart City. *JELE (Journal of English Language and Education)*, 6(2).
- Sayuti, S. (2004). *Sampah Masih Menjadi Kendala di Perkotaan*. Dlhk.banten prov.go.id. Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and. Cognition*, 8, 279.
- Wijana, I.D.P (2019). *Pengantar Sociolinguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.