



Moral Values Found in Linguistic Politeness Patterns of Bugis Society

Nashruddin¹, Fiptar Abdi Alam², Abdu Harun^{3*}

¹(English Education Department, STKIP Muhammadiyah Barru, Indonesia)

²(Guidance and Counseling Department, STKIP Muhammadiyah Barru, Indonesia)

³(Pancasila and Civic Education Department, STKIP Dampal Selatan, Indonesia)

*Corresponding Author. Email: 1nashruddin@stkipmb.ac.id

Abstract

Politeness Strategy is very urgent because it plays an important role in human communication. It is a key point in enhancing the interpersonal relationship and communication. If participants of communication can obey this principle, they can make their expression more tactful; in other hand, if they violate the Politeness Strategy, they may not make the hearers feel good. The objectives of the current research are to: (i) explore the form and the characteristics of linguistic politeness in Bugis ethnic people at Pangkep, Barru, and Soppeng with some examples, and (ii) represent the implication of cultural value in Buginese society. The results of this research show the characteristics and the forms of linguistic politeness through some morphemes marked such as prefix *ta'*, suffix pronouns *ta'*, *ki'*, *ni*, some honorific vocabularies such as *idi'*, *nak*, *daeng*, and some lexemes *iye'*, *tabe'*, and strategies of linguistic politeness, namely bald on record strategy, positive, negative, off record strategy. The implication of cultural values as a basic value such as ethics and language politeness, self-image, courage, solidarity, and cooperation, are also found in this study.

Keywords: politeness strategy, bugis society, moral value

Introduction

Using a language is not just applying the meaning of the utterances or sentences literally, but it deals with the speakers' intention in performing a linguistic act. According to Goody (1978) sometimes what the listener understands from the speaker is different from what the speaker intends to communicate. This kind of meaning may be difficult to analyze grammatically or semantically. Pragmatics is then used, namely the study of how language is used in a particular context or situation. The speaker and the hearer carry out the strategy so that the communication runs well. Thus, after the communication process is completed, the speaker and the hearer gain the deep impression, that is, the polite impression.

Linguistic politeness is one of the studies in pragmatics. Pragmatics bridges

the distance between the side of system language and the usage, and connect both at the same time. Greenfield (1972) defined pragmatics as meaning in interaction, and meaning is bound. Meaning is not something that is inherent in the word itself, nor something that the speaker produces, nor just something that the listener comprehends. In line with that definition, Levinson (1983) defined pragmatics as a linguistics branch that studies the relation between language and the context.

One of the theories about politeness is proposed by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson. The basis of Brown and Levinson's theory on politeness is Face Threatening Act (FTA). Brown and Levinson extended Goffman's notion of face and proposed two kinds of face: positive and negative face. Politeness

theory as Brown and Levinson stated represents a tool for describing the quality of social relationships.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) the term 'politeness strategies' refers to verbal message strategies that satisfy the hearer's face. A politeness strategy is used to prevent a violation of the hearer's face. The use of strategies is seen as inherent in face related communication. They are choices that a speaker can make in choosing language to reflect a social positioning to the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) sum up human politeness strategies into: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record-indirect strategy, and the ultimate strategy is "Do not do the FTA".

Bald on record strategy is ranked as the most direct strategy. It refers to the expression of an act in the most direct way. It requires no effort from the part of the speaker to reduce the impact of the FTA's. "Bald on record" covers strategies, which is usually using the imperative form without any redress, and is employed when the face threat is minimal. By using this strategy, it is likely to shock the persons to be addressed, embarrass them, or make them feel a bit uncomfortable. However, this type of strategy is commonly found with people who know each other very well, and are very comfortable in their environment, such as close friends and among family members. It can be seen in the following example.

Emergency condition : "Help!"
Task oriented : "Give me those books!"
Requesting : "Put your jacket away"
Alerting : "Turn your lights on!"

