

# REALIZATION OF NEGATIVE POLITENESS STRATEGY ON SPEECH ACT OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS IN THE LEARNING PROCESSES

Abdurahman<sup>1</sup> and Ngusman Abdul Manaf<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ [abdurahman.ind@fbs.unp.ac.id](mailto:abdurahman.ind@fbs.unp.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ [ngusman@fbs.unp.ac.id](mailto:ngusman@fbs.unp.ac.id)

## Abstract

Research on the use of negative politeness strategies in speech acts has often been done, but the realization of strategies that speak with negative politeness in speech acts to ask and answer in the classroom learning process by teachers and students has not been fully explained. This article was written to explain the realization of the strategy of speak act with negative politeness in Indonesian which is done by teachers and students in the classroom learning process. This article's data is a speech act of asking-and-answering that is carried out with negative politeness strategies by teachers and students in the classroom learning process in 2017-2018. Data was collected by observing techniques and analyzed qualitatively based on the theory of speech acts, speech strategies, and language politeness. Based on the findings and discussion, the result of research is concluded the following. The strategy of speaking with negative politeness in speech acts to ask in the learning process in the classroom to be realized with *maaf* 'an expression of forgiveness', *permisi* 'excuse', *sedikit* 'a little', *siapamau* 'who wants', *siapaingin* 'who wants it', *siapabisa* 'who can', *siapalagi* 'who else', *is there*, and requests for approval (*ya, kan?* 'yes, right?'). In the speech act of answering, the strategy of speaking with negative politeness is realized with the *maaf* 'expression of forgiveness', *permisi* 'excuse me', *izinkansaya* 'allow me', *kalautidakalah* 'if not mistaken', *sejauh yang sayatahu* 'as far as I know', *kalaubolehberbeda* 'if may be different', and *tambahsedikitlagi* 'a little extra'. These expressions can minimize coercion or minimize the burden on speech partners. In addition, Those speech acts asking questions and answering can protect the speaker's self-image and the speech partner's self-image so that the speech acts are perceived as polite by the speech partner.

**Keywords:** language politeness, speech acts of ask and answer, negative politeness, speech act in the learning process.

## Introduction

The language politeness theory used in Indonesia today is a language of politeness that is based on social Western culture so that the theory does not fully match Indonesian. So far, there is no adequate description and explanation of Indonesian manners in speech acts to ask and answer based on Indonesian social culture, especially the Minangkabau social culture.

A number of people both in Indonesia and other countries have conducted research on politeness of speech acts, among others by Gunarwan (1994 and 2000), Manaf, Abdurahman, and Amir (2003a), Manaf (2003b), Anggraeni (2005), Manaf (2010 and 2011), Purnomo (2011), Susanto (2014), Manaf and Amir (2015), and Yazdanfar and Bonyadi (2016). The following is a description of the results of the study. Gunarwan (1994) conducted a study of the politeness of the Javanese bilingual. The results of the study show that the Indonesian-language politeness strategy of Javanese speakers is based on Javanese cultural values. Gunarwan (2000) conducted a study of politeness in two members of ethnic groups in Indonesia, namely Javanese and Batak. The results showed that the two ethnic groups had different perceptions of the politeness value of the strategy, the non-continuity of the message of the speaker to the speech partners in speech acts and the two ethnic groups also spoke Indonesian but remained based on their respective ethnic values. Anggraeni (2005) conducted a study to find politeness speakers in Javanese. Manaf (2010 and 2011) and Manaf and Amir (2015) examined the politeness of speech acts in Indonesian, seen from the variable degrees of loading and coercion of speech partners. Purnomo (2011) examined the politeness of speech acts of English, Japanese, Indonesian, and Javanese tourists in relation to their sociocultural background. The

politeness of native Persian and English-speaking native language strategies is examined by Yazdanfar and Bonyadi (2016). Manaf (2017) examines the use of fences to form politeness of speech refusal in Indonesian.

