

THE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN BUGINESE BONE LANGUAGE

Sunnurainj^{1,2} Abdul Hakim Yassf

¹Hasanuddin University

²Email: sunnurainiaini@gmail.com

Abstract: This study was aimed to investigate the kind politeness strategies used by Buginese Bone in several situations. The source of data was verbal utterances by Buginese Bone. This study used pragmatic study especially theory of politeness by Brown and Levinson. It also used the qualitative descriptive method. The writer used observation by recording and note-taking providing the technique of collecting data. The result of the study showed that the types of politeness strategies used in Buginese Bone are; Negative Politeness, Off-record which found in the interaction between strangers, local inhabitants, family members, superior and subordinate. While, positive politeness is appeared in the interaction between friends. The implication of this research was intended for making good interaction when interacting to other people. The writers also suggest that for further research to investigate the same field in terms of semantics. The implication of the study is to encourage the reader how important to apply the politeness in interacting to the people. The more the speaker speaks polite, the more she/he shows what the speaker she/he is.

Keywords: *Politeness Strategies, buginese, sociolinguistics, brown and levinson theory, pragmatics.*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a tool of humans to communicate each other through signs or symbols such as words and body languages. Stanlaw et al., (2018:2) stated that Language is involved in a wide variety of human situations, perhaps every situation. In addition, Saleh et al., (2021) stated that language is a means of obtaining cultural and other knowledge through conversation. Moreover, according to (Idris et al., 2020; Yulianti et al., 2022), they stated that the intricacy and precision of the words or language they employ are crucial factors in determining politeness in conversation. In line with Sahib et al., (2021), they noted that people use

multilingual languages to practice communicating with people.

The use of language in communication is a part of pragmatics study. It is put in place in order to create a happy connection and good communication Bachriani et al., (2018); Aswad, et al., (2019). In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987:9) stated that Pragmatics is the study of the relation between language and context. While, Mey (2001:6) stated that pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the condition of society. Thus, in Pragmatics, the meaning of language is depend from the context and condition of community.

One of important aspect of pragmatics competence is politeness which was established by Brown and Levinson in 1987. They stated that politeness is prototypically exhibited in conversation and other kinds of face to face interchange, and so other approaches to discourse analysis, using the different kinds of text (predominantly narrative) have contributed less our theme. The knowledge of politeness has an influential role in the social interaction. Moreover, it is said to be primarily motivated by a desire to develop a more universal and effective framework for elucidating politeness in people of various linguistic and cultural backgrounds Yassi (2018).

Brown and Levinson (1987:60) categorized politeness strategy types into: Bald on record (The speaker want to communicate content directly and to the point without any ambiguity), Positive Politeness (The speaker want to treating as member of group or friend), off-record (The speaker want to treat imposition as so great with do not talk directly and make the ambiguity meaning. The term “combination” in grammar refers to the process of creating a holistic approach Tahir et al., (2018). Negative Politeness (The people want to maintain claims of territory and self determination) and Do not do FTA (The speaker avoid offending hearer at all with this particular FTA and of course the speaker fails to achieve his desired communication). Based on the explanation, this paper will be discussed about the politeness strategy of social interaction in Buginese Bone by using Brown and Levinson theory. The data will be obtained from utterances of Buginese native speakers by recording and note-taking. After collecting the data, it will be categorized in five types of politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson.

PREVIOUS STUDY

The study of The Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Buginese Bone Language have been studied by many researchers. The findings from these studies have offered the benefit and helpful to this analysis.

The similar research by Yetty (2018). “Politeness Strategy on Social Interaction Used by Munanese”. In her research, she investigated the differences of politeness strategy used by Munanese in their social interaction. The result of the study showed that there are some similarities and differences of the strategies used by Munanese Dialect Gu and Makassarese based on Yassi’s theory. The differences of the strategies maybe caused by several possible reasons including cultural differences, age and social status.