Positive politeness is meant to establish a feeling of solidarity between the speaker and the hearer by choosing from number of strategies. Brown and Levinson propose three broad strategies that convey positive politeness, the first one is claiming common ground with others, and it means

that the speaker and the hearer have many things in common, such as the same interests, attitudes, and group membership. Group membership is realized using address terms like "sister" and "honey". Sharing similar interests includes commenting on other's appearance and possessions. The second strategy of positive politeness is linked to be aware and interested in the hearer such as taking his opinion. The third strategy is to accomplish the others wants and desires such as sympathy.

The important feature of positive politeness is to share some degree of familiarity with people. It can be considered as the code or language of intimacy. For more details, it can be seen in the following expressions.

Attend to the hearer : "You must be hungry; it's a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch?"

Avoid disagreement:

A : How is she, small?

B : Yes, yes, she's small, smallish, mm..., not really small but certainly not very big.

Assume agreement : "So when are you coming to see us?"

Hedge opinion : "You really should sort of try harder."

Unlike the positive politeness strategies that aim at the realization of solidarity, Brown and Levinson's negative politeness strategies function to increase the social distance between interlocutors. It is essentially avoidance-based, it dictates that the speaker respects the addressee's negative face and will not interfere with his or her freedom of action. The main focus for using this strategy is to assume that the speaker may be imposing on the hearers, and intruding on their space. Therefore, these automatically assume that there might be some social distance or awkwardness in the situation. Some examples of utterances,

which contain the negative politeness, are as follows.

Be indirect : "I'm looking for a pen"

Request forgiveness : "You must forgive me but, could I borrow your pen?"

Minimize imposition : "I just wanted to ask you if I could use your pen"

The fourth strategy of Brown and Levinson is the off record by which they mean that a certain act can be performed in an unclear and indirect way. Off-record indirect strategies minimize the pressure that is on the speaker by avoiding the direct FTA, and thus, one becomes free from any imposition. As a matter of fact, these strategies are not universal - they are used more or less frequently in other cultures. Off-record (indirect) strategies take some of the pressure off. For example, the speaker is trying to avoid the direct FTA of asking for a beer. The speaker would rather it be offered to him/ her once the hearer sees that the speaker wants one. Other examples are:

Give hints : "It's a bit cold in here"

Be sarcastic, or joking : "Yeah, it's really hot here"

In "Do not do the FTA" strategy, nothing is said because the risk of face loss is extremely great. It is to remain silent and not doing the act. But the researchers did not provide any discussion concerning this strategy. Brown and Levinson regard silence as the ultimate expression of politeness, although they offer no discussion of it.

Politeness behavior is very closely related to the culture and language of an ethnicity (Haryanto, Weda, & Nashruddin, 2018). Both of these can not be separated from one another. Language is a reflection of culture. Instead, culture is the values and principles that occurs in a speakers community of a language.

Indonesia is a country that has diverse cultures. According to Joan (2002) Indonesian people apply different linguistic

politeness principles based on their cultures. That is because the culture in a society have an impact on their linguistic pattern.

One of the cultural ethnics in Indonesia which is known to have politeness principle is Buginese culture. In Bugis language, politeness is called *ampe madeceng* (Haryanto et al., 2018). This definition has in common with the definition which is stated by Leech (1983) that politeness is a behavior that is expressed in a good way or ethical. The politeness principle in Bugis society is known with *sipakatau*, *sipakainge*, *sipakalebbi* (Haryanto et al., 2018). *Sipakatau* is a principle that demands everyone should respect to one another. *Sipakainge* is the principle of mutual remind that every human being should possess, for the balance of life. Someone who sees other people doing bad in society must remind in a good way. It means that in a society there must be mutual concern for others. *Sipakalebbi* is expression of appreciation. This is an attitude that is able to see the good in others and provide congratulation on the achievement that has been achieved by others.