Based on the previous studies as far as the authors have done up to the current year (2017), research on the realization of negative politeness in speech questions asking and answering in Indonesian in the classroom learning process by members of the Minangkabau ethnic group in Padang has not been carried out. As a result, the question, how does the realization of negative politeness bases in speech acts act in and answer Indonesian in the classroom learning process by members of the Minangkabau ethnic group has not been answered thoroughly. In connection with that, the research needs to be carried out immediately.

The problem of this research is under the field of pragmatics that addresses the use of language (forms of language) for communication functions. The pragmatic theory used in this study is the theory of politeness of speech, speech acts, narrative strategies, the context of the speech situation, and the social culture of Minangkabau.

Leech's concept of politeness theory (1983) places social relations as one of the goals of speech acts. He considered language politeness to be an attempt to minimize or eliminate the fall of the face (image) of the speaker when acting said. Minimizing the fall of the 'face' of the speech actor can be done by obeying the principle of language politeness which consists of maxims (Leech, 1983: 81-39; Cruse (2000: 366-367)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 64--232), language politeness is related to the concept of "face". "Face" refers to a person's self-image or self-esteem. Uka Face 'is grouped into two, namely positive faces and negative faces. Positive face refers to someone's desire for himself, what he has, and what he believes are considered good by others. Negative face refers to one's desire to be left free to do whatever he likes or he is freed from various obligations.

In addition, there are two language politeness theories derived from Eastern cultural values, namely from Chinese and Japanese cultural values that need to be studied. Theories of politeness speak according to Eelen and Trosborg. Trosborg (1995: 29) explains that among societies in which group member relationships and role structures are central, face comments provide ways of expressing politeness by paying more attention to social conventions (such as honorifics) rather than interactive strategies, such as Japanese.

The language of politeness theory expressed by Eelen and Trosborg has paid attention to the characteristics of Eastern culture. However, the politeness theory is based on Chinese and Japanese culture. Indonesian culture belongs to the Eastern cultural group. However, Indonesian cultural values, especially Minangkabau culture are not entirely the same as Chinese and Japanese culture. Therefore, research is needed to describe and explain Indonesian language politeness based on Indonesian culture, especially Minangkabau culture.

In the speech act, asking questions can be used in various types of question sentences. Alwi, et al. (2000: 357-362) group the types of question sentences based on criteria based on the answers expected by the questioner to the person being asked. Furthermore, the type of sentence is detailed again based on the criteria for the formation of the sentence and the type of complete information desired by speakers from the army.

In addition, Searle's (1976: 1--24) states that concept, according to the function of speech acts in communication, answering speech acts can be used to run a number of functions, for example, explaining functions, criticizing functions, promising functions, and ordering functions. In connection with that, speech acts answer (in accordance with Searle's term), can be used for assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declaration functions.

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that politeness strategy theory pays attention to the context of speech acts, especially speech actors from aspects of social distance factors between speakers and speakers (social distance = D) and (differences in power between speakers and speakers (addressee) (power = P) In addition, the theory of narrative strategy also pays attention to the cultural context regarding the relative status of the types of speech acts in the culture concerned (the absolute ranking of implication in particular culture = R). considered polite and there are also certain forms of speech that are considered not polite, politeness strategies chosen by speakers are based on the weight of threatening faces of speakers and speakers. Based on the weight of the face of the speaker, the speaker chooses one politeness strategy from the five main politeness strategies, namely (1) speak frankly or without further ado (bald on record); (2) speak using positive politeness; (3) speak by using negative politeness; (4) speak vaguely (off record); (5) don't say something (Don't do the FTA) or keep quiet.

Minangkabau cultural values are revealed in the philosophy that forms the basis of Minangkabau culture. Penghulu (1994: 13-17) explains that culturally, the lives of members of the Minangkabau ethnic group are governed by the Minangkabau Customary. Human behavior according to Minangkabau custom is a noble character based behavior. Noble character must be applied in all human activities, including in language.