Fatimah (2021) The title of her research was “Ideology and Politeness Strategies used by American People and Buginese with Special Reference to Bone”. The result of this study is the ideology of expectation can influence the politeness strategies. The Buginese Bone tend to use negative face or indirect language in expecting something to the other because they more hierarchy in their life while American tend to use positive face or direct language although they have an expectation to other people.

Ayuningrum et al., (2018) as mentioned in her research with the title An Analysis of Politeness Strategies Applied by The Members of UKM Debat, The University of Bengkulu, this study aims to determine the politeness strategy based on Brown and Levinson’s politeness strategy theory used by members of the Debate UKM, Bengkulu University when practicing debate. The subjects of this study were members of the Debate UKM, Bengkulu

University, which consisted of eight students. This study used descriptive qualitative as the research method and data were collected using transcripts from video recordings and observation sheets as instruments. The results of the data analysis showed that the debate participants used all politeness strategies but did not use all sub-strategies when practicing debate, namely bald on record, positive politeness strategies, negative politeness strategies, and off record. There are 28 utterances that are included in the politeness strategy.

Hasmi (2013) in her thesis title *A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Reflected in Nanny McPhee Movie* described that this research is a pragmatic study of the politeness strategies used by the main character in the film *Nanny McPhee* in the context of family discourse. This study aims (1) to identify the types of politeness strategies used by the main character in the film *Nanny McPhee* and (2) to describe how these politeness strategies are manifested in the speech used by the main character in the film *Nanny McPhee*. Therefore, this study used a descriptive qualitative approach. The data are in the form of utterances containing politeness strategies. The data source is the *Nanny McPhee* film script. The results of the study show two important points. First, there are four types of politeness strategies used by the main character in the film *Nanny McPhee* when having conversations with children.

The next researcher is Mahmud (2019) with the title of her journal is the use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. In her research, she stated politeness as

one way to maintain effective classroom interaction. Furthermore, the results of this analysis revealed that English students used different kinds of expressions to encode their politeness in the class. The findings of her studies might be used as an input for teachers and students in an effort to create effective classroom interactions.

Rahayu (2009). The title of her research is *Politeness strategies in giving and responding to compliments: A socio-pragmatics study of compliments in 'the devil wears prada'*. The results of this analysis can be seen as follows: First, the compliments delivered by characters come along with combination of non-verbal acts. So that the addressees respond to compliments in various ways. The next is Four types of compliment responses were delivered by the characters. The responses are appreciation token, scale down, question, and disagreement. In this research, the characters respond to the compliment with a combination of verbal and non-verbal acts or only non-verbal acts. Second, all characters employ positive politeness in delivering compliments. Furthermore, in responding compliment, the characters employ different strategies. The strategies are positive politeness, negative politeness, and saying nothing or do not do FTA.

The next research is by Adel, et al., (2016) A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in a class blog that mentioned in regard to the important role of information and communication technology (ICT), it is becoming increasingly important to gain a better understanding in the education system, the features of language

used by learners in the new contexts created by these media. This paper aims to analyze politeness strategies including negative politeness, positive politeness, bald on-record, and bald-off record strategies in posts written by Iranian EFL students on class blogs as an opportunity for asynchronous interaction in response to teachers and their peers. The study participants were 14 Iranian EFL students who were selected based on their level of language proficiency. There are 1,520 politeness remarks in all posts including 800 politeness words used when students interact with their teachers and 720 politeness greetings used when students interact with their peers. The collected data were analyzed using content analysis and Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA). The results showed that students often used positive strategies as a sign of close psychological relationships, reciprocity and friendship in groups.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Base on the discussion from the previous section, the objective of this study is formulated as follows: 1) to find the politeness strategy of social interaction in Buginese Bone by using Brown and Levinson theory and, 2) to obtain from utterances of Buginese native speakers by recording and note-taking. The strategy to achieve those two objectives above are designed through the method as in the objective of the study, after collecting the data, it will be categorized in five types of politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatics

