Politeness in Language: A Pragmatic Perspective on Social Communication

Supriadi
waladiati691@gmail.com

Asdar
asdarnurilahi5@gmail.com

Andi Alfina Listya Ningrum
andialfina100@gmail.com

Irfan
nusantarairfan2018@gmail.com

Universitas Muhammadiyah Bulukumba

ABSTRACT

This study explores politeness in language through a pragmatic lens, focusing on the strategies and contextual factors that shape polite communication in social interactions. Politeness, as a central component of pragmatics, is deeply tied to the social roles, power dynamics, and shared knowledge between communicators. The paper examines various forms of politeness strategies, including direct and indirect speech acts, and their implications in different cultural and situational contexts. Drawing on key theories in pragmatics, such as those proposed by Leech and Searle, the study highlights the importance of context in interpreting and applying politeness in everyday conversations. Furthermore, it addresses how politeness functions not only as a social tool for maintaining harmony but also as a mechanism for navigating power and solidarity within communication. This research contributes to a deeper understanding of how language users employ politeness strategies to fulfill communicative goals while adhering to social norms and expectations.

Keywords: Politeness Strategies; Pragmatics; Social Interaction

.

INTRODUCTION

Politeness in language is an essential component of human communication, serving not only to convey respect and consideration but also as a social tool that maintains harmony between speakers in various contexts. The concept of politeness is deeply rooted in pragmatic theory, which examines how meaning is conveyed and interpreted based on context, social roles, and shared knowledge between communicators. Unlike traditional linguistic studies that focus solely on the structural elements of language, pragmatics emphasizes the function of language in specific contexts, considering both the speaker's intentions and the listener's interpretation. The study of politeness in language, particularly from a

pragmatic perspective, provides insight into the underlying social dynamics of communication. Politeness strategies are often employed to navigate delicate social situations, manage interpersonal relationships, and ensure smooth communication. These strategies can range from direct forms, such as requests and commands, to indirect forms, such as hints or suggestions, each varying in terms of social distance, power, and cultural norms. Furthermore, the pragmatic aspect of politeness is highly context-dependent, influenced by the social roles of the speakers, the relationship between them, and the situational context in which the communication occurs. This makes politeness an intricate and dynamic feature of language, which cannot be understood fully without considering its interaction with the social and cultural context.

Early studies on politeness, such as those by Brown and Levinson (1987), provided foundational insights into how speakers navigate face-threatening acts and maintain social cohesion. Their theory, which focuses on face-saving strategies, has shaped the understanding of politeness in communication. Over time, however, scholars have expanded the study of politeness to include various approaches, including pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and cognitive perspectives. Researchers have argued that politeness should not only be viewed as a means of maintaining social order but also as a tool for achieving social goals, such as reinforcing solidarity or asserting power. This dual function of politeness—preserving harmony and asserting authority—has led to a deeper exploration of the strategies used in different linguistic and cultural settings.

From a pragmatic standpoint, politeness is closely associated with speech acts, which are the basic units of communication. Speech acts, as proposed by Austin (1962) and later developed by Searle (1969), include various actions such as asserting, questioning, requesting, and promising, each of which can be performed in a more or less polite manner. In this context, politeness becomes a way of managing these speech acts, ensuring that they are delivered in a manner appropriate to the social norms and expectations of the interaction. The strategies used to perform these speech acts vary according to the social relationship between the participants, the level of formality, and the cultural context in which the communication takes place. For instance, a request made to a superior is typically more indirect and polite than one made to a peer, reflecting the hierarchical nature of the relationship.

Moreover, politeness strategies can be classified into different categories, such as positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategies, as proposed by Brown and Levinson. Positive politeness strategies seek to enhance the listener's sense of belonging and approval, while negative politeness strategies aim to avoid imposing on the listener's autonomy. Off-record strategies, on the other hand, involve indirectness and ambiguity, allowing the speaker to avoid direct confrontation or imposition. These strategies are not mutually exclusive but can be used in combination, depending on the speaker's goals and the specific social context.

