

Prohibited Speech Acts in Indonesian Bugis Makassar Dialect for Students of the Department of Indonesian Literature, Hasanuddin University

Andi Meirling AJ¹

¹ Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

*Correspondence: andimeirling@unhas.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research aims to describe the speaking strategies of Indonesian Literature Department students, and to analyze prohibited speech acts in Indonesian Bugis Makassar dialect for students. This research is a quantitative descriptive research with pragmatic studies. The data source in this research is students from the Department of Indonesian Literature, Hasanuddin University, from the Bugis-Makassar tribe. Data was obtained through distributing questionnaires to respondents. The research results show that the speaker/partner is older and more familiar. The most widely used strategies are STT, SKN, SSS, SKP. The speakers/interlocutors are older and less familiar, SKN, STT, SSS, and SKP. Younger and more familiar speakers, STT, SKN, SSS, and SKP. Younger and less familiar speakers, STT, SKN, SSS, SKP. If the speakers are the same age and are not familiar, STT, SSS, SKN, and SKP and if the speakers are the same age and are not familiar, STT, SKN, SSS, SKP. However, the strategy of younger and unfamiliar partners and speakers of the same age who are not familiar are still considered impolite or low in politeness, resulting in a shift in norms because the strategy most often used by teenagers in expressing something is the strategy of being frank without further ado so that the speaker loses face and this makes his politeness low.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Published March 4th 2024



KEYWORDS

Bugis-Makassar students; Prohibition; Speech acts.

ARTICLE LICENCE

© 2024 Universitas Hasanuddin
Under the license CC BY-SA
4.0



1. Introduction

According to Poedjosoedarmo (1988, p. 526), Indonesian society is a bilingual society. This linguistic situation is triggered by the use of two or more languages, for example a regional language as a mother tongue (first language) and Indonesian as a second language. The expression in Indonesian says that language shows nation. This expression can be interpreted from various perspectives, one of which is that the language used by a person reflects character and also shows which group he comes from, for example the Bugis-Makassar ethnic community in South Sulawesi, known as a tribe that upholds the culture of sipakatau, sipakalebbi, and sipakainge. In the Bugis-Makassar tribe, these cultural values teach individuals how to achieve success and relate to fellow humans. Thus, the basic concept of life of the Bugis-Makassar community is to always live in harmony and peace, and maintain and strengthen ties of brotherhood) and this is also reflected through the use of language in everyday life.

Language as a means of interaction requires attention to language behavior (Aswad et al., 2019; Sukmawaty et al., 2022). Language behavior must be accompanied by norms that apply in the culture of the language-using community, including in this case the use of polite language (Tanduk, 2023; Prihandoko et al., 2019; Yaumi et al., 2024). Agus (2013, p. 15) stated that "Polite attitudes and behavior are manifested through the use of forms, language patterns and speaking strategies so that speakers must maximize their polite behavior towards their speech partners so that they feel respected." The Bugis-Makassar community, both men and women, have unique characteristics in speaking Indonesian, for example by adding markers in the form of honorific enclitics (-ki) and non-honorific enclitics (-ko). Enclitics such as -ki are a sign of respect or appreciation for someone who is being spoken to (speaker/speech partner), be it someone who is older, younger, or of the same age. However, it is usually used for older people because it is more polite. The -ko enclitic is usually used with close friends, while the use of the -ko enclitic is not recommended for parents, teachers or strangers.

Politeness in language is very important and needed by everyone because disputes can occur because of the speech used (Hidayat et al., 2023; Andini et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2024). Among teenagers today, language politeness

is still very low or less polite. The use of impolite words or foul language in daily conversation has become a culture or ingrained in the flesh. Dirty language used when spoken to close friends is not a bad thing, but when around people, especially parents, it is very disturbing. Teenagers are the backbone of the nation in the future (Alam & Sulaiman, 2022). Teenagers who will later lead the nation towards true prosperity. Communication is important for a leader to achieve the welfare of the nation.

