universitas bandar lampung
SOLUTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE

In Cooperation With

JNU

BURAPHA UNIVERSITY

INDONESIA

INDIA

THAILAND

SHINAWATRA UNIVERSITY

NIE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
SINGAPORE

الجامعة الإسلامية العالمية ماليزيا
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

THAILAND

SINGAPORE

MALAYSIA

2nd ICEL 2014

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE

20, 21, 22 MAY 2014
Bandar Lampung University, Indonesia
PROCEEDINGS

Hosted by
Teacher Training and Education Faculty (FKIP),
English Education Study Program, Bandar Lampung University (UBL)

PROCEEDINGS

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE

2nd ICEL 2014

20 -22 MAY 2013

PREFACE

The activities of the International Conference are in line and very appropriate with the vision and mission of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) to promote training and education as well as research in these areas.

On behalf of the Second International Conference of Education and Language (2nd ICEL 2014) organizing committee, we are very pleased with the very good responses especially from the keynote speakers and from the participants. It is noteworthy to point out that about 80 technical papers were received for this conference

The participants of the conference come from many well known universities, among others: University of Wollongong, NSW Australia, International Islamic University Malaysia, Kyoto University (Temple University (Osaka), Japan - Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India - West Visayas State University College of Agriculture and Forestry, Lambunao, Iloilo, Philipine - Bahcesehir University, Istanbul, Turkey - The Higher Institute of Modern Languages, Tunisia - University of Baku, Azerbaijan - Sarhad University, KPK, Pakistan - Medical Sciences English Language Teacher Foundation Program, Ministry of Health, Oman - Faculty School of Arts and Sciences, Banga, Aklan Philippines - Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten, - Pelita Harapan University, Jakarta - STIBA Saraswati Denpasar, Bali - University of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta - Ahmad Dahlan University Yogyakarta - Sriwijaya University, Palembang - Islamic University of Malang - IAIN Raden Fatah Palembang - Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia - Universitas Haluoleo Kendari - State Islamic University of Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung - Tadulako University, Central Sulawesi - Sanata Dharma University - Lampung University and Open University,

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the International Advisory Board members, sponsors and also to all keynote speakers and all participants. I am also grateful to all organizing committee and all of the reviewers who contribute to the high standard of the conference. Also I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Rector of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) who gives us endless support to these activities, so that the conference can be administrated on time.

Bandar Lampung, 20 May 2014

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M
2nd lCEL 2014 Chairman

PROCEEDINGS

The Second International Conference on
Education and Language (2nd ICEL 2014)
BANDAR LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
May 20,21,22 2014

STEERING COMMITTEE

Executive Advisors

Dr. Ir. M. Yusuf S. Barusman, MBA
Prof. Dr. Khomsahrial Romli, M.Si
Dr. Lintje Anna Marpaung, S.H.,M.H
Drs. Thontowie, M.S
Dr. Andala Rama Putra Barusman, S.E., M.A.Ec
Mustafa Usman, Ph.D

Chairman

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M

Co-Chairman

Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M

Secretary

Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A

Treasurer

Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M

Managing Committee Team

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M
Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A
Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M
Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum
R. Nadia R.P Dalimunthe, S.S., M.Hum
Bery Salatar, S.Pd
Kartini Adam, S.E
Nazil Chupra Hakim, S.Pd
Miryanti Feralia, S.Pd

Table Of Content

POLITENESS AND CAMARADERIE:
HOW TYPES OF FORM MATTER IN INDONESIAN CONTEXT

Jumanto

Faculty of Cultural Studies, Dian Nuswantoro University, Semarang, 50131, Indonesia

Corresponding email: ilhamj_wp@yahoo.com

Abstract

This article is about politeness and camaraderie through pragmatic viewpoints within Indonesian context. A language, the writer argues, should be directed to politeness (distant language) and camaraderie (close language), the two varieties of language use in some diglossic speech situation. The writer's arguments are, among others, that distant language is formal, indirect, and non-literal, and that close language is informal, direct, and literal. Distant language is spoken to hearers with power factor, while close language is spoken to hearers with solidarity factor. Ignorance or incompetence of this may cause impoliteness, i.e. rude situations or awkward situations in interpersonal interactions. This tendency elaborates pragmatic viewpoints from Goffman's positive and negative face [1], Brown and Levinson's positive and negative politeness strategies[2], Renkema's solidarity and respect politeness [3], Jumanto's friendship and politeness[4],[5], and types of hearer elaborated by Brown and Gilman [6] and advocated by Jumanto[5]. Examples in the Indonesian language, based on a simple emic research, are given to support the everyday-use-of-Indonesian-language arguments.

Keywords: Politeness, camaraderie, impoliteness, distant language, close language, rude situation, awkward situation

1. INTRODUCTION

A diglossic situation exists in some speech society. High and low varieties of language usually exist there in the society, as they meet the demands of verbal interactions of the members. A diglossic situation in a speech society is then a situation where people usually speak the two varieties or variants of their language, i.e. high language and low language, or for more ease to say, formal language and informal language. What is pragmatics to do with politeness and camaraderie? How is politeness and camaraderie elaborated in the Indonesian language? This article is trying to propose the thesis.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research findings are based on a simple *emic* research on some Indonesian native speakers of different ages, i.e. 9 people aged up to 30 (younger generation), 9 people aged between 31 to 60 (middle generation), and 9 people aged above 60 (older generation). By 'generation' here is meant to be a period of time of 30 years. This qualitative research is empirical and synchronic in nature. This research is empirical in the sense that it studies the data of verbal signs directly obtained by interviewing the informants. It focuses on the emic perspective, i.e. viewpoints, perceptions, meanings, and interpretations given by the informants [7]. Thus, this qualitative research seeks for meanings, to see the world from the viewpoints of the subjects under research [8]. This research is also synchronic in nature in the sense that it is not aimed at studying politeness and camaraderie among Indonesian native speakers from time to time. This qualitative research involves the three components proposed by Strauss and Corbin [9], i.e. interview to get the data, coding as an analytic and interpretive procedure, and a review of research findings or an in-depth discussions as a written verbal report. Meanwhile, in line with Silverman [10], the methods employed in this research are interview, transcript, and textual analysis.