Language is a tool of communication to convey message from the speaker to the hearer. Language and context cannot be separated in conveying message. So, one of studies explained about language and context is Pragmatic. According to Crystal (1987: 120) mentioned that pragmatics studies the factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effects of our choice on others. This definition already emphasized the absolute roles that context and language users (speaker and hearer) play. The former is instrumental in framing language users' choices of linguistic means for optimal communication outcomes, while the later are solely responsible for the awareness of context or speech environment in which they are to perform certain functions via language or to fulfill specific objectives by utilizing available linguistic means within their capability.

According to Mey (1993:42) pragmatics is the study of the conditions of human language uses as these are determined by the context of society. As mentioned by Levinson (1983:9) pragmatic is the study of just those aspect of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing of grammars. So does Leech (1983:6) defines pragmatics as the study of meaning in relation to speech situations. The speech situation enables the speaker use language to achieve a particular effect on the mind of the hearer. Thus, the speech is goal-oriented i.e. the meaning which the speaker or writer intends to communicate.

Politeness

Politeness can be viewed as deviation from maximally efficient communication; as violations (in some sense) of Grice's (1975) conversational maxims. To perform an act other than in the most clear and efficient manner possible is to implicate some degree of politeness on the part of the speaker. To request another to open a window by saying "It's warm in here" is to perform the request politely because one did not use the most efficient means possible for performing this act (i.e., "Open the window"). . .

There is an infinite number of ways in which people can be polite by performing an act in a less than optimal manner, and Brown and Levinson's typology of five super strategies is an attempt to capture some of these essential differences. (Thomas Holtgraves, *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use* Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002)

Furthermore, Politeness theory is the choices in employing a particular strategy depend upon the social situation in which the speech occurs. These social situations are who is the speaker, the hearer, in what situation. So, what is the relationship and what is the topic.

Buginese Culture

According to Mattulada (2015) Buginese language becomes a communication tools for all cultural activities. This language used to spread religion, trading, farming and literature. So, Buginese is one of the ethnic groups in Southeast Asia which is the part of Austronesian family with four million populations located on the southern peninsula of

South Sulawesi island. As mentioned before, Pelras, (1997). also stated that Buginese's main characters are language and culture.

According to Untara, & Rahayu, (2020): Andini, et al., (2021) Buginese language is one of the four major language groups in South Sulawesi. The three of western of Austronesia languages are Makassarese, Mandarese, and Torajanese. Buginese speaker are dominated in South Sulawesi, like Bone, Soppeng, Wajo, Sidrap, Pinrang, Barru, Sinjai, and Pare-Pare. While in the other area like Bulukumba, Pangkep, and Maros they tend to speak both of Buginese and Makassarese.

There are 3 concepts of Buginese culture. They are Sipakatau, Sipakalebbi, and Sipakainge. The first concept is sipakatau. Sipakatau or can be interpreted in Indonesian as "mutual respect". This word also means "to humanize human". Sipakatau is a concept that views every human being as a human being. A human being should treat anyone as a whole human and not treat humans outside of the proper treatment for humans.

This concept views human beings with all their respect for inherent human rights to him without recognizing differences in physical conditions, social status and economic status. The second concept is sipakalebbi. Sipakalebbi is defined as "mutual respect". Sipakalebbi is a concept that views humans as creatures who enjoy being praised and treated accordingly. So that, every human being naturally wants to be respected. Humans deserve to be treated according to their atmosphere, to anyone who be in that condition will be happy and excited. The

attitude of sipakalebbi will make anyone will enjoy life as a beauty.

The third concept is sipakainge. Sipakainge means “to remind each other”. Sipakainge is a concept that views humans as beings who have advantages and deficiency. Humans are creatures who often forget so that every human being is obliged to remind and advise each other towards goodness. respective advantages. Praise each other will create a fun and exciting.