Another cultural ethnic in Indonesia is the Javanese culture. Politeness principle that is applied in Javanese culture is called *papan*, *empan*, *adepan*. *Papan* means place or situation. When we talk to other people, we should consider where we are talking, at what time, and how the situation is. *Empan* means content. When we talk to other people, we should deliver it in a good way so that it can be accepted by them and the content of our utterance does not cause misunderstanding. *Adepan* means to whom we speak. If we are talking to an older person or to a person that we should respect, we have to use subtle language, or *kromo inggil*, as an expression of our respect to that person. Hence, *papan*, *empan*, *adepan* is politeness principle in the context of Javanese culture, which means that in speaking, one's utterance should be appropriate, based on the place or situation,

delivered in a good way, and paying attention to whom the utterance is addressed (Muljono, 2012).

Several studies on the relationship between politeness and culture had been conducted by many researchers. One of the studies was conducted by Kiyama, Tamaoka, and Takiura (2012) in Japan. The study aims to assess the differences between the politeness strategies used by Westerners and the politeness strategies employed by the Japanese. The results indicate that factors related to intrinsic charge and the attitude of the other person have greater influence than interpersonal and intrapersonal factors. Those researchers conclude that Brown and Levinson's politeness theory can be applied to non-Western cultures, especially Japan.

In the United States, Pitts, Fowler, Fisher, and Smith (2013) investigated the politeness strategy in communication. They assumed that in the USA, many adult children and their aging parents reach the point when it is necessary to address future care needs of the parent. The researchers used politeness theory about Face Threatening Act (FTA) proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) to illuminate ways in which adult children incorporate face work in imagined messages to initiate a conversation with their aging parent. By using mixed method in their study, the researchers found that discussing future care needs could be face threatening. Therefore, an examination of how adult children approach such conversations and manage face needs is an important first step toward understanding what makes these conversations effective and supportive.

In Indonesia context, Jenkins and Dragojevic (2011) had conducted a qualitative research on the ways of addressing people in Indonesia. In conducting the study, the researchers focused on the theory of politeness rules proposed by Lakoff (1973). The researchers presented some data about the forms of address in Indonesia, which are different from other forms of address in other

countries, like America. The researchers found that the forms of address in Indonesia sometimes concern with politeness level. For example, in Indonesia it is normal to address a pupil in the school as *Nak* (child). However, an older man could still possibly address a twenty-five-years-old man as *Nak* because he was much older than the addressee was, and he remembered the teacher-pupil relationship. The American system does not have forms of address other than first name for children and does not provide forms of address where the name of the child is not known.

Considering the previous related studies above, it is clearly revealed that politeness principles always appear in the interaction. This research technically shared some similarities with the previous studies above. However, the present research focused on Politeness Phenomena in Buginese People Communication. Through this study, the researchers first gave an analysis and explanation of the Politeness strategies in Buginese people communication with some examples. Then it illustrated the application of the Politeness Strategies through the relationship among speech participants. At last, the researchers elaborated its application in daily life.

Research Method

This research was conducted in the year of 2019, at Barru, and Soppeng, with the population of Buginese people language characteristic in daily communication. The sampel of this research covered discourse data or utterances that were recorded and the result of interview about the implication of moral value considering politeness markers. In getting data, the researcher used purposive sampling and snow ball by listening method with free conversation technique, recording, and interview. To analyze the data, the researchers used componential utterance (Levinson, 1983), namely reciting the interpretative meaning (pragmatics) and utterances based on context situation.

Results and Discussion

The followings are some results of recorded conversation between Bugis people in Barru, and Soppeng.

Data 1

This conversation was happened between two persons who did know each other (-P, +D, -K).

- A : “*Wengngerangmupasedding, iyarobolanakapaladesae, kuroseddenamasiji’e, lecce ni gare dii...*” (1)
(I still remember that, the house of the village head was at the next of the mosque, some said that he had moved, yaa...)
- B : “*Iye, mettana. Engkanakapang, eee... seppulotaung. Tegaki’ idi’ makkukkuangnge?*” (2)
(Yes, he had moved, it had been long time. Perhaps ten years ago. Where are you now?)
- A : “*Iye, kuna’ Surabaya marape’. Oo... mettani diii,*” (3)
(Yes, I am now living at Surabaya. Oo... it had been very long time, yaa...)
- B : “*Iye, mettani*” (4)
(Yes, you are right.)
- A : “*Ta issengkadetegailecce bola?*” (5)
(Do you know where he moved?)