Thus, this research focuses on teenage speakers aged 18-22 years, especially students from the Indonesian Literature Department who are Bugis-Makassarese. Therefore, the aim of this research is to determine the politeness behavior of teenagers in expressing prohibitive speech acts by measuring the speaking strategies used by Brown and Levinson.

1.1. Speech Act

In pragmatics, speech is a form of action in the context of a speech situation so that the activity is called a speech act. Speech acts are entities that are central in pragmatics so that they are basic in pragmatics or the basis for the analysis of other pragmatic topics, such as presuppositions, conversational implicatures, principles of cooperation, and principles of politeness (Sukirman et al., 2022; Yassi et al., 2022; Harlinah & Kusmianti, 2022). Pragmatic studies that do not base their analysis on speech acts are not pragmatic studies in the true sense (Rustono, 1999, p. 33). Saying a particular utterance can be seen as carrying out an action, in addition to uttering or uttering that utterance. In communicating, each speaker will carry out speech activities. Yule (2006, p. 83) argues that speech acts are actions displayed through speech. Every speech act uttered by a speaker has a certain meaning. Speech acts can take the form of requests, apologies, complaints, praise, promises, prohibitions and so on. In speech acts, we look more at the meaning or meaning of the action in the speech. So, it can be concluded that a speech act is an utterance that contains action as a function in communication that takes into account aspects of the speech situation.

A speech situation is a situation that gives rise to speech. This statement is in line with the view that speech is the effect, while the speech situation is the cause. In communication there is no speech without a speech situation. Speech situations are very important in pragmatics (Yassi et al., 2022). The true meaning of speech can only be identified through the speech situation that supports it. Rustono (1999, p. 25) mentioned that the story does not always directly describe the meaning contained by its elements.

Rahardi (2005, p. 50-51) divided aspects of speech situations into five types, namely: speaker and opponent, speech context, purpose of speech, speech as action, speech as product of verbal speech acts.

1.2. Language Politeness

Language politeness by several experts has provided an understanding or definition of what language politeness is. Watts (in Murni, 2009, p. 90), language politeness is an effort or strategy to consider other people. Politeness is an understanding developed by society to reduce friction in communication between individuals. Furthermore, Leech (1993) stated that politeness is only a strategy for avoiding conflict which can be measured in terms of the level of effort made to avoid conflict situations. Levinson (1987) politeness relates to politeness as a complex system for softening facial threats.

There are five politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 60), namely:

a. Perform speech acts frankly and matter-of-factly, which is called bald on record (without further ado)

The choice of bald on record is done if the speaker wants to convey the meaning of the speech as efficiently as possible and this is known by both parties so that there is no need for face protection (image). For example, in an emergency or panic, an expression such as "help" in the event of a fire will be more effective than a face-protecting expression such as "please help me, if you would be so kind."). The last expression will reduce the degree of importance of the information conveyed.

b. Carry out speech acts as is by using positive politeness

The choice of positive politeness is made if the speaker wants to protect the positive face of the interlocutor, namely the desire to be appreciated. In carrying out FTA, the speaker gives the impression that the speaker has the same desire for the speech partner to show friendship between them. Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 101) stated that there are fifteen strategies that can be chosen to express positive politeness. In this case, the positive politeness

referred to is grouped into three, namely: recognition of similarities (claim for common ground), showing that the speaker and the speech partner are working together, and fulfilling (in part) the wishes of the speech partner.

c. Perform speech acts using negative politeness

The choice of negative politeness is made if the speaker is to protect the negative face of the interlocutor, namely his desire to be free to act and not be disturbed. Negative politeness characteristics are marked by linguistic markers that indicate the existence of social distance between the speaker and the speech partner. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 130) state that there are ten strategies that can be chosen to express negative politeness which can be grouped into five, namely speaking directly, expressing the speaker's desire not to burden the speaker, do not assume, do not force the speaker, and protect other desires generated by negative face. The ten strategies are: 1) Using conventional expressions; 2) Using question expressions or guarded expressions; 3) Using optimistic expressions; 4) Reducing the level of imposition; 5) Give expressions of respect; 6) Apologize; 7) Avoid using the pronouns I 'I' or you 'you'; 8) Declare FTA as a general rule; 9) Using nominalization expressions; 10) Using direct expressions such as being indebted to or not indebted to the speaker.