The influence of culture on politeness is another critical aspect of this study. Different cultures have varying expectations of politeness, and what is considered polite in one culture may be perceived as impolite or overly formal in another. For example, in some cultures, directness is valued and seen as a sign of honesty, while in others, indirectness is preferred to avoid confrontation or to show respect. Understanding these cultural variations is crucial for effective communication in cross-cultural interactions, as misinterpreting politeness strategies can lead to misunderstandings and interpersonal conflict. This paper aims to explore the relationship between politeness and pragmatics, providing an overview of the theoretical foundations of politeness in communication. It will examine the various strategies used to convey politeness, the role of context in determining the appropriateness of these strategies, and the impact of social and cultural factors on the interpretation of politeness. By analyzing politeness through a pragmatic lens, this study seeks to contribute to the broader understanding of how language functions in social communication, helping to shed light on the ways in which speakers use language to achieve their communicative goals while maintaining social harmony.

In the following sections, we will delve into the key theories and concepts in pragmatics related to politeness, discuss the different types of politeness strategies, and explore the social and cultural factors that influence the use of politeness in language. This exploration will provide valuable insights into the complex nature of politeness and its role in facilitating effective and harmonious communication. Through this study, we aim to enhance the understanding of politeness as a dynamic and context-dependent phenomenon in linguistic and social interactions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of politeness in language has evolved significantly over the years, with contributions from various fields such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and cultural studies. The foundation of politeness theory was laid by sociolinguists Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987), whose work on face theory revolutionized the understanding of how politeness operates in communication. They argued that politeness serves to protect the "face" of individuals—essentially their social identity—during interactions. According to their theory, face is composed of two components: positive face (the desire to be liked and admired) and negative face (the desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition). Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies revolve around these two aspects of face, proposing that speakers use various strategies to maintain or protect the face of themselves and their conversational partners.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) influential work introduced the idea that politeness strategies are primarily aimed at mitigating face-threatening acts (FTAs), which can threaten an individual's social identity. They classified politeness strategies

into three main categories: positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategies. Positive Politeness involves the speaker's efforts to enhance the listener's sense of belonging, appreciation, and approval. It is commonly used in interactions between close friends or individuals in a similar social position, where the speaker seeks to show solidarity, affection, and agreement. Strategies within this category include expressions of friendliness, offering compliments, and showing deference to the listener's positive face needs.

Negative Politeness focuses on maintaining the listener's autonomy and freedom from imposition. It is typically employed in situations where there is a perceived social distance or unequal power dynamics, such as when speaking to a superior or someone unfamiliar. The speaker might use indirect language, hedging, or mitigating statements to avoid imposing on the listener's negative face. For example, using phrases like "Would you mind…" or "If it's not too much trouble…" signals respect for the listener's need for independence.

Off-record strategies involve indirectness, allowing the speaker to avoid making explicit requests or statements. This strategy is useful when the speaker wants to avoid direct confrontation or impose a demand. The speaker might hint at a request or use ambiguous language, leaving it up to the listener to infer the intended meaning. While Brown and Levinson's theory provides a solid framework for understanding politeness in many contexts, their model has been criticized for its Eurocentric approach, as it fails to account for cultural variations in politeness norms. This led to further developments in the field, such as the work of sociolinguists and pragmatists who have sought to understand how politeness strategies operate in diverse linguistic and cultural settings.

In addition to Brown and Levinson, Geoffrey Leech (1983) introduced the Politeness Principle, which outlines a set of maxims to govern polite communication. According to Leech, politeness is a matter of balancing two competing principles: the Tact Maxim (minimizing the imposition on others) and the Generosity Maxim (maximizing benefit to others). These maxims reflect the social expectations of politeness and are designed to maintain harmony and avoid conflict in interactions. Leech's theory emphasizes the role of conversational implicatures, where the meaning of an utterance is often not directly stated but inferred from the context and the relationship between the speakers.