The data collection in this research is carried out through an informal interview and an observation method. The interview in this research is of informal and semi-structured type so that the interview can be relaxed but still focused with some prepared agenda (questionnaires of open interview guide). The

interview is about politeness and camaraderie in Indonesian language use. Opinions are directed into distant language and close language formulated by the researcher and adjusted to the types of hearer, i.e. superiors or close hearers, adapted from Brown and Gilman [6]. The interview is varied with *prompts* – some leading and more specific, short questions [7], which are constructed based on logical, empirical considerations on utterances for distant language (formal, indirect, non-literal) and utterances for close language (informal, direct, literal). The informants' responses on the prompts are then elaborated in a textual analysis to come to the findings of the research. Preparation for the interview is done before and points of the interview are taken into notes. The results of the interview are used as the primary data of the research. Meanwhile, the observation method is used for collecting material or data from other sources, such as discussions with colleagues and stories or talks from Indonesian native speakers.

The data analysis is carried out through a coding technique with three steps, i.e. *open coding*, *axial coding*, *selective coding* [9], [7]. Open coding is a process to separate and conceptualize data; axial coding is a process to reunite the separated data in the open coding to build major categories; and selective coding is used to discover the main phenomena, i.e. the core categories or the core variables, which relate all existing categories.

Upon the completion of the coding process, the data are then analyzed by using an interpretation method with theoretically critical and empirically logical assumptions. The researcher then provides presentations on the research findings in a synthesis, with tables and captions, and related discussions.

3. ASPECTS OF PRAGMATICS IN LANGUAGE

The aspects of pragmatics in language talked about here are meaning interaction, form, distant language, close language, politeness, camaraderie, object language, and metalanguage. The writer has selected the aspects, as those aspects exist and are elaborated in speech society for daily verbal interactions by the native speakers. Each of the aspects is taken into account below.

3.1. Pragmatics as interaction of meanings

Pragmatic linguistics or linguistic pragmatics or, for short, pragmatics is not merely talking about locution, illocution, or perlocution. It inevitably is. A speech is an act with the three meanings, i.e. locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary meanings. In pragmatics, this each meaning can be a force, an illocutionary or a pragmatic force. We are speaking and doing something at the same time, or to be more pragmatically specific: we do the act of *saying something*, *implying something*, and *affecting someone* at the same time. In the context that a speaker is talking to a cold wall or even a beautiful statue, or is speaking alone (*soliloquy*), we miss the perlocution. This is what Austin has elaborated in his grand theory of speech acts *How to Do Things with Words* [11]. Austin's elaboration of speech acts theory is, in the writer's opinion, in line with Malinowski's argument that language is *a mode of action* [12].

Pragmatics is of human interactions every day (*pragmeme* = a human act [13]). Pragmatics is about interaction of meanings [14], [5]. Though the search of meaning has long been done since de Saussure and Peirce in the early 1900, Bühler [15], Malinowski [12], and Morris [16] it has been interrupted by the search of form since Bloomfield in the 30's[17], Fries in the 40's [18], and Chomsky in the 50's [19]. The search of meaning was revived by Austin [11] with his speech acts theory and then advocated by Searle [20].

Pragmatics is the study of language use within context. Language use or spoken/written communication is a discourse [21], [13], [22], [5]. Utterances are the concrete forms of language use which we analyze as text. The analysis of pragmatics is then basically a discourse analysis on text within context [23], [13], [24]. Pragmatics is thus the study of meaning on using language in communication between the speaker and the hearer, within context, i.e. linguistic context and context of situation, in a particular speech society [5].

Pragmatics regards communication as interaction of meanings, not interaction of forms. However, form or text is important as the vehicle of meaning. Without the form or text, language use or communication or discourse never happens, as there is nothing to be perceived or there is no text [5].

The meaning (explicature or implicature) interacted in pragmatics is later developing or is open to probable elaboration by the speaker into the so-called *ideology* and then the *myth*. Here, the vehicles of meaning are not only an utterance or a speech act (or an *idio*text), but also an *ideo*text (a text bearing an ideology of a particular societal group or a political party) and a *socio*text (a text bearing an ideology of a particular society) [25], [5].

How does pragmatics deal with form to find out meaning, as the form is the vehicle of meaning? To come to this answer, let us observe the account below.

3.2. Form in Pragmatics

Forms of utterance in pragmatics can be observed in three dichotomy types: (1) formal-informal, (2) direct-indirect, and (3) literal-non literal (Jumanto, 2011). The word 'formality' refers to high or strict attention to rules, forms, and convention [26], and, therefore, informality does the reverse. Formal utterances then have more complete, longer forms, and are in a good order. Informal utterances, in the same light, then have incomplete, shorter forms, and are not in a good order, and sometimes *cut-down*, *reversed-up*, and *changed* in favor of the speaker [5].

Direct utterances are the utterances whose meanings can be soon interpreted directly from parts of the utterances, i.e. the meanings based on linguistic context (*cohesive meanings*). This meaning is called *explicature* in pragmatics. The opposite of this is called *implicature*. Implicatures are the meanings of indirect utterances, i.e. the meanings based on context of situation (*coherent meanings*). To come to an implicature of an indirect utterance, a hearer usually thinks a bit longer than he does to an explicature of a direct utterance.

Similar to direct and indirect utterances are literal and non-literal utterances. Literal utterances are the utterances in their usual and obvious sense. The opposite is non-literal or figurative utterances. Non-literal utterances use allegories and metaphors [27]. Allegories are stories, paintings, or descriptions of ideas such as anger, patience, purity, and truth by symbols of persons with those characters. Metaphors are imaginative ways to describe something by referring to something else with the similar characteristics or qualities. A metaphoric language is thus the language with no usual or literal meaning but the language which describes something by images or symbols. Direct and literal utterances include *banter*, while indirect and non-literal utterances involve *irony* and *hedges* [28], [5].

How do forms of utterances affect the meanings in pragmatics? Let us talk about distant language and close language in the next account.

3.3. Distant Language and Close Language

Distant language and close language here refer to and derive from the notion *social distance*. Social distance is the physical as well as psychological distance between the speaker and the hearer [5]. Social distance is neither *distant* nor *close*. It is a flexible concept of relative relationship between the speakers. Social distance is assumed to be *zero* when the speaker is talking to themselves [29].

From this context, pragmatics regards a diglossic situation of a speech society as having two variants of language, i.e. *distant* language and *close* language. Distant language refers to formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, while close language refers to informal, direct, and literal utterances. As referring to formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, distant language is usually carefully elaborated and uses safe and common topics. Meanwhile, as referring to informal, direct, and literal utterances, close language usually involves contractions, slangs, reverse-ups, changes, taboos, swearings, f-words, and uses any topics, personal and private [30], [31]. The speaker tends to use distant language to the hearers with *power* factor (superiors); on the other hand, the speaker tends to use close language to the hearers with *solidarity* factor (close hearers).[1]

What are distant language and close language to do with politeness and camaraderie? Please watch our manners and read the following account carefully.