This is a conversation between a man (A) who newly come at a village in Barru and a woman (B) who were selling at her stand. The use of morpheme ‘*iy’e*’ as like in the utterances number 2, 3, and 4 is the realization of cultural value in Bugis people. In addition, that morpheme is representative of linguistic politeness in Buginese. Likewise the use of morpho-phonemic /ki/ in ‘*tegaki*’ (2), that means ‘Where are you’. Besides that, another feature of politeness is indicated by the use of morpheme /ta/ in interrogative sentence ‘*Ta isseng ...*’ that means ‘do you know’. In that situation, both are not known each other, then there is distance between them. There is not power, and not

kinship, but they use polite utterances in communicating.

Data 2

The conversation is between two residents who have no family relations, in a small village in Soppeng (-P, -D, -K).

- A : “*Tegaki’ tumangolo?*” (1)
(Where are you going to?)
- B : “*Iye, lokkakurogalungnge, anu, engkaelouwita*” (2)
(Yes, I want to go to the fields, ee..., there’s something I want to see.)
- A : “*Leppakki!*” (3)
(Come on, stop by)
- B : “*Iye, anu... aii,,, mapperrri-perrika’ belah*” (4)
(Yes, unfortunately I am in a hurry.)
- A : “*Aga pale’ tuitiwi?*” (5)
(Then, what are you bringing?)
- B : “*Anue, eee,,, otti, silalolautubbang*” (6)
(Mmm ... this is banana, I just cut down the tree.)

The use of morpheme ‘*iy’e*’ as like in the utterances number 2, and 4 is the representative of linguistic politeness in Buginese. Likewise the use of morpho-phonemic /ki/ in ‘*tegaki*’ (number 1 and 3), that means ‘Where are you’. Besides that, instead of saying ‘*mutiwi*’ to say ‘you bring’, A said ‘*itiwi*’ (number 5) that actually means ‘*brought*’. He used /i/ as the representative of politeness. There is not power, and not kinship, between those two residents, but they use polite utterances in communicating.

The conversation between two farmers in a village in Soppeng indicated different situation. It can be seen in the following data.

Data 3

The conversation is between two farmers who have no family relations, but they are close friends, in a small village in Pangkep (-P, -D, -K).

- A : “*Uppannamurencanaimattanengiko?*” (1)
(In your planning, when will you plant?)

- B : “*Aii, de pa rouwissengngi, apaa...manuuwitae, asewe, eh, bibi’ e, de pa gaga*” (2)
(I don't know yet, because, I see, rice, eh ... there are no seeds)

The two farmers already knew each other and were close. Although there is not power, and not kinship, between those farmers, they tend to use casual utterances in communicating. This can be seen in word ‘*iko*’ (number 1). It is a casual utterance that means ‘you’. Because those two farmers have close friendships, the language they use is casual language.

Data 4

The following is the conversation between two small children who have close friendships, in a small village in Barru (-P, -D, -K).

- A : “*Sama’, embanimaccul?*” (1)
(Sama’, let's play)
B : “*Teyama’, ikonaa....*” (2)
(I do not want. Just you)
A : “*De’ mu elomaccul?*” (3)
(You don't want to play?)
B : “*Iyo, ceyamaa.....*” (4)
(Yeah. I don't)

They also use casual language in communicating. Their friendship is very close, so there is no power, no distance, and no kinship between both. They tend to use casual utterances in communicating. This can be seen in word ‘*iko*’ (number 2). It is a casual utterance that means ‘you’. Besides that, another feature of casualness is indicated by the use of morpheme /*mu*/ in ‘*mu elo*’ (number 3). The morpheme ‘*mu*’ means ‘you’.

Data 5

Another situation in the communication among symmetrical relations is seen in the following conversation. This is a recording of conversation among three classmates in an elementary school in Soppeng. There is no power, no distance, and no kinship among them (-P, +D, +K).