Brown and Levinson (1987: 60) categorized politeness strategy types into:

- a. Bald on record, people can say thing literally or ‘on record’. This involves mutual cooperation between hearer and speaker found in situations such as in welcoming, farewells, and offers where S is afraid the H’s face may be threatened.

In this strategy, FTA is performed “[...] in the most direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way possible” (Brown and Levinson in Bousfield, 2008:57). To do so ‘baldly’ entails phrasing it in direct, honest terms with no attempt to soften the face-threatening trust. The bald on-record does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer’s ‘face. Here, there is no attempt to acknowledge the hearer’s face wants. This type of strategy is commonly found in people who know each other very well, and who are very comfortable in their environments, such as a close friend and family. And in applying this strategy, someone can utilize its five sub strategies. They are showing disagreement (criticism), giving suggestion/ advice, requesting, warning; threatening, and using imperative form.

- b. Positive Politeness strategies emphasis what speaker and hearer have in common and are addressed to hearer’s positive face.

Positive face refers to every individual’s basic desire for their public self-image that wants to be shown engagement, ratification, and appreciation from others the want to be wanted. The FTA is performed utilizing strategies oriented towards the positive face threat to the hearer (Bousfield, 2008: 57). The positive politeness shows that the speaker recognizes the hearer has desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and it expresses group reciprocity. This type of strategy is usually seen in the groups of friends or where the people in the social situation know each other fairly well.

Here, the threat to face is relatively low. It usually tries to minimize the distance between them by expressing friendly statement and solid interest in the hearer’s needs. And according to Brown and Levinson in Bousfield (2008: 57), there are three strategies which are included in Positive politeness: claiming common ground, conveying that S and H are co-operators, and fulfilling H’s want for some X.

- c. Negative Politeness directed towards the negative face of the hearer, to his/her right to be free from imposition.

The negative politeness also recognizes the hearer’s face. However, it also admits that the speaker is in some way imposing on the hearer. This is the most common and linguistically diverse strategy. Negatively polite constructions

contain negative face by demonstrating distance and wariness. Negative face represents the want of every action to get freedom from impingement. Bousfield (2008: 57) states that the FTA in this strategy is performed utilizing strategies oriented towards redressing the negative face threat to the hearer.

Here, the threat to face is relatively high. The negative politeness focuses on minimizing the imposition by attempting to soften it. The sub-strategies of negative politeness include being indirect, not presuming/assuming, not coercing H, communicating S's want to not impinge on H, and redressing other wants of H's (Brown and Levinson in Bousfield, 2008: 57-58).

- d. Off record threat imposition as so great with only raised 'off record', speaker don't talk directly, but make the communication ambiguous, so the imposition can be taken as either an imposition or ignored. The decision is up to the hearer.

Off-record (indirect) takes some of the pressure off of the speaker. Its utterances are indirect uses of language which precise meaning has to be interpreted. The FTA performs off record, typically through the deployment of an indirect illocutionary act which has more than one interpretation and, thus, allows for plausible deniability on the part of the speaker if the intended recipient takes offence at the face threat inherent in the utterance (Bousfield, 2008: 58).

Thus, if the speaker wants to do an FTA, in contrary, he/she wants to avoid the responsibility in doing it. He/she can do off-record and leave it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret

it. The hearer cannot know with certainty that a hint has been broached; the speaker can credibly claim an alternative interpretation. Here, the threat to face is very high.

- e. No FTA judged to be too threatening to the intended recipient, is, therefore, in the interests of social harmony, not performed (Bousfield, 2008:59). Here, the speakers entirely avoid performing the FTA, perfectly avoiding threat to another's face. Speakers choose this strategy when they estimate the threat to another's face is extremely high.

For example, there is someone who wants to borrow a lawnmower from his neighbor. If he does not know his neighbor, he might decide to choose the negative pole of rational decision (not to do the FTA at all), which would logically result in never borrowing the lawnmower at all. Of course, if he is desperate, he could secretly 'borrow' the lawnmower without asking and without the addressee knowing, but if this ever becomes known, it would constitute a very serious face-threatening act (Watts, 2003: 93).