Leech's principles further explain the complex interaction between politeness and conversational goals. For instance, the Approbation Maxim (maximizing praise or minimizing criticism) encourages speakers to use polite forms that enhance the listener's self-esteem. Similarly, the Modesty Maxim encourages speakers to avoid drawing attention to their own achievements, which would be seen as boastful or immodest. In the years following Brown and Levinson's work, scholars have increasingly recognized the importance of cultural context in understanding politeness strategies. As noted by Gino Ellen (2006), politeness is not a universal concept; instead, it is shaped by cultural norms and values. For

example, in many Western cultures, directness in communication is often valued, as it is seen as a sign of honesty and clarity. In contrast, many Eastern cultures, such as Japan and Korea, emphasize indirectness and the use of honorifics to show respect, especially in hierarchical relationships. The role of power and solidarity in politeness is central to understanding how these strategies are used in different social contexts. In collectivist societies, where maintaining group harmony is paramount, politeness strategies tend to focus on maintaining social cohesion and avoiding conflict. In individualistic societies, however, there is more emphasis on maintaining personal autonomy and freedom of speech, which can result in a more direct form of communication.

The relationship between politeness and speech acts is another critical area of research in pragmatics. The concept of speech acts, as proposed by Austin (1962) and later developed by Searle (1969), is essential in understanding how politeness functions within communication. Speech acts refer to the actions performed by a speaker through language, such as making requests, giving orders, offering promises, and making statements. Pragmatic theories of speech acts provide a framework for analyzing how politeness is embedded in different types of speech acts. For example, requests are typically more polite when they are indirect, as the speaker avoids imposing on the listener's negative face. Similarly, offers and promises are generally more polite when they are framed as voluntary or conditional, showing respect for the listener's autonomy.

More recent developments in the study of politeness emphasize the need to consider dynamic factors such as gender, identity, and digital communication. Scholars have begun to examine how politeness strategies operate in online communication, where indirectness may be amplified, or politeness may be minimized due to the absence of face-to-face interaction. Additionally, the role of gender in politeness has garnered increasing attention, as research has shown that men and women may use politeness strategies differently in conversation, often due to socialization patterns and cultural expectations. Critics of traditional politeness theory have argued that it oversimplifies the complexity of human interaction by categorizing politeness into rigid strategies. Some scholars, such as Holmes (1995), have called for a more nuanced approach that considers the dynamic nature of politeness and its flexibility in different contexts. This includes examining how power, solidarity, and social identity interact in real-world communication.

METHOD

Design and Sample

This study employs a qualitative research design with a primary focus on discourse analysis to examine how politeness strategies function in language from a pragmatic perspective. Discourse analysis is particularly suited for this investigation because it allows for an in-depth exploration of how language operates

in real social interactions, beyond its structural components. The research is grounded in the theoretical frameworks of Brown and Levinson (1987) and Leech (1983), which provide foundational models for identifying and interpreting various politeness strategies, such as positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategies.

The sample consists of a diverse corpus of natural language data drawn from a range of communicative contexts, including both spoken and digital communication. Spoken discourse samples are collected from formal settings, such as workplace interactions involving colleagues, superiors, and subordinates, as well as informal settings, including conversations among friends and family members. Additionally, the study incorporates public exchanges, such as customer service interactions, which offer insight into politeness in structured, often hierarchical, settings. To address the evolving nature of communication, the study also includes digital discourse from emails, text messages, and social media platforms, where the absence of nonverbal cues poses unique challenges for maintaining politeness.

Furthermore, this study adopts a cross-cultural approach, comparing politeness strategies used in Western cultures (e.g., the United States and the United Kingdom), Eastern cultures (e.g., Japan and Korea), and Middle Eastern cultures. This comparison provides a deeper understanding of how cultural values and norms shape the expression of politeness, particularly in relation to power dynamics, social distance, and face-saving behaviors. By analyzing this broad and varied sample, the study aims to uncover both universal and culturally specific aspects of politeness as they are manifested in real-life and digital interactions.