3.4. Politeness and Camaraderie

Apart from various theories of politeness [28], [2], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36], [37], [38], [39], and *Hipotesis Pollyanna* [14]), Jumanto [5] is trying to define what politeness is. Jumanto [5] proposed a theory of politeness among Javanese speakers, advocating the theory of Gunarwan [40]. Many of the politeness theories above are the results of violating Grice's *Cooperative Principles* [41], though some proposed a new atmosphere. However, none has proposed a working definition of politeness. Jumanto [5] covered this gap with a definition that *politeness* is *everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face*.

---

[1]Types of hearer can be further seen in Brown and Gilman [6] or Brown and Gilman in Jumanto [5].

The notion of *face* in politeness has come into high attention and importance since it was borrowed by Brown and Levinson [2] from [1], [42]. In Goffman's grand theory, everyone in interaction has two faces, *positive face* and *negative face*. *Face* refers to the will, intention, and other associations of ideas and values in the self of the speaker. In short, *positive face* refers to *appreciation* of the speaker's self and negative face refers to no depreciation of the speaker's self. The elaboration of face by Brown and Levinson has resulted in *face management* for two major politeness strategies, positive politeness strategies (which refer to positive face) and negative politeness strategies (which refer to negative face).

Under the light of this face management theory, Jumanto [30] argues that the politeness theories in verbal interactions fall into or lead to two major poles, i.e. one is directed to *distancing* politeness and the other is directed to *closeness* politeness. *Distancing* politeness refers to Goffman's *negative* face [1], Brown and Levinson's *negative* politeness strategies [2], Renkema's *respect* politeness [3], and Jumanto's *politeness* [4][5]. *Closeness* politeness, on the other hand, refers to Goffman's *positive* face [1], Brown and Levinson's *positive* politeness strategies [2], Renkema's *solidarity* politeness [3], and Jumanto's *friendship* or *camaraderie* [4], [5]. This tendency has been well-strengthened and highlighted by the results of Jumanto's research on *phatic communication among English native speakers* [5].

From the accounts above, with high gratitude to the former theorists and researchers, we can see clearly that distancing politeness and closeness politeness are in line with distant language and close language the writer has proposed above. Here, *so far so good*, we can sum up that distant language brings politeness, and close language brings friendship or camaraderie. Distant language and close language to show politeness and camaraderie finally meet the demand of language as a means of communication, i.e. a real-life everyday use of language in all situations or pragmatic use of language in a diglossic situation.

A BIG QUESTION is rising here: HOW IS POLITENESS AND CAMARADERIE ELABORATED THROUGH PRAGMATIC VIEWPOINTS? Please wait a minute and be patient. We still have to deal with object language and metalanguage first below.

3.5. Object Language and Metalanguage

The subtitle above of the two levels of language has long been advocated by de Saussurians and Peircians since early 1900. Indeed, as grand theorists of the states of the linguistic arts, their influences have persisted in linguistic areas to date. The first level of language function is called *object language*. This level is also noted as *denotative* level, which is the usual and obvious sense of language, based on some convention, which is objective. In this level, language is seen as an object (*object language*). The word RAT in this level, for example, refers to an animal, i.e. a four-footed mammal of the rodent family.

The second level of language is called *metalanguage*. This level is also noted as *connotative* level, which is the level of additional meaning to give an image or imagination based on some convention, which is subjective. This metalanguage level is metaphorical. A metaphor, as mentioned above, is an imaginative way to describe something by referring to something else with the similar characteristics or qualities. The word RAT in this level, for example, may be used to describe a person who breaks or deserts the duty. In this similar context, for another example, the word HEART as object language is the center of blood circulation in the human body, but the word HEART as metalanguage may refer to somebody the speaker is in love with.

Object language and metalanguage exist in living languages in the world, the two levels of which serve human language as a means of communication, within interpersonal or social context.

Now we are coming to the discussions of *politeness and camaraderie through pragmatic viewpoints* below. As the Indonesian language is the text raised and talked about here, we are talking about politeness and camaraderie in the Indonesian language, or as the title suggests, *the politeness and camaraderie in Indonesian context*.

4. POLITENESS AND CAMARADERIE IN THE INDONESIAN LANGUAGE

The presentation of politeness and camaraderie in Indonesian context here means discussing politeness and camaraderie in the Indonesian language through pragmatic viewpoints. Here, politeness and camaraderie in the Indonesian language is basically the language use in form of everyday verbal interactions, so that distant language and close language are there in real-life practice in the Indonesian diglossic speech situation. The pragmatic viewpoints applied in the data-based discussions here are of four aspects, i.e. (a) elaboration of meaning and form, (b) distant language and close language, (c) politeness and camaraderie, (d) object language and metalanguage. The four pragmatic aspects are like the building

blocks of politeness and camaraderie in the Indonesian language, the discussions of which is carried out through two major accounts below.

4.1. Types of Utterances in the Indonesian Language

4.1.1. Formality-based utterances

Formality-based utterances in the Indonesian language discussed here may fall into two categories, i.e. formal utterances and informal utterances. Formal utterances tend to have more complete, longer forms, and are in a good order. Whereas, informal utterances have incomplete, shorter forms, and are not in a good order, and sometimes *cut-down*, *reversed-up*, and *changed* in favor of the speaker. The two variants can be illustrated in the table below:

Table 1: Formality-based utterances

Formal utterances	Informal utterances
Saya mengucapkan terima kasih banyak. 'I thank you very much'	Terima kasih; Makasih; Kamsia; Tks; Thanks; Thx. 'Thank you'; 'Thanks'; 'Thx'

Examples in shorter utterances can also be found in daily use, as illustrated below:

Formal utterances	Informal utterances
memberikan 'giving'; 'give them'	berikan; beri; kasihkan; kasih 'givin''; 'giv'em'
Selamat pagi! 'Good morning!'	Met pagi!; Pagi! 'Morning!'
Semoga Anda segera sembuh. 'May you get better soon'	Cepet sembuh; Cepet baikan; Lekas sehat. 'Get better soon'; 'Better soon'
membantu 'helping'; 'help them'	mbantu; bantu 'helpin''; 'help'em'
lelah sekali 'extremely tired'	capek banget; ka-o; ngos-ngosan 'exhausted'
berlebihan 'superfluous'	lebay [?]
jarang dibelai 'seldom cared for'	jablay [?]
tidak 'No, I do not'	tak; tdk; nggak; gak 'No'; 'I don't'; 'don't'
meskipun 'although'; 'even though'	meski; mskpn 'though'
tetapi 'however', 'nevertheless'	tapi; tp; but 'but'
ayah 'father'	yah; papa; daddy; bokap 'daddy', 'dad'
ibu 'mother'	bu; mama; mammy; nyokap 'mommy'; 'mom'
Bapak Budi 'Mister Budi'	Pak Budi; P Budi 'Mr. Budi'
Ibu Rini 'Mistress Rini'	Bu Rini; B Rini 'Ms. Rini'
Saya 'I would …'	Aku; Gue; Ai; Ike 'I will …'
Anda 'You would …'	Kamu; Lu; Situ; You 'You will …'
Saudara 'You would …'	Sdr 'You will …'

dan sebagainya	dsb
'et cetera'	'etc.'