The regional language of the Minangkabau Ethnic Members is Minangkabau or often abbreviated as Minang. Navis (1984: 101-102) explains that Minangkabau language behavior is based on the style of *kato nan ampek* (four language barrel). *Langgam kato* is a Minangkabau-style rule or manners. The difference in

the use of kato styles is determined by who is the person speaking (speaker). The *kato nan ampek* style includes *kato mandaki* style, *kato mandata* style, *malereang kato* style, and *manurun kato* style.

Relationship between Indonesian and Minangkabau languages and social values of Minangkabau culture. Gunarwan (1994) conducted a research on the relationship of Indonesian speakers' behavior with their regional cultural values. The results of the study indicate that Indonesian speakers are generally bilingual, even multilingual, but monocultural. That is, Indonesians speak Indonesian, but are still based on their respective cultural values. On that basis, members of the Minangkabau ethnic group in Padang are assumed to speak Indonesian, but remain based on Minangkabau cultural values.

This article was written to explain the realization of negative politeness in speech acts to ask and answer in Indonesian in the classroom learning process by members of the Minangkabau ethnic group.

## Method

This article is written based on a qualitative research approach using descriptive methods. Data in the form of speech acts ask and answer that uses negative politeness. Data is collected by observation and interview techniques. The research instrument is the researcher himself who is equipped with an observation format and interview guide. Observation techniques are used to collect data in the form of negative politeness forms that are used in speech acts to ask and answer in Indonesian in the learning process by members of the Minangkabau ethnicity and the context of their use. The interview technique is used to collect data on the reason speakers use negative politeness in the context of certain speech and how the respondent responds (speech partners) when they get the negative politeness.

The object of this research is Indonesian language used by teachers and students in the learning process in the classroom. The informants of this study were teachers and students who were the target of observation in Padang and South Solok.

Data were analyzed with the following steps: (1) identifying not saying questions and answering those who used negative politeness; (2) identify the context of the situation speech act using negative politeness; (3) connecting the forms of positive politeness and the context of their use, (4) classifying the forms of negative politeness and the context of their use. (5) draw conclusions.

## Results and Discussion

### Realization of Negative Decency Bases in the Act of Speech Question

Negative politeness in speech questioning is realized using expressions of *maaf*, 'apology', *permisi*, 'excuse', *sedikit* 'little', *yang mau* 'who want', *yang ingin* 'who wants', *yang bisa* 'who can', *siapa lagi*, 'who else', *apakah ada*, 'is there', and asking of agreement *ya, kan?* '... yes, right?'. Each expression tells the politeness of negative politeness in the question sentence is described below.

#### *Maaf or Permisi*

The realization of negative politeness with not saying questions by using *maaf* 'apology' or *permisi* 'excuse' can be seen in the example of speech acts (1) and (2). In sentence (1) a student still does not understand the explanation of his friend (the group that appears) about the difference between posters and slogans. Speech acts (2) are carried out by a student discussion participant to the moderator.

(1) *Maaf, bisakah diulangi penjelasan tentang perbedaan poster dan slogan?*

Sorry, can the explanation be repeated about the difference between posters and slogans?'

(2) *Permisi moderator. Boleh diulang posternya?*

Excuse me, moderator. Can the poster repeat?'

In speech acts (1) speakers use negative politeness adultery by using the expression of *maaf* (forgiveness) in their speech acts. The humble speaker apologizes to the speaker for bothering or disturbing the freedom of the speaker because the speaker asks his speech partner to give a re-explanation of the differences between posters and slogans.

In speech acts (2), speakers use negative politeness to make use of expressions of *permisi* (excuse). The use of excuse expressions in speech acts (2) shows that humble speakers acknowledge their mistakes, which has troubled or disrupted the speech partner's freedom so that the moderator gives another team member the opportunity to provide additional explanations about the poster.