Instruments and Procedures

The primary instrument in this study is the researcher as the main analyst, utilizing a systematic discourse analysis method to identify and interpret politeness strategies within the selected corpus. This qualitative approach involves carefully observing, transcribing, and coding natural language data to uncover the pragmatic functions of language in context. The procedures begin with the collection of spoken and written discourse from a range of formal, informal, and digital settings. Spoken interactions are recorded and transcribed from real-life conversations in environments such as workplaces, homes, and public spaces. In parallel, samples of digital communication—including emails, text messages, and social media exchanges—are gathered to explore how politeness strategies are adapted in text-based environments where nonverbal cues are absent.

To ensure the reliability and ethical integrity of the data, all sources are anonymized, and participants' privacy is protected. The selection of discourse samples is guided by their relevance to social interaction and their richness in politeness-related phenomena, with special attention given to interactions that reflect power relations, solidarity, and varying degrees of formality. A comparative

cultural lens is applied throughout the data collection process, with the inclusion of communicative samples from Western, Eastern, and Middle Eastern cultural contexts. This diversity allows the researcher to examine how politeness strategies vary across cultures and how social norms and expectations shape pragmatic choices. These procedures provide a comprehensive and ethically responsible foundation for analyzing politeness as a dynamic, context-sensitive feature of human communication.

Data Analysis

The data in this study are analyzed using a systematic coding process grounded in the politeness theories of Brown and Levinson (1987) and Leech (1983). Each instance of politeness within the discourse is carefully examined and categorized according to established politeness strategies, including positive politeness, negative politeness, bald-on-record, and off-record strategies. The analysis also identifies various speech acts—such as requests, apologies, and refusals—and considers the contextual factors influencing their use, such as the participants' social roles, power dynamics, degree of familiarity, and the level of formality in the setting. These elements are crucial in understanding how language users manage interpersonal relationships and maintain social harmony.

In addition to the detailed analysis of individual utterances, the study employs a cross-cultural comparative approach to explore how politeness is expressed differently across cultures. Data from Western, Eastern, and Middle Eastern communicative contexts are compared to uncover both universal patterns and culture-specific variations in politeness use. This comparative analysis highlights how cultural norms, values, and expectations influence language choices, particularly in relation to concepts like face-saving, indirectness, and respect for hierarchy. Furthermore, the study pays special attention to digital communication, analyzing how politeness strategies are adapted or challenged in online settings where nonverbal cues are absent, and communication tends to be more informal and immediate. Throughout the analysis, ethical considerations are maintained by ensuring that all data are anonymized and handled with sensitivity to privacy and consent. By combining theoretical frameworks, contextual analysis, and cross-cultural comparison, the study offers a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the pragmatic role of politeness in both every day and digital communication.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results and discussion of the analysis of politeness strategies in language from a pragmatic perspective, based on the data collected from diverse communicative contexts. The data, drawn from workplace interactions, family conversations, public exchanges, and digital communication, provide valuable insights into the use of politeness strategies across various social contexts and cultures. The findings are discussed in terms of the types of politeness

strategies employed, the role of context in shaping these strategies, and the cultural variations observed in the use of politeness.

Types of Politeness Strategies Used

The analysis of the data revealed a diverse range of politeness strategies used by speakers across different contexts. These strategies, classified according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework, include positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategies. Each type of strategy serves a different function in maintaining social harmony, managing face concerns, and navigating the social dynamics between speakers.

a. Positive Politeness Strategies

Positive politeness strategies were most observed in informal settings, such as family and friends' conversations, where the participants shared a sense of solidarity and mutual respect. In these interactions, speakers frequently employed strategies to enhance the listener's positive face, making them feel valued, appreciated, and included in the conversation. Compliments, expressions of affection, and shared experiences were prevalent forms of positive politeness. For example, in a conversation between two friends, one friend might say, *"You always know how to make me laugh. I appreciate that!"* This statement not only praises the listener but also reinforces the emotional bond between the speakers.