4.1.2. Directness-based utterances

Directness-based utterances in the Indonesian language may also fall into two categories, i.e. direct utterances and indirect utterances. Direct utterances are the utterances whose meanings can be soon interpreted directly from parts of the utterances, i.e. the meanings based on linguistic context (*cohesive meanings*). This meaning is called *explicature* in pragmatics. The opposite of this is called *implicature*. Implicatures are the meanings of indirect utterances, i.e. the meanings based on context of situation (*coherent meanings*). To come to an implicature of an indirect utterance, a hearer usually thinks a bit longer than he does to an explicature of a direct utterance. The two variants can be illustrated in the table below:

Table 2: Directness-based utterances

Direct utterances	Indirect utterances
Saya tidak setuju dengan Anda.	Menurut saya, sebaiknya begini … .
'I do not agree with you'	'I think that it is better like this …'

Other examples of direct and indirect utterances can also be found in daily use, as illustrated below:

Direct utterances	Indirect utterances
Saya sedang sibuk dan tidak bisa diganggu sekarang. 'I am busy. You should not disturb me now'	Bagaimana jika besok saja? 'What if we do this tomorrow?'
Tolong hidupkan AC-nya! 'Please turn on the AC!'	Ruangannya kok panas, ya. 'It is hot here, isn't it?'
Cinta mereka tidak serius. 'Their love is not very serious'	Mereka sedang cinta monyet. 'They are in puppy love'
Panggilkan Pak Kebun! 'Call the gardener!'	Pak Kebun di mana, ya? 'Where is the gardener?'
Saya tidak minum kopi. 'I do not drink coffee'	Bisa minuman yang lain? 'Do you have something else to drink?
Lama. 'Long time'	Tidak sebentar. 'Not a short time'
Terlambat. 'Late'	Tidak tepat waktu. 'Not on time'
Bodoh. 'Stupid'	Tidak begitu pintar. 'Not very smart'
Maaf, saya harus pergi. 'Excuse me, I have to go now'	Maaf, saya ada urusan lain. 'Excuse me, I have something else to do'
Sudah tua. 'Already old'	Tidak begitu muda. 'Not very young'

4.1.3. Meaning-based utterances

Meaning-based utterances in the Indonesian language may also fall into two categories, i.e. literal utterances and non-literal utterances. Literal utterances are the utterances in their usual and obvious sense. The opposite are non-literal or figurative utterances. Non-literal utterances use allegories and metaphors. Allegories are stories, paintings, or descriptions of ideas such as anger, patience, purity, and truth by symbols of persons with those characters. Metaphors are imaginative ways to describe something by referring to something else with the similar characteristics or qualities. A metaphoric language is thus the language with no usual or literal meaning but the language which describes something by images or symbols. Direct and literal utterances include *banter*, while indirect and non-literal utterances involve *irony* and *hedges* [28], [5]. The two variants can be illustrated in the table below:

Table 3: Meaning-based utterances

Literal utterances	Non-literal utterances
Koruptor merugikan negara. 'Corruptors corrupt a country'	Tikus berdasi merugikan negara. 'Rats in the government corrupt a country'

Other examples of literal and non-literal utterances can also be found in daily use, as illustrated below:

Literal utterances	Non-literal utterances
Pelari itu tidak kenal lelah. 'That runner is never tired'	Pelari itu seperti kuda. 'That runner is like a horse'
Selalu datang terlambat. 'Always come late'	Pakai jam karet. 'Have a rubber time'
Terlalu banyak berbicara. 'Talk too much'	Tong kosong berbunyi nyaring. 'A gasbag'
Kencing. 'Urinate'	Buang air kecil. 'Pass water'
Toilet/WC 'Toilet/bathroom'	Kamar kecil. 'Restroom'
Mau ke kamar mandi. 'Go to the bathroom'	Mau ke belakang. 'Go wash one's hands'
Naik pesawat ke Singapura. 'Take a plane to Singapore'	Terbang ke Singapura. 'Fly to Singapore'
Menyelesaikan masalah kecil secara berlebihan. 'Settle a minor problem in a superfluous manner'	Membunuh tikus dengan membakar gudang. 'Burn the warehouse to kill a rat'
Pemuda itu besar, tegap, kuat, dan gagah. 'That young man is big, strong, and steady'	Pemuda itu Superman. 'That young man is Superman'
Marah dan melabrak apa saja. 'Be mad and destroy everything'	Membabi buta. 'Run amuck'

4.2. Politeness and Camaraderie in the Indonesian language

Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face [5]. Politeness in the Indonesian language is basically distant language and close language together in context, as proposed by Jumanto [31]. Distant language and close language refer to and derive from the notion *social distance, i.e.* the physical as well as psychological distance between the speaker and the hearer. Social distance is not *distant* nor *close*. It is a flexible concept of relative relationship between the speakers. Social distance is assumed to be *zero* when the speaker is talking to themselves.

Pragmatics regards a diglossic situation in a speech society as having the two variants of language above. Distant language refers to formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, while close language refers to informal, direct, and literal utterances. As referring to formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, distant language is usually carefully elaborated and uses safe and common topics. Meanwhile, as referring to informal, direct, and literal utterances, close language usually involves contractions, slangs, reverse-ups, changes, taboos, swearings, f-words, and uses any topics, personal and private [30]. The speaker tends to use distant language to the hearers with *power* factor (superiors); on the other hand, the speaker tends to use close language to the hearers with *solidarity* factor (close hearers). Examples of superiors are our bosses, our supervisors, our parents, and others, those who can relatively be close or not close to us. Examples of subordinates are our employees, our younger siblings, our servants, and others, those who can relatively be close or not close to us.[2]

---

[2] Adopted and adapted from Brown and Gilman [6].