d. Carrying out speech acts in a vague manner or off the record

The choice of a vague speech act is made if the speaker feels it is impossible to convey his meaning clearly or the speaker allows the speaker to understand the speaker's utterance according to the speaker's own interpretation. In this way, the speaker avoids being involved in interpreting his speech. There are fifteen strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 213) in connection with this, namely: 1) Giving hints; 2) Giving related instructions; 3) Presumptive; 4) Understate the situation (understate); 5) Exaggerating the situation (overstate); 6) Using tautology; 7) Using conflicting expressions; 8) Using ironic expressions; 9) Using metaphors; 10) Using rhetorical questions; 11) Using ambiguous expressions; 12) Using unclear expressions; 13) Using expressions that are too general (overgeneralize); 14) Not placing the speech partner properly (displace hearer); 15) Using incomplete expressions, using ellipsis.

e. Do not perform speech acts

The choice of speaking without speaking or without comment is generally chosen if the speaker considers the situation does not allow him to speak. In this case, the speaker thinks that not making comments or remaining silent can have the effect of behaving politely compared to making comments.

1.3. Principles of Politeness in Language in Bugis-Makassar Culture

The concept of Sipakatau, Sipakalebbi, and Sipakainge is a basic concept of life in the Bugis-Makassar community to always live in harmony and peace and maintain and strengthen ties of brotherhood so that this concept has become a culture in the life of the Bugis-Makassar community (Hamid, 2003). Room (2011) and Agus (2015) explain that the concepts of sipakatau, sipakalebbi, sipakainge are closely related to the values of linguistic and cultural politeness and are also used as principles in the life of the Bugis-Makassar tribe. Therefore, in speaking, the Makasar Bugis community pays attention to age, place, and social status. The form of a person's speech is greatly influenced by these three indicators so that it is said to be sipakatau, sipakalebbi, and sipakainge.

2. Methodology

This research used quantitative descriptive method. The use of quantitative techniques is intended to classify the answers obtained and calculate the number of emergence of an answer from all data findings (Sutrisna et al., 2014). The subject of this research was 60 students of the Indonesian Department of Literature Hasanuddin University from the age of 18-22 years who were Bugis Makassar. Research on speech acts prohibited from describing the strategies and levels of students' politeness of the speech partners. Furthermore, the technique used in this research, namely the questionnaire technique. The way of collecting data, namely identifying data by calculating the number of respondents who prefer the strategy to be frank, positive politeness, negative politeness and vague politeness and analyze the data by using SPSS or Statistical Package for the social. This questionnaire was made 3 parts, namely: the first part filling questions to capture personal data, namely the initials, ethnicity and age of respondents; Part two of the respondents was asked to check the speech based on the context that had been prepared if committed acts of speech prohibits, and; The third part is provided a column to write the speech that respondents use other than those provided by the researcher. In addition, a topic is given based on three pairs of parameters, namely power, social distance (close and uncomfortable), and the public. The use of quantitative techniques is intended to classify the answers obtained and count the number of emergence of an answer from all data findings (Sutrisna et al., 2014).

3. Result and Discussion

Based on the results of research into the speech acts used by Indonesian Literature Department students in prohibiting smoking according to different topics as follows:

a) If the interlocutor/listener is older and more familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) to prohibit smoking is (1) "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the least occurrence (70%) and the least (2) "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, sir, but you should not smoke here" with the appearance presentation (8.33%).

b) If the speech partner/listener is older and not familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) in prohibiting smoking is, (1) Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokokkik= Sorry sir, you should not smoke with the appearance presentation (66.66%) and the least (2) "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, sir, but it's better sir not to smoke here" with an appearance presentation (5%).

c) If the partner is younger and familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) to prohibit smoking is "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (47%) and the least "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but it's better sir not to smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (11.66%).

d) If the partner is younger and not familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) in prohibiting smoking, "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (68.33%) and the least "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, but it's better Sir, don't smoke here" with an appearance presentation (6.66%).

e) If the partners are the same age and close friends, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) to prohibit smoking is "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (75%) and the least "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but it's better sir not to smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (13.33%).

f) If the partners are the same age and are not close, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) to prohibit smoking is "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (66.66%) and the least "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but it's better Sir don't smoke here" with presentation of emergence (5%).