Speakers' humble attitude in the form of apologizing and permissiveness to speech partners is an indicator of the speaker acknowledging the power of the speech partner. Speakers' humble attitude and willingness to acknowledge the power of tutuur partners are considered polite by the speech partners.

### **Sedikit**

The realization of negative politeness with not saying inquires by using *sedikit* 'a little' phrase can be seen in the example of speech acts (3). In action (3) a student still does not understand the explanation of his friend (the group that appears) about the difference in the poster. Speech acts (3) are carried out by a student participating in the discussion to his or her peers who practice the presentation in front of the class.

(3) *Apakah bisa dijelaskan sedikit lagi tentang poster?*

Can you explain a little more about the poster?

In speech acts (3) speakers use negative politeness to use a little expression in their speech acts. Speakers try not to interfere or not bother their speech partners. If forced to interfere, speakers try to disturb as little as possible. to give a re-explanation of the differences between posters and slogans. Because speakers try to minimize disturbing freedom or minimizing disturbing their speech partners, the speech act of the researcher is considered polite by his speech partners.

### **Yang mau, Yang Ingin, yang Bisa**

The realization of negative politeness with not saying inquires by using a phrase *yang mau* 'that wants', *yang ingin* 'that wants', *yang dapat* 'which can', can be seen in the example of speech acts (4) (5), and (6). In action (4) a student gives the opportunity to ask students who want to ask questions about material that has not been understood or is not clear from the explanation of their peers (the group that appears).

(4) *Apakah ada yang mau bertanya tentang jawaban kami tadi?*

Does anyone want to ask about our answer?

(5) *Ada kelompok lain yang ingin memberikan saran?*

There are other groups who want to give advice?

(6) *Siapa lagi yang bisa memberikan contoh poster?*

Who else can provide a poster sample?

In speech acts (4), (5) and (6) speakers use negative politeness-based words by using expressions *yang mau* 'that want', *yang ingin* 'who want', *yang dapat* 'which can' be in their speech acts. Speakers try not to disturb or not bother his speech partners. Only speech partners *yang mau* 'who want', *yang ingin* 'who want', or who are negative politeness in the speech acts ask are realized by using an expression of forgiveness, excuse, a little, who wants, who wants, who else, is there, can, and ... yes, right Each expression tells the politeness of negative politeness in the question sentence is described below. It can be requested to ask because speakers try to minimize disturbing freedom or minimize disturbing their speech partners, speech acts (4), (5), and (6) are considered polite by their speech partners.

### **Apakah ada**

Realization of negative politeness with inner speech does not ask questions using the expression *apakah ada* 'has anyone' can be seen in the example of speech acts (7). In the speech act (7) a teacher gives the opportunity to ask students who do not understand or are not clear from their explanation (the group that appears).

(7) *Apakah ada yang menanggapi?*

Has anyone responded?

In speech acts (7) speakers use negative politeness adoptions by using an expression whether they are in their speech acts. Speakers try not to interfere or not bother their speech partners. Because speakers try to minimize disruption to freedom or minimize disruptive speech partners, the act (7) is considered polite by the speech partner.

### **Persetujuan ... ya kan?**

The realization of negative politeness and not in asking questions by using the approval agreement ... *ya kan* '...yes right' can be seen in the example of speech acts (8) and (9). In acts (8) and (9), a teacher asks students not to look for an agreement, *ya kan?* ... 'yes right'. Speech acts (8) and (9) are carried out by the teacher to students who are participants in the discussion .

(8) *Di pinggir-pinggir sungai, ya kan?*

On the banks of the river, right?

(9) *Dibuatnya di sana, seperti rumah dari kardus, iya kan?*

He made it there, like a cardboard house, right?

In speech acts (8) and (9), speakers use negative politeness to make use of expressions of approval, not in their speech acts. Speakers try to ask approval from their speech partners to minimize coercion to their speech partners. Because speakers try to minimize disturbing freedom or minimizing disturbing their speech partners, the acts (8) and (9) are considered polite by their speech partners.