- A : “*Iwang, purani PR mu?*” (1)
(Iwang, is your homework finished?)

- B : “*Iyyo, puranii....*” (2)
(Yes, it is finished.)

- C : “*Iyya de’ pa, pitakkadolo*” (3)
(I do not yet. Let me cheat it.)

- B : “*De uwelooo...*” (4)
(No....)

- A & C : “*Aiii... masekke’ ko belah.....*” (5)
(Aii... you are very stingy)

Those three children use casual language to communicate to one other. Those are seen in ‘*mu*’, (number 1), and ‘*ko*’ (number 5).

Data 6

This is the recording of a conversation between two sisters, in a village in Barru (-P, -D, +K).

- A : “*Engkamanengngigare’ pole Kalimantan?*” (1)
(He said everybody in Kalimantan would come)
B : “*Na de’ to iyyatuu...de gaga pole mollika, tau Kalimantannge mi talipongibapakmu*” (2)
(Me neither. Nobody called me, but Kalimantan people contacted your father)

Those two girls who are siblings use casual language. There is no power, no distance, between both, but there is kinship because both are siblings. They tend to use casual utterances in communicating. The casualness is indicated in ‘*bapakmu*’ (number 2), means your father.

Data 7

This is the recording of a conversation between two sisters, in a village in Barru (-P, -D, +K).

- A : “*Melona’ lesu, pauwwangngiemmanaaa... makkade lesu na*” (1)
(I want to go home now. Tell mother yaa...)
B : “*Iye, magannapasi ta engkapaemeng?*” (2)
(Me neither. When will you come again?)

Different from the previous, those two girls who are siblings use polite language. There is no power, no distance,

between both, but there is kinship. However, they tend to use honor utterances in communicating. The honorific is indicated by the use of morpheme /ta/ in interrogative sentence 'ta engka ...' (number 2), that means 'you come'.

Data 8

This is the recording of a conversation between two little boys, in a village in Soppeng. They are brothers (-P, -D, +K).

A : "Kakak, tegai mama?" (1)

(Old brother, where is our mother?)

B : "Lokairumasaki', naantara'iadek?" (2)

(She went to hospital. She brought our young sister.)

A : "Laparka', Kakak." (3)

(I am hungry, old brother.)

B : "Tajenni, u welliakko mi" (4)

(Wait here, I will buy noodle for you"

The older child use casual language in communication to his young brother. The casualty is seen in 'u welliakko' (number 4) that means 'I will buy for you'.

Data 9

This is the recording of a conversation between two little boys, in a village in Soppeng. They are brothers (-P, -D, +K).

A : "Ndi', tegaioto-otoku?" (1)

(Young brother, where is my car toy?)

B : "Kae kakak e...., pinjamka dulu" (2)

(Here, it is, old brother. Let me borrow it a moment.)

A : "Ajamusolagi dii...." (3)

(Don't break it, yaa....)

The older child use casual language in communication to his young brother. The casualty is seen in 'musolangi' (number 3), /mu/ is casual language that means 'you'.

Data 10

This is the recording of a conversation between two women in a village in Barru. They are cousins (-P, +D, +K).

A : "Makkadai?" (1)

(He said?)

B : "Iyo, tanniyasaalena,?" (2)

(Yes, actually not he said that

A : "Ai... manu tonging ngitu, apa engkatucatatangiyarengngi, ciceng ma balancaiyaressikuitansi....." (3)

(Wah, that is incorrect, because there is always a note, every payment has a bill)

B : "De napolekualenaro..., maelokomappaselle?" (4)

(This information is not from him....., do you want to exchange your clothes?)

A : "Iyo" (5)

(Yes)

Thosetwo women in cousin use casual language to communicate each other. The casualties are seen in 'ma eloko' (number 4), and 'iyo', (number 5).

Data 11

This is a recording of another conversation between two cousins in a village in Soppeng. There is no power between them. However, there are deference and kinship in their relationship (-P, +D, +K).