METHOD

The method applied in this study is descriptive and qualitative in manner. Since the researcher described all the data finding both in the form of words, phrases, or sentences and numeric information, qualitative method was applied in the present research. It is based on the statement of Creswell, J (2013) that qualitative method is an approach in which the researcher tends to base knowledge claims on pragmatic and sociolinguistic

grounds. Thus, this research describes and categorize the face of British in their social interaction.

Procedure

Buginese language data was taken from recording and note taking. Firstly, the writer attended in certain social situations and recorded the conversations. The writer did the recording without asking the participants' agreement in order to have the natural data especially from participants in the public places. The writer utilized the mobile phone which was held by hand. Secondly, Note-taking is a process of making written document when the writer participated in interaction. It contains every essential datum occur during the interactions with look about the cultural background when the interlocutors said the word. The note showed the context of utterances produced by interlocutors.

Participants

The writer took the spoken data from both English and Buginese. The way to determine participants is to ask for their willingness and willingness to respond to the researcher during this research, this strategy is needed to ensure that the respondent will provide data according to the needs of the researcher so that this research can run well. This principle of participant selection is very commonly used in research models like this. Specifically, in this study, the terms and categories of participants were determined according to the theory proposed using Brown and Levinson's Theory.

Data Analysis

In this study, the writer used the politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson. In the beginning,

the writer transcribed the utterances from the conversations of Buginese Bone. Then, the writer analyzed and determined the type of politeness strategies used by Buginese Bone which are Bald on record, Positive Politeness, Off-record, Negative Politeness, and Do not do FTA.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Politeness Strategies is used by Buginese Bone

The Interaction between Stranger

Datum 1

This is the interaction between stranger who looking for the address of her family and ask to the local inhabitant. A is the stranger and B is local inhabitant.

Table 1. Stranger and Local Inhibitant

A:	<i>Assalamu Alaikum.</i> (Assalamu Alaikum)
B:	<i>Waalaiikum Salam.</i> (Waalaiikum Salam)
A:	<i>Tabe, loka makkutana, tega monro bolana imang e?</i> (Excuse me, i want to ask, where is the imam's house?)
B:	<i>Oh iye, annye yolo bola e warna ridi e.</i> (Oh yah, that is in front of this house, the yellow colour)
A:	<i>Oh iye, terimah kasih banyak. Ki' mai.</i> (Oh oke, thank you very much, good bye)
B:	<i>Iye.</i> (Oke)

The datum 1 above shows that the two participants are using negative politeness with using honorifics *-tabe*, *-iye* (*-iyo* is impolite), *-ki'* (*-ko* is impolite) in the word *ki' mai* as the polite form to say good bye in English. It tends to show deference.

The Interaction between Local Inhabitant Datum 2

This is the interaction between neighbor. A and B are neighborhood.

Table 2. Local Inhabitant and Local Inhabitant

A:	<i>Engkatumbe utti ku bolae, ne' dewisseng makkeda cocok mua ga di barongko.</i>
	(There are bananas in my home, but I don't know if is it good for make Barongko or not)
B:	<i>Baa cinapi ulokka malai.</i>
	(I see, I will go later)
A:	<i>Iya, engkami tu ku laleng kulkas e.</i>
	(Yah, those are in the refrigerator)

The datum 2 above shows the conversation of two close neighbors. The first utterance of speaker A is a kind of indirect language. She utters it without mention of an act to be requested, it only hinted and left for hearer or speaker B to infer it. Then, the speaker B is directly understood. It is the kind of off-record.

The Interaction between Friends Datum 2

This is the interaction between close friends.