From the accounts above, we can see clearly that distant language and close language are in line with distancing politeness and closeness politeness. Distant language brings politeness, and close language brings friendship or camaraderie [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. Distant language and close language to show politeness and camaraderie finally meet the demand of language as a means of communication, i.e. a real-life everyday use of language in all situations or pragmatic use of language in a diglossic situation.

Back to politeness and camaraderie in the Indonesian language, we should be aware of the two variants of language above; and therefore, to find out the distant Indonesian language and the close Indonesian language, we should relate the types of forms of utterances in the Indonesian language with politeness and camaraderie. A probable data-based illustration is shown in the table below:

Table 4: Types of forms of utterances in the Indonesian language
in relation with Politeness and Camaraderie

Types of utterances	Politeness (to superiors)	Camaraderie (to close hearers)
formality-based	formal utterances	informal utterances
directness-based	indirect utterances	direct utterances
meaning-based	non-literal utterances	literal utterances

From the categories illustrated in the table above we can say that the distant Indonesian language (*politeness*) tends to have formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, while the close Indonesian language (*camaraderie*) tends to have informal, direct, and literal utterances, the tendencies of which can be shown in another table below:

Table 5: Types of forms of utterances in the Indonesian language
in relation with Distant language and Close language

Types of language	Types of forms of utterances
Distant Indonesian language	formal utterances, indirect utterances, non-literal utterances
Close Indonesian language	informal utterances, direct utterances, literal utterances

With reference to the distant Indonesian language and the close Indonesian language illustrated in the table above, we can transfer the previous data of utterances into the three tables below. Here, for more ease to say and to learn, we refer the utterances in the three tables to the so-called distant utterances and close utterances. Distant utterances bring politeness, while close utterances bring camaraderie.

Table 6: Formality-based utterances in the Indonesian language in relation with Politeness and Camaraderie

Distant Indonesian language (politeness) with formal utterances	Close Indonesian language (camaraderie) with informal utterances
Saya mengucapkan terima kasih banyak. 'I thank you very much'	Terima kasih; Makasih; Kamsia; Tks; Thanks; Thx. 'Thank you'; 'Thanks'; 'Thx'
memberikan 'giving'; 'give them'	berikan; beri; kasihkan; kasih 'givin''; 'giv'em'
Selamat pagi! 'Good morning!'	Met pagi!; Pagi! 'Morning!'
Semoga Anda segera sembuh. 'May you get better soon'	Cepet sembuh; Cepet baikan; Lekas sehat. 'Get better soon'; 'Better soon'
membantu 'helping'; 'help them'	mbantu; bantu 'helpin''; 'help'em'
lelah sekali 'extremely tired'	capek banget; ka-o; ngos-ngosan 'exhausted'

berlebihan 'superfluous'	lebay [?]
jarang dibelai 'seldom cared for'	jablay [?]
tidak 'No, I do not'	tak; tdk; nggak; gak 'No'; 'I don't'; 'don't'
meskipun 'although'; 'even though'	meski; mskpn 'though'
tetapi 'however', 'nevertheless'	tapi; tp; but 'but'
ayah 'father'	yah; papa; daddy; bokap 'daddy', 'dad'
ibu 'mother'	bu; mama; mammy; nyokap 'mommy'; 'mom'
Bapak Budi 'Mister Budi'	Pak Budi; P Budi 'Mr. Budi'
Ibu Rini 'Mistress Rini'	Bu Rini; B Rini 'Ms. Rini'
Saya 'I would …'	Aku; Gue; Ai; Ike 'I will …'
Anda 'You would …'	Kamu; Lu; Situ; You 'You will …'
Saudara 'You would …'	Sdr 'You will …'
dan sebagainya 'et cetera'	dsb 'etc.'

Table 7:   Directness-based utterances in the Indonesian language in relation with Politeness and Camaraderie

Close Indonesian language (camaraderie) with direct utterances	Distant Indonesian language (politeness) with indirect utterances
Saya tidak setuju dengan Anda. 'I do not agree with you'	Menurut saya, sebaiknya begini … . 'I think that it is better like this …'
Saya sedang sibuk dan tidak bias diganggu sekarang. 'I am busy. You should not disturb me now'	Bagaimana jika besok saja? 'What if we do this tomorrow?'
Tolong hidupkan AC-nya! 'Please turn on the AC!'	Ruangannya kok panas, ya. 'It is hot here, isn't it?'
Cinta mereka tidak serius. 'Their love is not very serious'	Mereka sedang cinta monyet. 'They are in puppy love'
Panggilkan Pak Kebun! 'Call the gardener!'	Pak Kebun di mana, ya? 'Where is the gardener?'
Saya tidak minum kopi. 'I do not drink coffee'	Bisa minuman yang lain? 'Do you have something else to drink?
Lama. 'Long time'	Tidak sebentar. 'Not a short time'
Terlambat. 'Late'	Tidak tepat waktu. 'Not on time'
Bodoh. 'Stupid'	Tidak begitu pintar. 'Not very smart'
Maaf, saya harus pergi. 'Excuse me, I have to go now'	Maaf, saya ada urusan lain. 'Excuse me, I have something else to do'
Sudah tua. 'Already old'	Tidak begitu muda. 'Not very young'

Table 8: Meaning-based utterances in the Indonesian language in relation with Politeness and Camaraderie

Close Indonesian language (camaraderie) with literal utterances	Distant Indonesian language (politeness) with non-literal utterances
Tikus membawa penyakit. 'Rats carry disease'	Tikus berdasi merugikan negara. 'Rats in the government corrupt a country'
Pelari itu tidak kenal lelah. 'That runner is never tired'	Pelari itu seperti kuda. 'That runner is like a horse'
Selalu datang terlambat. 'Always come late'	Pakai jam karet. 'Have a rubber time'
Terlalu banyak berbicara. 'Talk too much'	Tong kosong berbunyi nyaring. 'A gasbag'
Kencing. 'Urinate'	Buang air kecil. 'Pass water'
Toilet/WC 'Toilet/bathroom'	Kamar kecil. 'Restroom'
Mau ke kamar mandi. 'Go to the bathroom'	Mau ke belakang. 'Go wash one's hands'
Naik pesawat ke Singapura. 'Take a plane to Singapore'	Terbang ke Singapura. 'Fly to Singapore'
Menyelesaikan masalah kecil secara berlebihan. 'Settle a minor problem in a superfluous manner'	Membunuh tikus dengan membakar gudang. 'Burn the warehouse to kill a rat'

Pemuda itu besar, tegap, kuat, dan gagah. 'That young man is big, strong, and steady'	Pemuda itu Superman. 'That young man is Superman'
Marah dan melabrak apa saja. 'Be mad and destroy everything'	Membabi buta. 'Run amuck'

4.3. Impoliteness in the Indonesian language

Politeness in using the Indonesian language happens when we use the distant Indonesian language and the close Indonesian language eligibly, i.e. when we use the distant language and the close language to superiors and close hearers respectively [31]. Here, as we speak of politeness and camaraderie in the Indonesian language, the Indonesian speakers adjust their utterances to a particular situation that may call. They can perform the so-called code-switching, whether to use the distant Indonesian language or to use the close Indonesian language.