### **Realization of Negative Courtesy Conducts in Speech Acts Answering**

Negative politeness in speech acts said that it was realized by using the expression sorry, excuse me, my permission, if I am not mistaken, as far as I know, it may be different, and a little extra. Every expression regarding politeness of negative politeness in the speech acts answered is described below.

#### ***Maaf, Permisi, and Izinkan Saya***

The realization of negative politeness with deep speech does not answer by using the expression *maaf* 'sorry', *permisi* 'excuse me' and *izinkan saya* 'allow me' to be seen in the example of speech acts (10), (11), and (12). In acts (10), (11), and (12) a student answers the questions submitted by his more senior friends.

(10) *Saya akan menjawab pertanyaan Saudara. Maaf, kalau jawaban saya ada yang tidak tepat.*

*I will answer your question. Sorry, if my answer is incorrect.*

(11) *Permisi saya mau menjawab pertanyaan Saudara.*

*Excuse me, I want to answer your question.*

(12) *Izinkan saya untuk menjawab pertanyaan Anda tentang tenaga kerja di Indonesia.*

*Allow me to answer your questions about labor in Indonesia.*

In speech acts (10), speakers use negative politeness by using the expression of forgiveness (*maaf*) in their speech acts. The humble speaker apologizes to the speech partner for troubling or disturbing the speech partner's freedom because the speaker asks his speech partner to listen to his explanation. The expression apologizing to the speaker at the beginning of answering the question is a humble nature and a form of respect for the speaker to the speech partner so that the speech act is perceived as polite by the speech partner.

In speech (11), speakers use negative politeness with the use of expressions of excuse (*permisi*). The use of excuse expressions in speech acts (2) shows that humble speakers acknowledge their mistakes, namely that it has troubled or disrupted the speech partner's freedom, that is, the army to listen to the answer. Therefore, speech acts that use the expression permission are felt polite by the speech partner.

In speech acts (12), speakers use negative politeness by using expressions to allow me (*izinkan saya*). The use of the expression allow me in speech acts (12) shows that humble speakers acknowledge their mistakes, namely that it has been troublesome or disturbing the freedom of the speech partner to hear the answer. Therefore, speech acts that are accompanied by an expression allow me to be felt politely by the speech partner.

The humble attitude of the speaker in the form of apologizing, excuse me, asking permission from the speech partner is an indicator of the speaker acknowledging the power of the speech partner. Speakers' humble attitude and willingness to acknowledge the power of speech partner's are considered polite by the speech partner's.

#### ***Kalau tidak salah, Sejauh yang saya tahu, Kalau Boleh berbeda***

Realization of negative politeness in speech acts responds by using expressions *kalau tidak salah* 'if they are not wrong', *sejauh yang saya tahu* 'as far as I know', and *kalau boleh berbeda* 'if possible' can be seen in examples of text (13), (14), and (15).

(13) *Kami dari kelompok IV akan menjawab pertanyaan Ibu. Kalau tidak salah, permasalahan dalam ketenagakerjaan ialah pertama, jumlah penduduk dengan lapangan kerja yang tidak sesuai dan rendahnya mutu tenaga kerja.*

*We from group IV will answer your questions. If not mistaken, the problems in employment are first, the number of people with unsuitable employment and the low quality of labor.*

(14) *Sejauh yang saya tahu, contoh serangan tenaga kerja asing adalah tenaga asing mempunyai keterampilan atau kemampuan yang tinggi yang membuat industri-industri di Indonesia memilih tenaga asing tersebut, daripada tenaga kerja Indonesia.*

As far as I know, examples of attacks by foreign workers are foreign workers who have high skills or abilities that make Indonesian industries choose foreign workers, rather than Indonesian workers.