A : "Aga tosiidiitanengkuanutta, ku dare-dare ta?" (1)

(What did you plant in your garden?)

B : "Anumiiyautaneng, ee... anumikasi', lame mi sibawaa... engka to ro cede, arelletanengmatu. Idi pale, agatosiitaneng?" (2)

(I only planted cassava, and I also will plant little corn later. How about you? What will you plant?)

A : "Deparouwissengngi, silalolapura....depauwissengngiagaromatu....." (3)

(I do not know yet, it just finishedI have not known yet.)

Those two men in cousin use polite language to communicate each other. The polite utterances are seen in 'idi' (number 1 and 2), means 'you'.

Data 12

This is a recording of conversation between a little child and his neighbor who is an old man in a village at Barru. There is power and deference, but no kinship in their relationship (+P, +D, -K).

- A : “*Leppakkimaii...?*” (1)
(Could you stop by?)
- B : “*Ooiyye, haha....accana, hehe...lokayolokurocina’e*” (2)
(Oo...yes, haha....very clever, hehe...I want to go there just a minute.)
- A : “*Tegakitumangngolo?*” (3)
(Where are going to?)
- B : “*Hehe...cinakuoroyolo, kubolanaiyanu, uwakmu*” (4)
(Hehe...just there, your uncle’s house.)

Power and deference occur in their relation because the man is very old and far older than the small child. However, there is no kinship between them because their relation is only neighborhood. The small boy uses polite utterance, while the old man uses casual one.

Data 13

Another conversation among people with power and deference but no kinship in their relations (+P, +D, -K), is shown below. The situation is in a mosque at Soppeng.

- A : “*A...tennangmanekki yoloyangkalingai dii...e...inggami ssengn gipaddoangennakulokk i tama ri WC we*” (1)
(Be silent please, yaaa....please listen to me, e....who knows the prayer when we will enter the toilet?)
- B, C, and friends : “*iyya....iyya....iyaaaa*” (2)
(It’s me....It’s me....”
- A : “*Aaa...coba pale idi Ilham. Nah, Rudi, ammekko-mekkokiyolo dii, angkalingai Ilham*” (3)
(Right, could you try Ilham? Rudi, be silent please, and listen to Ilham)

(A little boy named Ilham recites the prayer of entering toilet.)

A is *guru mengaji* at a small village in Soppeng. Hence, he has power on all pupils. B, C, and friend are small children and the pupils. There is deference but no kinship in the relation between A and his pupils. In communicating with his pupils, A uses polite language.

Data 14

The same situation is also shown in the following conversation. It is between an elementary school teacher in Barru with his pupil (+P, +D, -K).

- A : “*Yayan, nigabantukijamai PR ta iyaewenninnae?*” (1)
(Yayan, who helped you doing your homework last night?)
- B : “*iyee, Pak, emma’ku*” (2)
(Yes, Sir, my mother helped me.”
- A : “*Idi muamoki’i? Tanniyamua mama ta isuromoki’i ye PR ta e?*” (3)
(Did you write it by yourself? Didn’t you ask to you mother to write it?)
- B : “*iyee, Pak, iyyamettomoki’i*” (4)
(Yes, Sir, I write it myself.”

The teacher (A) has power on his pupil (B). There is deference but no kinship in the relation between A and B. However, in communicating, both use polite language.

Data 15

This is a recording of conversation between an old man and his children in a village at Soppeng. There are power, deference, and kinship in their relationship (+P, +D, +K).

- A : “*Melomanennilokkamangngaji, Nak?*” (1)
(Do you all want to go to mangaji, Nak?)
- B and C : “*Iye, Bapak*” (2)
(Yes, Dad.)
- A : “*Ajayaccule-cule, aja to ilari-lari kumasiji’eNak, diii...?*” (3)
(Don’t play and also don’t run in the mosque, Nak?)
- B : “*Iye, Bapak. Lokkana pale, assalamu alaikum*” (4)

(Yes, Dad. Allow us to go,
assalamu alaikum.)