Impoliteness in using the Indonesian language happens when we do not learn the distant language and the close language. When we use the close language to superiors, probably due to our lack of knowledge about distant Indonesian language, we are being not polite or we are being rude, or impoliteness happens. On the other instance, when we use the distant language to close hearers, probably intentionally due to some interpersonal friction, we are also being not polite or impoliteness (or irony) happens. In this case, we are trying to be distant to close hearers. Awkwardness is in the air and there is usually less harmony between us.

Illustrations on rude situations and awkward situations in using the Indonesian language are given below:

4.3.1. Rude situations (impoliteness): using the close Indonesian language to superiors

Examples of rude situations are as follows:

1. 'Cepet baikan, ya Pak Bud!' (?)[3]
   'Better soon, OK, Mr. Bud!' (?)
   [It should be:]
   'Semoga segera sembuh, Bapak Budi.'
   'May you get better soon, Mister Budi.'

2. 'Saya tidak setuju dengan Anda.' (?)
   'I do not agree with you.' (?)
   [It should be:]
   'Menurut saya, sebaiknya begini … .'
   'I think that it is better like this …'

3. 'Maaf, Pak. Saya mau ke WC dulu.' (?)
   'Excuse me, Sir. I want to go to the toilet first.' (?)
   [It should be:]
   'Maaf, Bapak. Saya ijin ke kamar kecil dulu.'
   'Excuse me, Sir. May I go to the restroom, please?'

   Rude situations may happen in the three utterances above, as the speakers are speaking to superiors by using a close language. Here, (1) 'Cepet baikan, ya Pak Bud!', (2) 'Saya tidak setuju dengan Anda.', and (3) 'Maaf, Pak. Saya mau ke WC dulu.' are all of close language, i.e. informal, direct, and literal respectively.

4.3.2. Awkward situations (impoliteness): using the distant Indonesian language to close hearers

Examples of awkward situations are as follows:

1. 'Saya mengucapkan terima kasih banyak atas bantuan Anda, ya Susanto!' (?)
   'I thank you very much for your help, OK,
   Susanto!' (?)
   [It should be:]
   'Makasih banget bantuanmu, ya Sus!'
   'Thanks so much for your help, OK, Sus!'

---

[3] A query (?) is used here to show a rude or an awkward situation that may happen.

2. 'Ruangannya kok panas, ya.' (?)
   'It is hot here, isn't it.' (?)
   [It should be:]
   'Tolong hidupkan AC-nya!'
   'Please turn on the AC!'

3. 'Wah, Anda pakai jam karet terus, nih!' (?)
   'Well, you always have rubber time, don't you!'
   (?)
   [It should be:]
   'Ngapain kamu kok datang terlambat terus?'
   'Why the hell d'you always come late?'

Awkward situations may happen in the three utterances above, as the speakers are speaking to close hearers by using a distant language. Here, (1) 'Saya mengucapkan terima kasih banyak atas bantuan Anda, ya Susanto!', (2) 'Ruangannya kok panas, ya.', and (3) 'Wah, Anda pakai jam karet terus, nih!' are all of distant language, i.e. formal, indirect, and non-literal respectively.

4.3.3. Cases of confusion due to factors of power and solidarity: code-mixing for camaraderie

In the case that confusion happens due to the factors of power and solidarity in the hearer, i.e. whether a superior is close or a close hearer has power, for example, the so-called code-mixing happens. However, as the terminology suggests, the code-mixing in language use belongs to informality, thus using a close language (camaraderie)[4]. Cases like these usually happen between close speakers, i.e. a superior to a close subordinate or a subordinate to a close superior. Examples on these cases are given below:

1. 'Aku mengucapkan terima kasih banyak atas
   bantuanmu, ya Sus!'
   'I thank you very much for your help, OK, Sus!'

This is a probable situation between a superior to a close subordinate, i.e. using a code-mixing of distant and close language. Here the expressions 'Aku', 'OK', 'Sus', and '-mu' are informal, while the expression 'mengucapkan terima kasih banyak atas bantuan-' is formal.

2. 'Saya tidak setuju dengan rencana kamu, lho.'
   'I do not agree on your plan, you see.'

This is another probable situation between a subordinate to a close superior, i.e. using a code-mixing of distant and close language. Here the expressions 'setuju', 'kamu', and 'lho' are informal, while the expressions 'saya' and 'tidak' are formal. The whole expression 'Saya tidak setuju dengan rencana kamu, lho.' itself is a direct utterance, thus used between close speakers.

3. 'Wah, kamu ini pakai jam karet terus, sih!'
   'Well, you always have rubber time, you know!'

The example (3) above is another probable situation between a superior to a close subordinate, i.e. using a code-mixing of distant and close language. Though the expressions 'wah', 'kamu', and 'sih' are informal (thus, part of close language), the expression 'jam karet' is non-literal, and thus, part of distant language.

From the three examples above, however, as the code-mixing happens only between close speakers, awkwardness does not usually happen and politeness between them is maintained. Camaraderie instills. Language use is a matter of probabilities.