(15) *Kalau boleh berbeda, dalam memberikan jawaban, saya juga akan menjawab pertanyaan dampak pengangguran. Pertama adalah rendahnya pendapatan penduduk; kedua, meningkatnya kemiskinan; ketiga, meningkatnya angka kriminalitas yang dipicu kesulitan ekonomi.*

If you may be different, in giving an answer, I will also answer the question of the impact of unemployment. First is the low income of the population; second, increasing poverty; third, increasing crime rates triggered by economic difficulties.

In speech acts (13), (14), and (15), speakers use negative politeness by using expressions *jika saya tidak salah* 'if I am not mistaken', *sejauh yang saya tahu* 'as far as I know', *jika saya boleh berbeda* 'if I may

be different'. The use of those expression shows that speakers are humble, acknowledging their limitations, admitting they have troubled or disrupted the freedom of speech partners. Therefore, speech acts that are equipped with these expressions are perceived as polite by the speech partners.

### **Tambahan sedikit lagi**

The realization of negative politeness in speech acts by using *tambahan sedikit lagi* 'a little more' can be seen in the example of speech (16).

(16) *Tambahan sedikit lagi Bu, dampak pengangguran adalah kemerosotan moral.*

In addition to a little more, the impact of unemployment is moral decline.

Speech response (16) is carried out by a student who is addressed to his teacher's mother in the learning process in class. Speakers use *sedikit lagi* 'a little more expression' to build the impression of minimizing disturbing speech partners so that it is felt polite by the speech partner.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the findings and discussion, the following is concluded. The strategy of speaking with negative politeness in speech acts to ask in the learning process in the classroom to be realized with *maaf* 'an expression of forgiveness', *permisi* 'excuse', *sedikit* 'a little', *yang mau* 'who wants', 'yang ingin' 'who wants it', *yang bisa* 'who can', *yang lain lagi* 'who else', *adakah* 'is there', and requests for approval *ya, kan...* (yes, right?). The strategy of speaking with negative politeness In the speech act to answer is realized with *maaf* 'the expression of forgiveness', *permisi* 'excuse me', *izinkan saya* 'my permission', *jika sayatidak salah* 'if I'm not mistaken', *sejauh saya tahu* 'as far as I know', *kalaupun berbeda* 'if may be different', and *sedikit berbeda* 'a little extra'. These expressions can minimize coercion or minimize the burden on speech partners. In addition, speech acts asking questions and answering them can protect the speaker's self-image and the speech partner's self-image so that the speech acts are perceived as polite by the speech partner.

### **Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank the Rector of Universitas Negeri Padang, the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia for providing financial assistance for the implementation of this research through PNPB funds for the 2018 fiscal year.

### **References**

- Amir, A. &Manaf, N.A. (2007). Penggunaan kesantunan negatif oleh wanita Minangkabau untuk melindungi citra dirinya dan citra diri orang lain di dalam tindak tutur direktif bahasa Indonesia. *Humanus*. Volume VIII. Number 1. Page 15—26.
- Austin, J.I. (1962). *How to do thing with word*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, P. dan Levinson, S. (1987). Universal in Language Usage: PolitenessPhenomena. In Esther N. Goody (Ed.) *Question and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* . New York: Cambridge University. Page 56—324.
- Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Polittness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Ermitati. (2014). Budaya Indonesia Tersandi dalam Kosakata Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal SALINGKA*. Volume 11, Nomor 1, Juni 2014. Page 86—97.
- Ermanto &Abdurahman. (2001). Pemarkah Gender Pria dan Wanita dam bahasa Indonesia. In *Humanus*. Volume IV, Number 1, 2001. page 25--37.
- Gunarwan, A. (1994). Kesantunan Negatif di Kalangan Dwibahasawan Indonesia-Jawa di Jakarta: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. In Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (Penyunting). *PELLBA 7*. Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa Atma Jaya. Page 81—121.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2000). Tindak Tutur Melarang di Kalangan Dua Golongan Etnis Indonesia: ke Arah Kajian Etnopragmatik. In Yassir Nasanius dan Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (Penyunting). Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa dan Budaya Universitas Atma Jaya. Page: 1—37.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Priciples of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman
- Manaf, N.A. 1999. Strategi Kesantunan Berbahasa Indonesia Kaum Wanita Penutur Bahasa Indonesia yang Berlatar Belakang Bahasa Minangkabau dalam Tindak Tutur Memerintah. In *Humanus : Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-Ilmu Humaniora*, Volume II, Nomor 1, 1999. Pages 19—30.