1) The speech partner/listener is older and more familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) in prohibiting smoking, namely (1) "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with a percentage of occurrence (70%) and the least (2) "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but you better not smoke here" with the appearance presentation (8.33%). The most widely used strategy with the above forms of speech is the Frank Strategy. Brown-Levinson (in Agus, 2013, p. 27) states that the form of direct speech without further ado is always analogous to the lowest form of culture or as a form of less polite speech. However, the speech act form of prohibiting smoking in hospitals chosen by the speaker is still in the polite category because the interlocutor is familiar with the speaker.

Table 1. The speech partner/listener is older and more familiar

Context	Setting : in Pete-Pete (Public transportation) -K+P +S				
	Situation: Relax				
	Domain: public				
	Speech	Strategy to speak	Frequency of appearance	Total respondent	Percentage of appearance
1	Janganki merokok di sini	frankly without further ado	42	60	70%
2	Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini	Positive politeness	5	60	8,33%

3	Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokok	Negative politeness	40	60	66,66%
4	Tutup hidungmu banyak asap, nanti sesak napas	Faint politeness	17	60	28.33%

2) The speech partner/listener is older and not familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) in prohibiting smoking, namely, (1) Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokok= Sorry sir, you should not smoke with the appearance presentation (66.66%) and the least (2) "aya juga merokok, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, sir, but you should not smoke here" with presentation of appearance (5%). The strategy most often chosen by speakers in prohibiting smoking on public transportation is the positive politeness strategy. The choice of positive politeness is made if the speaker wants to protect the positive face of the interlocutor, namely the desire to respect them especially when they are in an unfamiliar situation so they are still considered polite/high in politeness. Recognition of common ground (claim for common ground), showing that the speaker and speech partner are working together, and fulfilling (some of) the wishes of the speech partner by using the option "saya juga merokok= I smoke too".

Table 2. The speech partner/listener is older and not familiar

Context	Setting : in Pete-Pete (Public transportation) -K+P +S				
	Situation: Relax				
	Domain: public				
	Speech	Strategy to speak	Frequency of appearance	Total respondent	Percentage of appearance
1	Janganki merokok di sini	frankly without further ado	24	60	40%
2	Saya juga merokok, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini	Positive politeness	3	60	5%
3	Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokok	Negative politeness	40	60	66,66%
4	Tutup hidungmu banyak asap, nanti sesak napas	Faint politeness	11	60	18,33%

3) Mitra is younger and more familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) in prohibiting smoking, "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (47%) and the least "Saya juga merokok, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but it's better sir, don't smoke here." with emergence presentation (11.66%). The form of speech that is most often chosen is the direct strategy. The direct strategy is the simplest form of speech among other forms of speech, although there are many politeness strategies that have the highest politeness, but because they are familiar, speakers choose the direct strategy to convey their speech efficiently.

Table 3. Mitra is younger and more familiar

Context	Setting : in Pete-Pete (Public transportation) -K+P +S				
	Situation: Relax				
	Domain: public				
	Speech	Strategy to speak	Frequency of appearance	Total respondent	Percentage of appearance

1	Janganki merokok di sini	frankly without further ado	47	60	78,33%
2	Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini	Positive politeness	7	60	11,66%
3	Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokokkik	Negative politeness	27	60	45%
4	Tutup hidungmu banyak asap, nanti sesak napas	Faint politeness	26	60	43,33%

4) If the partner is younger and not familiar, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) in prohibiting smoking, "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (68.33%) and the least "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but it's better sir not smoking here" with the presentation of occurrence (6.66%). The direct strategy chosen by the speaker threatens the addressee's face or makes the addressee disrespectful because the direct form of speech has the potential to offend the addressee, especially if they are not familiar and in a reprimanding situation on public transportation.