5. CONCLUSION

From all the discussions above, conclusions on this article *Politeness and camaraderie: how types of form matter in Indonesian context* can be drawn as follows:

(1) Politeness and camaraderie in language is basically the nature of human language use as a means of verbal communication between the speakers, i.e. the language use elaborated through pragmatic viewpoints. There are four pragmatic aspects to be applied in language use, i.e. (a) elaboration of meaning

---

[4] Analogy of this is just like wearing a T-shirt and a tie.
  Using a language is, indeed, like wearing clothes. [5]

and form, (b) distant language and close language, (c) politeness and camaraderie, (d) object language and metalanguage;

(2) The pragmatic viewpoints on the Indonesian language use can be seen from two major aspects, i.e. the types of utterances in the Indonesian language use, and the politeness and camaraderie in using the language;

(3) The Indonesian language use is distinguished into three types of utterances, i.e. formality-based, directness-based, and meaning-based utterances; and, therefore, the Indonesian utterances fall into three dichotomies: formal and informal utterances, direct and indirect utterances, and literal and non-literal utterances;

(4) Politeness in Indonesian language use is distinguished in two variants, i.e. the distant Indonesian language and the close Indonesian language. The distant Indonesian language has formal, indirect, and non-literal utterances, while the close Indonesian language has informal, direct, and literal utterances. The distant Indonesian language is used to bring politeness to superiors, and the close Indonesian language is used to bring camaraderie to close hearers;

(5) Impoliteness in Indonesian language use happens when we do not use the distant language and the close language eligibly, i.e. to superiors and to close hearers respectively. Rude situations (impoliteness) may happen when we use the close Indonesian language to superiors, and awkward situations (impoliteness) may also happen when we use the distant Indonesian language to close hearers. In either one case, an interpersonal friction between speakers is potentially there;

(6) The Indonesian speakers adjust their utterances to a particular situation that may call by performing code-switching, whether to use the distant Indonesian language or to use the close Indonesian language;

(7) In the case that code-mixing happens between close Indonesian speakers, as confusion happens due to the factors of power and solidarity in the hearer, impoliteness (awkwardness) does not usually happen, and therefore, camaraderie instills.

REFERENCES

[1] Goffman, erving, the presentation of self in everyday life. New york: anchor books, 1959.
[2] Brown, penelope and levinson, stephen c., politeness: some universals in language usage. New york: cambridge university press, 1987.
[3] Renkema, jan, discourse studies: an introductory textbook. Amsterdam: john benjamins publishing company, 1993.
[4] Jumanto, jumanto, phatic communication among english native speakers. Semarang, indonesia: worldpro publishing, 2008.

[5] Jumanto, jumanto, pragmatics: linguistic world is broad. Semarang, indonesia: worldpro publishing. , 2011.

[6] Brown, roger and gilman, albert, "the pronouns of power and solidarity," in readings in the sociology of language, j. A. Fishman, ed. The hague: mouton & co. N.v. publishers, 1968, p. 252–275.

[7] Holloway, immy, basic concepts for qualitative research . Oxford: blackwell science ltd., 1997.

[8] Hammersley, martyn and atkinson, paul, ethnography: principles in practice, 2nd ed. London: tavistock, 1995.

[9] Strauss, anselm and corbin, juliet, basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques. California: sage publications , 1990.

[10] Silverman, david, doing qualitative research: a practical handbook. London: sage publications , 2000.

[11] Austin, john l., how to do things with words. Oxford: oxford university press, 1957.

[12] Malinowski, bronislaw, "the problem of meaning in primitive languages," in the meaning of meaning. London, c. K. Ogden and i. A. Richards, eds. London: k. Paul, trend, trubner, 1923, pp. 296-336.

[13] Mey, jacob l., pragmatics: an introduction, 2nd ed. Oxford: blackwell., 2001.

[14] Thomas, jenny, meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics. London: longman, 1996.

[15] Bühler, karl, theory of language: the representational function of language. Amsterdam: john benjamins publishing co, 1918.

[16] Morris, charles w., signs, language, and behavior. New york : prentice-hall , 1946, vol. Morris, charles, 1946, signs, language, and behavior, new york: prentice-hall.

[17] Bloomfield, leonard, language. New york: allen & unwin, 1933.

[18] Fries, charles c., "review of grammatical analysis," in language, 1979, pp. 907-11.

[19] Chomsky, noam, aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge: mit press, 1950.

[20] Searle, john r., speech acts. Cambridge: cambridge university press , 1965.

[21] Richards, jack c., et al., longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics . Essex: longman, 1985.

[22] Cobuild cobuild english dictionary. 2003.

[23] Schiffrin, deborah, approaches to discourse . Cambridge: blackwell publishers, 1994.

[24] Jumanto, jumanto, "discourse analysis and ideology critics," in lingua komunika. Semarang, indonesia: university of 17 august 1945 , 2011.

[25] Jumanto, jumanto, "language of advertising: an ideology critic," in languages and science (bip). Semarang, indonesia: akaba 17 semarang , 2010.

[26] Hornby, albert sidney, oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current english . Oxford: oxford university press, 1987.

[27] Cald cambridge advanced learner's dictionary. 2008.

[28] Leech, geoffrey, principles of pragmatics. New york: longman group limited. , 1983.

[29] Gunarwan, asim, "articles on loose papers in phd study classes, university of indonesia," university of indonesia papers, 2005.

[30] Jumanto, jumanto, "pragmatics and character language building," in the 58th teflin international conference on language teaching and character building, semarang, indonesia, indonesia , 2011, p. 329–340.

[31] Jumanto, jumanto, "teaching a character bipa (indonesian for non-native speakers) ," in the 2012 kipbipa viii-asile international conference , salatiga, indonesia, 2012, pp. 1-20.

[32] Spencer-oatey, helen d.m., "cross-cultural politeness: british and chinese conceptions of the tutor-student relationship ," unpublished phd thesis , lancaster university , lancaster, 1992.

[33] Lakoff, robin t., talking power: the politics of language in our lives. Glasgow: harpercollins, 1990.

[34] Fraser, bruce and nolen, william, "the association of deference with linguistic form," international journal of the sociology of language , no. 27, pp. 93-109, 1981.

[35] Gu, yueguo, "politeness phenomena in modern chinese," journal of pragmatics , vol. 14 , pp. 237-257, 1990.

[36] Ide, sachiko, "formal forms and dicernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness," multilingua , vol. 8 , pp. 2-3;223-248, 1989.

[37] Blum-kulka, shoshana, "the metapragmatics of politeness in israeli society," in politeness in language: studies in its history, theory, and practice, s. I. K. E. Richard watts, ed. Berlin: mouton de gruyter, i992.

[38] Arndt, horst and janney, richard w., "politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies," international review of applied linguistics in language teaching , vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 281-300, 1985.

[39] Watts, richards, "relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politic behavior," multilingua, vol. 8 , no. 2-3, pp. 131-166, 1989.

[40] Gunarwan, asim, "implicatures of linguistic codes selection in some dialogues of ludruk," pellba, vol. 14, 2001.

[41] Grice, paul, "logic and conversation," syntax and semantics, vol. 3, no. Speech acts, 1975.

[42] Goffman, erving, interaction ritual: essays on face to face behavior. New york: anchor books, 1967.