- Manaf, N.A. (2002). Persepsi Kesantunan Tindak Tutur Memerintah dalam Bahasa Indonesia. In *Wacana. Volume 4*. Number 2. Pages 174—191
- Manaf, N.A., Abdurahman, dan Amir, A. 2003. Kesantunan Berbahasa Minangkabau dalam Tindak Tutur Memerintah dalam Komunikasi antara Suami dan Istri. *Jurnal Humanus*. Volume VI, No. 1. page 107—115.
- Manaf, N.A. 2003. Kesantunan Berbahasa Kelompok Etnik Minangkabau dan Implikasinya terhadap Kesetaraan Gender. In *Kajian Sastra: Jurnal Bidang Kebahasaan, Kesusasteraan, dan Kebudayaan*. No. 3. Tahun XXVII Juli 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Realisasi Kesantunan Direktif di dalam Bahasa Indonesia di Kalangan Anggota Kelompok Etnis di Padang. *Dissertation*. Depok: Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Peminimalan Beban dan Peminimalan Paksaan sebagai Cara Berperilaku Santun dalam Berbahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*. Volume 16, Number 1. Page 38—50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Kesopanan Tindak Tutur Menyuruh dalam Bahasa Indonesia. *LITERA*. Page 212—225.
- Manaf, N.A. and Amir, A.. (2013). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Memuji dalam Bahasa Indonesia oleh Anggota Etnis Minangkabau dan Implikasinya dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa. *Prosiding International Seminar on Languages and Art*. FBS UNP. Padang, Indonesia. 5—6 October 2013. Page: 417—426.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2015). Speech Act Prohibit Politely in Indonesian with Respect Courtecy by Member Minangkabau Ethnic Group. *Prosiding The International Seminar on Languages and Arts (ISLA)-4*. FBS UNP, Padang, 23—24 Oktober 2015. Page 371--376.
- Manaf, A. & Ermanto. (2015). Kesantunan Berbahasa Indonesia dalam Tindak Tutur Menolak oleh Anggota Etnis Minangkabau di Kota Padang. *Laporan Penelitian*. Padang: FBS UNP.
- Manaf, N.A. & Ermanto (2017). Hadging in Refusal Speech Act. Sixth International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2017). *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*; Atlantis Press; Volume 68; P. 180—185.
- Navis, A.A. (1994). *Alam Takambang Jadi Guru*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Pengulu, Idrus Hakimy Dt. Rajo. (1994). *Pokok-Pokok Pengetahuan Adat Alam Minangkabau*. Bandung: Rosdakarya.
- Purnomo, B. (2011). Tourism-service language: acrosscultural perspective on politeness. *Humaniora*. Vol. 23, No. 2 Juni 2011, 185-198.
- Samarin, William J. (1988). *Ilmu Bahasa Lapangan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Sari, Faizah. 2011. A Cross-Linguistic Dimension of the Pragmatic Particle *Ya*. *Jurnal Linguistik Indonesia*. Tahun 29, Nomor 1. Februari 2011. Halaman: 53—68.
- Searle, John R. (1976). The Classification of Illocutionary Acts. In *Language in Society* 5, Page 1 – 24.
- Susanto, D. (2014). The pragmatic meanings of address terms *Sampeyan* and *Anda*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 4. No. 1. Juli 2014, 140—155.
- Trosborg, Anna. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Request, Complaints, and Apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yasdanfar, S. and Bonyadi. A. (2016). Request strategies in everyday interaction of Persian and English Persian. *SAGE open*. October—December 2016, 1—11.