Table 4. If the partner is younger and not familiar

Context	Setting : in Pete-Pete (Public transportation) -K+P +S				
	Situation: Relax				
	Domain: public				
	Speech	Strategy to speak	Frequency of appearance	Total respondent	Percentage of appearance
1	Janganki merokok di sini	frankly without further ado	41	60	68,33%
2	Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini	Positive politeness	4	60	6,66%
3	Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokokkik	Negative politeness	32	60	53,33%
4	Tutup hidungmu banyak asap, nanti sesak napas	Faint politeness	17	60	28,33%

5) If the partners are the same age and close friends, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) to prohibit smoking is "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the presentation of occurrence (75%) and the least "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but it's better sir, don't smoke here." with the presentation of emergence (13.33%). The most widely used form of speech is the direct strategy. The direct strategy is the simplest form of speech among other forms of speech, although there are many politeness strategies that have the highest politeness, but because they are familiar, speakers choose the direct strategy to convey their speech efficiently.

Table 5. If the partners are the same age and close friends

Context	Setting : in Pete-Pete (Public transportation) -K+P +S				
	Situation: Relax				
	Domain: public				
	Speech	Strategy to speak	Frequency of	Total respondent	Percentage of

			appearance		appearance
1	Janganki merokok di sini	frankly without further ado	45	60	75%
2	Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini	Positive politeness	8	60	13,33%
3	Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokokkik	Negative politeness	22	60	36,66%
4	Tutup hidungmu banyak asap, nanti sesak napas	Faint politeness	25	60	41,66%

6) If the partners are the same age and are not close, the form of speech that is most often used by respondents (speakers) to prohibit smoking is "Janganki merokok di sini= Don't smoke here" with the appearance presentation (66.66%) and the least "Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini= I also smoke, bro, but it's better sir not smoking here" with presentation of occurrence (5%). The direct strategy is characterized by the word don't being chosen by the speaker which threatens the face of the interlocutor because the direct form of speech has the potential to offend the interlocutor especially if they are not familiar and of the same age, as well as the situation of being reprimanded on public transportation.

Table 6. If the partners are the same age and are not close

Context	Setting : in Pete-Pete (Public transportation) -K+P +S				
	Situation: Relax				
	Domain: public				
	Speech	Strategy to speak	Frequency of appearance	Total respondent	Percentage of appearance
1	Janganki merokok di sini	frankly without further ado	40	60	66,66%
2	Saya juga merokokkak, tapi sebaiknya Pak jangan merokok di sini	Positive politeness	3	60	5%
3	Maaf Pak, sebaiknya tidak merokokkik	Negative politeness	29	60	48,33%
4	Janganki merokok di sini	Faint politeness	13	60	21,66%

4. Conclusion

Makassar Bugis speakers among students of the Indonesian Literature Department at Hasanuddin University aged 18-22 out of 60 respondents. The Frank or direct strategy is most often used with older and familiar partners, younger and familiar partners, younger and unfamiliar partners, same-age and familiar partners, and same-age and unfamiliar partners. The direct strategy chosen is to make communication more efficient and some are socially familiar so it is still considered normal. However, the strategy of younger and unfamiliar partners and speakers of the same age who are not familiar are still considered impolite or low in politeness, resulting in a shift in norms because the strategy most often used by teenagers in expressing something is the strategy of being frank without further ado so that the speaker loses face and this makes his politeness low.

There are many ways to prevent someone from doing something, but to make them listen and do as the speaker wishes requires a more appropriate strategy based on the speaker, age and speaking situation.