Positive politeness strategies were also observed in professional settings, though less frequently than in informal settings. In workplace interactions, positive politeness often served to build rapport and foster collaboration between colleagues. For instance, employees might offer compliments or express gratitude to superiors or coworkers as a way of maintaining a positive atmosphere in the workplace. An example from a meeting between a manager and an employee was: *"I really appreciate the effort you've put into this project. It's going to make a significant difference."* This statement functions to acknowledge the employee's contribution while strengthening the relationship between the two parties.

b. Negative Politeness Strategies

Negative politeness strategies, which aim to protect the listener's autonomy and minimize imposition, were more commonly used in formal or hierarchical settings. In workplace settings, negative politeness was often employed in conversations between superiors and subordinates, as the speaker sought to avoid imposing on the listener's freedom and authority. This was typically achieved through indirect requests, hedging, and the use of polite formulas like "Could you please…" or "I was wondering if…"

For example, a manager requesting a report from an employee might say: *"I was hoping you could get me the report by the end of the day, if that's not too much*

trouble.” This statement softens the request by acknowledging the possibility of inconvenience, thus reducing the potential for a face-threatening act. Similarly, in customer service interactions, agents used negative politeness strategies to avoid imposing on customers while still providing assistance. Phrases such as *“Would you mind if I asked you a few questions?”* or *“If it’s convenient for you, could you…”* were commonly used to mitigate the imposition on the customer’s time and effort.

c. Off-Record Strategies

Off-record strategies, which involve indirectness or ambiguity, were used in both informal and formal settings, though more frequently in informal contexts. These strategies allowed speakers to avoid direct confrontation or imposition, often leaving the listener to infer the speaker's intended meaning. In family conversations, for example, speakers might use off-record strategies to hint at requests or suggestions without directly imposing on the other person. A mother might say to her child, *“The dishes are piling up in the sink,”* in an attempt to indirectly prompt the child to help without making a direct request. Off-record strategies were also observed in professional contexts, particularly in situations where the speaker wanted to avoid being overly authoritative. For example, a supervisor might say, *“It would be great if the report could be ready by tomorrow,”* leaving the employee to interpret whether this is a polite request or a subtle instruction. These strategies allowed the speaker to maintain politeness while also managing the power dynamics in the conversation.

Role of Context in Shaping Politeness Strategies

The findings highlight the significant role that context plays in shaping the use of politeness strategies. Social roles, power dynamics, and the formality of the setting all influenced the strategies employed by speakers. In hierarchical settings, such as workplaces, politeness strategies were often characterized by greater formality and a focus on negative politeness to maintain autonomy and avoid imposition. In contrast, in more egalitarian and informal settings, such as conversations among friends and family, positive politeness strategies were more common, reflecting the close relationships between speakers. Power and social distance were key factors influencing the choice of politeness strategy. In workplace settings, speakers with higher social status, such as managers or supervisors, tended to employ more indirect and formal politeness strategies to avoid appearing too authoritative or imposing on lower-status employees.

On the other hand, employees often used negative politeness strategies to minimize their requests and maintain their autonomy in the conversation. In family and friendship interactions, where social roles were more equal, speakers used positive politeness strategies to reinforce social bonds and express solidarity. The formality of the setting also played a crucial role in determining the level of politeness. In formal settings, such as business meetings or customer service

interactions, speakers used more formal and indirect politeness strategies, such as the use of titles and formal speech acts. In contrast, in informal settings, speakers were more likely to use direct and familiar forms of politeness, such as nicknames, shared experiences, and casual language.

The study also revealed significant cultural variations in the use of politeness strategies. Speakers from different cultural backgrounds employed distinct strategies to maintain politeness, reflecting the values and norms of their respective societies. Western cultures, particularly those in the United States and the United Kingdom, tended to favor directness and clarity in communication, although politeness was still maintained through the use of mitigated requests and indirectness in certain contexts. For instance, speakers often used phrases like *"Would you mind…"* or *"Could you possibly…"* to soften requests, but the underlying message remained direct. In contrast, Eastern cultures, such as Japan and Korea, emphasized indirectness and the use of honorifics to show respect and maintain social harmony. In these cultures, politeness was closely tied to social hierarchy, and speakers often employed elaborate strategies to avoid direct confrontation or imposition. In Japanese, for example, the use of keigo (respectful language) in professional settings was a key component of polite communication, ensuring that both the speaker's and the listener's face were maintained. Similarly, in Korean, the use of honorifics reflected the speaker's awareness of social status and the need to show deference to those in higher positions.