Their relations contain power, deference, and kinship because the man is the father of the children. However, the old man uses polite utterances when talking to his children. The children also use polite utterances when talking to their father.

Conclusion

The forms and linguistic features of Bugis language politeness markers are found in two levels namely morphological and syntactic levels. In the morphological level:

1. enclitic *-ta* (*-muis* impolite), which shows possessive pronoun
2. proclitic *ta* and morphophonemic *t* which is a combination of verbs
3. enclitic *-ki* (*-koi* impolite) in *leppakki* and enclitic *-ni* (*-nois* impolite) in *manenni*
4. politeness marker vocabulary, namely: *iyé*
5. The use of the honorific words, examples: *uwak, nak, and ndi*

At the level of syntax, it has been found that the power of speech is meaningful pragmatic and semiotic for example in terms of prohibiting. This research found the universality of linguistic formulas such as the use of morphemes, particles, certain vocabulary words, correct greetings, short speech lengths, kinesics, and pragmatic features. In addition, speakers often also use certain honorific vocabulary.

References

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goody, E. N. (1978). *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenfield, L. (1972). Situational Measures of Normative Language Views in Relation to Person, Place, and Topic Among Puerto Rican Bilinguals. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language* (Vol. 2). Mouton: The Hague.
- Haryanto, Weda, S., & Nashruddin. (2018). Politeness Principle and Its Implication in EFL Classroom in Indonesia. *XLinguae*, 11(4), 99-112.
- Jenkins, M., & Dragojevic, M. (2011). Explaining the Process of Resistance to Persuasion: A Politeness Theory-Based Approach. *Communication Research*, 40(4), 559-590. doi: 10.1177/0093650211420136
- Joan, C. (2002). Forms of Address in Indonesian. Retrieved September 10, 2016, from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/14548085/pragmatik>
- Kiyama, S., Tamaoka, K., & Takiura, M. (2012). Applicability of Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory to a Non-Western Culture: Evidence From Japanese Facework Behaviors. *SAGE Open*, 2(4). doi: 10.1177/2158244012470116
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The Logic of Politeness: or, Minding your p's and q's. In C. Corum, T. C. Smith-Stark & A. Weiser (Eds.), *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 345-356). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking about Language, Talking about Power*. USA: Basic Book.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

- Muljono, I. (2012). Subasita Jawa. Retrieved September 29, 2016, from <http://iwanmuljono.blogspot.co.id/2012/04/subasita-jawa-6-bicara.html>
- Pitts, M. J., Fowler, C., Fisher, C. L., & Smith, S. A. (2013). Politeness Strategies in Imagined Conversation Opens About Eldercare. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 33(1), 29-48. doi: 10.1177/0261927x13506708
- Sülü, A. (2015). Teacher's Politeness in EFL Class. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 2(4), 216-221.
- Yassi, A. H. (2016). *Pemetaan Pola Sistem Kesantunan Budaya Bahasa-Bahasa Sulawesi Selatan dan Barat (Sulselbar): Harmonisasi Kehidupan Sosial Bertetangga*. Paper presented at the Prosiding Seminar Nasional Bulan Bahasa Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Hasanuddin, Makassar.

Abdu Harun was born in Toli-toli, on 28th August 1951. He completed his undergraduate education at Makassar State University in 1984. Then, the author completed his Master Education at Hasanuddin University in 2002. The author is the head of the Pancasila and Citizenship Education Department at STKIP Dampal Selatan.

Authors Profile

Nashruddin was born in Masewali, Soppeng, on 3 July 1981. He is the second of four children of the Khaeruddin and Nasrang couple. The author completed his undergraduate education at the English language study program at Unismuh Makassar in 2012. Then, the author completed the Master Program of English education at Makassar State University in 2017. Currently the author is a lecturer in the English Education Department at STKIP Muhammadiyah Barru.

Fiptar Abdi Alam was born in Makassar, on 3 January 1975. He completed his Doctoral Program at Guidance and Counseling study program at Malang State University in 2012. The author who has the academic rank of Lector is now the Head of STKIP Muhammadiyah Barru.