References

- Agus, N. (2005). *Tindak Tutur Meminta Maaf Dalam Bahasa Indonesia oleh Penutur Wanita dan Pria di Kota Makassar*. Makassar: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Agus, N. (2013). *Forms of Linguistic Politeness and Speech Strategies for Bugis Ethnic Women and Men*. Dissertation. Makassar. Hasanuddin University Postgraduate. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 660 33.
- Alam, G. M., & Sulaiman, T. (2022). Supporting youths to continue further education in emerging nations: food for education intervention or education for food policy?. *British Food Journal*, 124(3), 853-870.
- Andini, C., Yassi, A. H., & Sukmawaty. (2021). The Use of Honorifics in English and Buginese with special Reference to Bone Language: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 6(7), 873-877.
- Aswad, M., Rahman, F., Said, I. M., Hamuddin, B., & Nurchalis, N. F. (2019). A software to increase English learning outcomes: An acceleration model of English as the second language. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 26(6.2), 157.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Hamid, A. (2003). "Siri" Butuh Revitalisasi". Dalam Mustafa. dkk.,(Eu.) Sini dan Passe: Harga Diri Orang Bugis. Makassar, Mandar dan Toraja. Makassar: Pustaka Refleksi, (online), (<http://mahasiswasulseluum.blogspot.co.id>, diakses 12 Desember 2015).
- Harlinah, S., & Kusmianti, R. M. (2022). Hedging system of modal auxiliary on English as Foreign Language (EFL) journal papers. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 1(1), 48-57.
- Hidayat, N. N., Rahman, F., & Abas, A. (2023). Language Politeness on Instagram: A Case Study of Public Officer at Jakarta, Indonesia. *Tekstual*, 21(2), 100-109.
- Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia (UI Press).
- Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murni, S. M. (2009). *Kesantunan Linguistik dalam Ranah Sidang Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Provinsi Sumatera Utara* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Sumatera Utara).
- Poedjosoedarmo, G. R. (1988). A phonetic description of voice quality in Javanese traditional female vocalists. *Asian music*, 19(2), 93-126.
- Prihandoko, L. A., Tembang, Y., Marpaung, D. N., & Rahman, F. (2019). English language competence for tourism sector in supporting socio-economic development in Merauke: A Survey Study. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 343, No. 1, p. 012170). IOP Publishing.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2005). *Pragmatik: kesantunan imperatif bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: CV IKIP Semarang Press.
- Room, R. (2011). *Penggunaan Honorifik Bahasa Bugis-Makassar dalam Kalangan Pelajar*. Konsep Thesis Progam P.hD. Universiti Utara Malaysia, (online), (<http://mahasiswasulseluum.blogspot.co.id>, diakses 12 Desember 2015).
- Sukirman, S., Firman, F., Aswar, N., Mirnawati, M., & Rusdiansyah, R. (2022). The use of metaphors through speech acts in learning: A case from Indonesia. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 10(3), 137-150.
- Sukmawaty, S., Andini, C., & Rahman, F. F. (2022). The Shift of Honorifics due to The Promotion As A Government Official: Comparative Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 5(1), 166-176.
- Sutrisna, I. P. G., Suandi, I. N., & Putrayasa, I. B. (2014). Penggunaan Tindak Tutur Penolakan Guru dan Siswa dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Kelas X SMA Laboratorium Undiksha. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha*, 2(1). <http://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JJPBS/article/view/2187>
- Tanduk, R. (2023). Pragmatic Aspects of Speech Acts: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(3), 881-890.

- Wang, S., Ye, D., & Liao, J. (2024). Politeness matters: The role of polite languages in online peer-to-peer lending. *Journal of Business Research*, 171, 114394.
- Yaumi, M. T. A. H., Rahman, F., & Sahib, H. (2024). Bridging Language and Technology through Semiotic Technology. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Review*, 7(1), 52-61.
- Yassi, A. H., Sahib, H., Ramadhani, R., & Aswad, M. (2022). The Language Attitudes of the Community Members Towards Their Local Language, Konjonese of Bulukumba, Indonesia. In *2nd International Conference on Social Science, Humanities, Education and Society Development (ICONS 2021)* (pp. 14-27). Atlantis Press.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatik*. Terjemahan oleh Indah Fajar Wahyuni Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.