Table 3. Friends and Friends

A:	<i>Assalamu Alaikum.</i>
	(Assalamu Alaikum)
B:	<i>Waalaiikum Salam.</i>
	(Waalaiikum Salam)
A:	<i>Ih manengka engka tau Lamedde' lokka kue.</i>
	(Ih, why there is Lamedde one here?)
B:	<i>Wih ajja lalo kasi' muakkeda akkutu, manengka napakkomanengkaru tawe, Marni denre makkeda to.</i>
	(Wih do not say like that, why all people say like that to me? Marni also said like that too).
A:	<i>Memeng.</i>
	(Certainly)

Datum 3 above shows positive politeness, when the speaker A mentions the name of speaker B directly. The use of *-mu* and *-ko* by both of them is also the kinds of direct form to say you in English (*-ta* is the polite form).

The Interaction between Family Members Datum 4

This is the interaction between brother and sister. A is sister and B is brother.

Table 4. Family Members vs Family members

A:	<i>Engka tu mbe kudung ku kutu.</i> (There is my veil next to you anyway)
B:	<i>Ku tega?</i> (Where is it?)
A:	<i>Atu ceddena angkalungung kaderae.</i> (It is that next to the sofa's pillow)
B:	<i>Oh... e...</i> (Oh, here you are)

The datum 4 above shows the conversation between sister and brother. The sister starts the conversation using indirect language when she asks for her veil to her brother. Her need is only hinted not mentioned and let the brother to infer the need. Whereas, she actually wants to say that “give me my veil that next to you” but she says it with very soft and indirect to avoid imposition. Thus, the conversation above is contained off-record.

The Interaction between Family Members as Inferior and Superior

Datum 5

This is the interaction between father and daughter. A is father and B is daughter.

Table 5. Family Members as Inferior and Superior

A:	<i>Ani</i> (Ani)
B:	<i>Iye, aga pak?</i> (Yes, dad?)

A:	<i>Alakka jolo kacamataku nak.</i> (Give me my glasses dear)
B:	<i>Ku tega monro pak?</i> (Where is it dad?)
A:	<i>Ku ceddena bobbo'ku nak.</i> (Near from my books dear)
B:	<i>Tabe pak.</i> (Here you are dad)

The datum 5 above represents the same politeness strategies used by the participants that is negative politeness. The polite form of it such as *iye* (*iyo* is impolite), *tabe* or *sorry* or *excuse* me in English, *nak* and *pak*.

The interaction between superiors and subordinates

Datum 6

This is the interaction between head of Public Health Centre and nurse. A is head and B is nurse.

Table 6. Head of Public Health Centre and Nurse

A	: <i>Asma purani di ketik data e?</i> (Asma have you type the datas?)
B	: <i>Iye purani bu'.</i> (Yes, it has done sir)

The datum 6 above is the conversation of both nursing partners, superior and subordinate. The speaker A as the superior starts to open the conversation using direct language with mention the name of speaker B. But, speaker B as the subordinate use indirect language which tend to more be polite with using honorific *iye* as the polite form (*iyo* is

impolite). Besides that, speaker B also mention –Bu’ to show deference and respect. Thus, the superior is dominant to use positive face while the subordinates still using negative face.

CONCLUSION

This study has clearly confirmed that Buginese Bone is tend to use negative face and off-record in several situations when they interact each other while positive politeness is not dominant in the conversation. According to Rani et al., (2020), they stated that the tactic of positive politeness demonstrates that the listener wishes to be appreciated. In line with Saleh et al., (2021), they noted that It has been determined that the majority of Buginese people employ indirect apologies when gently apologizing. It is because Buginese Bone more hierarchy in their life. They respect other people by using indirect speech or indirect language. In other words, Buginese Bone people are more deference based on their culture. The other factors affect the politeness strategies that occur in the research is age, behavior and personality of the speaker. The implication of this study is to encourage the reader how important to apply the politeness in interacting to the people. The more the speaker speaks polite, the more she/he shows what the speaker she/he is.