[43] Axtell, roger e., do's and taboos of using english around the world. New york: john wiley & sons, inc. , 1995.

[44] Beaugrande, robert de, text, discourse, and process: toward a multidisciplinary science of texts. London: longman, 1980.

[45] Axtell, roger e., do's and taboos of using english around the world. New york: john wiley & sons, inc, 1995.

[46] Carter, ronald et al., working with texts: a core book for language analysis. London: routledge, 1997.

[47] Chaika, elaine, language: the social mirror. Rowley: newbury house publishers, inc, 1982.

[48] Cook, guy, discourse. Oxford: oxford university press, 1989.

[49] Coupland, justine, small talk. Harlow: pearson education limited, 2000.

[50] Saussure, ferdinand de, pengantar linguistik umum . Yogyakarta, indonesia: yogyakarta: gadjah mada university press, 1916.

[51] Eastman, carol m., aspects of language and culture. San fransisco: chandler & sharp publishers, inc, 1975.

[52] Eelen, gino, a critique of politeness theories. Manchester: st. Jerome publishing, 2001.

[53] Fairclough, norman, language and power . London: longman, 1989.

[54] Fisher, aubrey and adams, katherine l., interpersonal communication: pragmatics of human relationships . New york: mcgraw-hill, inc, 1987.

[55] Halliday, michael a.k., explorations in the functions of language. London: edward, 1978.

[56] Halliday, michael a.k., "language structure and language function," in new horizons in linguistics, j. Lyons, ed. Harmondsworth: penguin, 1970.

[57] Halliday, michael a.k., language as sosial semiotic . London : edward arnold, 1978 .

[58] Halliday, michael a.k. and hasan, ruqaiya, cohesion in english . London : longman group ltd., 1976.

[59] Haugen, einar, the ecology of language . Stanford : stanford university press , 1972.

[60] Holmes, janet, an introduction to sociolinguistics . London : longman group ltd. , 1992 .

[61] Hudson, rodney a., sociolinguistics , 2nd ed. Cambridge: cambridge university press., 1996.

[62] Hinkel, eli, culture in second language teaching and learning . Cambridge: cambridge university press, 1999.

[63] Hymes, dell, "models of the interaction of language and social setting," journal of social issues , vol. 23 , no. Problems of bilingualism , pp. 8-28, 1967.

[64] Hymes, dell, "the ethnography of speaking," in readings in the sociology of langauge, j. Fishman, ed. The hague: mouton, 1968.

[65] Hymes, dell, "on communicative competence," in sociolinguistics, j. B. Pride and j. Holmes, eds. Harmondsworth : penguin books, 1972.

[66] Hymes, dell, foundations in sociolinguistics. Philadelphia: university of pennsylvania press, 1974.

[67] Innis, robert e., semiotics: an introductory anthology . Bloomington: indiana university press. , 1985.

[68] Jakobson, roman, "concluding statement: linguistics and poetics," in style in language , t. Sebeok, ed. Cambridge: mit press, 1960, pp. 350-377.

[69] Johnson, keith and johnson, helen, encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics. Oxford : blackwell publishers, 1999.

[70] Kramsch, claire, language and culture. Oxford: oxford university press, 1998.

[71] Jumanto, jumanto, "phatic communication among english native speakers," university of indonesia dissertation, 2006.

[72] Guendouzi, J., "negotiating socialized gender identity in woman's time-out talk," an unpublished phd thesis , university of wales , cardiff , 1998.

[73] Kridalaksana, harimurti, "pengantar ilmiah: dari fungsi fatis ke ungkapan fatis," in ungkapan fatis dalam pelbagai bahasa, h. Sutami, ed. Jakarta: university of indonesia, 2004.

[74] Lacoste, m., "doctor-patient language," in the concise encyclopedia of pragmatics , j. L. Mey, ed. Amsterdam : elsevier science ltd., 1998, pp. 266-269.

[75] Lincoln, yvonna s. And guba, egon g., naturalistic inquiry. Sage: beverly hills, 1985.

[76] Manchester, martin l., the philosophical foundations of humboldt's linguistic doctrines. Amsterdam: john benjamins publishing company, 1985.

[77] Marino, m., "irony," in the concise encyclopedia of pragmatics , j. L. Mey, ed. Amsterdam: elsevier science ltd. , 1998, pp. 409-412.

[78] Nunan, david, introducing discourse analysis. London: the penguin group, 1993.

[79] Economist, the, "obituary: allen read," the economist, oct. 2002 .

[80] Ogden, charles kay and richards, ivor armstrong, the meaning of meaning. London: k. Paul, trend, trubner, 1923.

[81] O'sullivan, tim, key concepts in communication and cultural studies. London : routledge, 1994.

[82] Recanati, francois, meaning and force. Cambridge: cambridge university press , 1988 .

[83] Richards, jack c. At al., interchange: english for international communication. Cambridge: cambridge university press, 1990.

[84] Robinson, william pter, language and social behaviour . Harmondsworth : penguin , 1972 .

[85] Samarin, william j., ilmu bahasa lapangan. Yogyakarta, indonesia: kanisius, 1988.

[86] Saville-troike, muriel, the ethnography of communication: an introduction, 3rd ed. Oxford: blackwell publishing ltd., 2003.

[87] Simpson, james m. Y., "ecology of language," in the concise encyclopedia of pragmatics, j. L. Mey, ed. Amsterdam : elsevier science ltd. , 1998, p. 272.

[88] Stewart, john and logan, carole, together: communicating interpersonally. New york: mcgraw-hill, inc., 1975.

[89] Sutami, hermina, "ungkapan fatis dalam pelbagai bahasa," pusat leksikologi dan leksikografi, fakultas ilmu pengetahuan budaya, universitas indonesia seminar papers, 2004.

[90] Thompson, linda, children talking: the development of pragmatic competence. London: multilingual matters publisher , 1997.

[91] Van dijk, teun a., explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. Essex: longman group ltd. , 1977.

[92] Vasconcelos, w. W., "electronic mail communication," in the concise encyclopedia of pragmatics, j. L. Mey, ed. Amsterdam: elsevier science ltd., 1998, pp. 278-280.

[93] Wardhaugh, ronald, an introduction to sociolinguistics, 4th ed. Malden: balckwell publishers inc. , 2002.

[94] Verschueren, jef, understanding pragmatics. London: arnold, 1999.

[95] Yule, George, Pragmatics. Singapore: National Institute of Education, 1998.

universitas bandar lampung

9 772303 141001