REFERENCES

- Adel, S. M. R., Davoudi, M., & Ramezanzadeh, A. (2016). A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in a class blog. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(1), 47-62.
- Andini, C. The Use of Honorifics in English and Buginese with special Reference to Bone Language: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*. 6(7), 837-377.
- Aswad, M., Rahman, F., Said, I. M., Hamuddin, B., & Nurchalis, N. F. (2019). A software to increase English learning outcomes: An acceleration model of English as the second language. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 26(6.2), 157.
- Ayuningrum, A., Pulungan, R., & Syafrizal, S. (2018). AN ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES APPLIED BY THE MEMBERS OF UKM DEBAT, THE UNIVERSITY OF BENGKULU. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 2(4), 1-8.
- Bachriani, B., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2018). A Comparative Study of Euphemism in English and Buginese: Pragmatic Stylistics Contexts. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 1(4), 429-440.
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction* (Vol. 167). John Benjamins Pub.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013b). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University: Cambridge.
- Fatimah, R. (2021). “Ideology and Politeness Strategies used by American People and Buginese with Special Reference to Bone”. *Published Tesis: Universitas Hasanuddin*.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics, Speech Acts*, (3),41 58. New York: Academic Pres.
- Holtgraves, T. M. (2013). *Language as social action: Social psychology and language use*. Psychology Press.
- Idris, A. M. S., Adliah, A., & Alfina, S. (2020). Multilingual Interaction in Classroom Context. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 6(2), 381.

- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 597-606.
- Mattulada, H.A. 2015. *Latoa. Antropologi Politik Orang Bugis*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ombak.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pelras, C. (1997). *The Bugis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Rahayu, I. R. (2010). Politeness strategies in giving and responding to compliments: a socio-pragmatics study of compliments in “the devil wears prada”.
- Rani, A. H., Manda, M. L., Yassi, A. H., & Machmoed, H. (2020). Typical Features of Politeness Strategy Performed by Anregurutta (Religious Leader in Pappandangan Maros District of South Sulawesi). *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 3(4), 590-606.
- Sahib, H., Hanafiah, W., Aswad, M., Yassi, A. H., & Mashhadi, F. (2021). Syntactic Configuration of Code-Switching between Indonesian and English: Another Perspective on Code-Switching Phenomena. *Education Research International*, 2021.
- Saleh, N. J., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2021). Strategy of Apology in Buginese: A Sociolinguistic Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 4(2), 188-196.
- Saleh, F., Rahman, F., & Hasyim, M. (2021). Metaphor in the Bugis Language Expression of the Sidenreng Dialect in South Sulawesi. *International Journal of Arts and Social Science*, 4(1), 312-318.
- Stanlaw, J., Adachi, N., & Salzman, Z. (2018). *Language, culture, and society: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Routledge.
- Tahir, D., Rahman, F., & Rahman, A. (2018). The Study of Buginese Reciprocal Verb in the Boegineesche Chrestomathies Manuscript. *Am. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Res*, 2(08), 48-54.
- Untara, I. M. G. S., & Rahayu, N. W. S. (2020). Bissu: Ancient Bugis Priest (Perspective On The Influence Of Hindu Civilization In Bugis Land). *Vidyottama Sanatana: International Journal of Hindu Science and Religious Studies*, 4(2), 243-249.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness: Key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Yetty, Y. (2018). Politeness Strategy on Social Interaction Used by Munanese. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 1(1), 59-65.
- Yassi, A. H. (2018). Mapping the Politeness Systems of Heritage Language Culture of South Sulawesi, Indonesia: Ages and Politeness Strategies. In *The 2nd International Conference on Culture, Art, Language, and Literature in Digital Humanities: Academic and Creative Challenges* (pp. 1-16).
- Yulianti, S., Arafah, B., Rofikah, U., Idris, A. M. S., Samsur, N., & Arafah, A. N. B. (2022). Conversational Implicatures on Saturday Night Live Talk Show. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 189-197.