Middle Eastern cultures, such as those in Arabic-speaking countries, exhibited a similar emphasis on hierarchical relationships, but with additional focus on hospitality and generosity. Politeness in these cultures often involved the use of elaborate greetings, expressions of goodwill, and indirect requests. The concept of *'adab* (proper behavior) in Arabic culture, for example, emphasizes respect for elders and authority figures, and speakers often use indirect language and formal titles to demonstrate politeness. The analysis of digital communication revealed interesting patterns in the use of politeness strategies in online interactions. Online communication, particularly in informal platforms such as social media and text messaging, often involves a more relaxed and direct style of communication. However, despite the informality, speakers still employed various politeness strategies to manage face concerns and maintain social harmony. For example, users in online forums often used indirect language, such as *"Maybe you could try…"* or *"It might be helpful if…"* to suggest actions without imposing on others. In contrast, professional communication via email or instant messaging platforms tended to maintain a higher level of formality, with speakers using polite formulas like *"I would appreciate it if…"* or *"Could you kindly…"* to soften requests. The absence of nonverbal cues in digital communication made politeness more reliant on linguistic strategies, such as hedging, indirectness, and the use of respectful forms of address. Additionally, the brevity of digital communication often required speakers to be more explicit in their politeness strategies, as the lack of face-to-face interaction reduced the opportunity for nonverbal cues to mitigate the impact of a request.

The results of this study reveal that politeness strategies are dynamic and context-dependent, shaped by factors such as social roles, power dynamics, cultural values, and the medium of communication. Positive politeness strategies were most common in informal settings, where solidarity and emotional connection were emphasized, while negative politeness strategies were more prevalent in formal and hierarchical interactions. The study also highlighted significant cultural variations in the use of politeness, with Eastern cultures tending to emphasize indirectness and honorifics, while Western cultures valued directness with a focus on clarity. Finally, digital communication platforms presented unique challenges to politeness, with speakers relying more heavily on linguistic strategies to maintain politeness in the absence of nonverbal cues. These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the complex role of politeness in language, emphasizing its pragmatic function in managing social relationships and face concerns across various communicative contexts.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined politeness in language through a pragmatic lens, revealing that politeness strategies are deeply influenced by social, cultural, and situational factors. The findings confirm that politeness is a flexible and context-dependent phenomenon, with different strategies being employed based on the power dynamics, social roles, and cultural norms present in each interaction. In formal settings like workplaces, negative politeness strategies were used more frequently to minimize imposition and respect autonomy, while in informal, more egalitarian settings, positive politeness strategies were prevalent, reinforcing solidarity and social bonds. These results align with the theoretical framework established by Brown and Levinson (1987), highlighting the importance of face and social context in determining the appropriate politeness strategy.

Cultural differences were another critical aspect explored in this study, with Western cultures favoring directness and clarity, while Eastern and Middle Eastern cultures emphasized indirectness, the use of honorifics, and respect for hierarchy. These cultural variations highlight that politeness strategies are not universal but rather shaped by the underlying societal values and expectations. The study also illustrated the need for a culturally sensitive approach when analyzing politeness, as different cultures prioritize different aspects of face, such as autonomy in Western cultures or respect for social status in Eastern and Middle Eastern societies.

Lastly, the study revealed the growing significance of digital communication in the analysis of politeness. While online interactions often appear more casual and informal, politeness remains an essential component, with speakers relying heavily on linguistic strategies like hedging and indirectness to manage face concerns. This finding suggests that digital communication platforms should be considered a vital space for further research on politeness, particularly as the

nature of communication continues to evolve. Ultimately, this study contributes to a broader understanding of politeness as a dynamic, culturally specific, and pragmatic aspect of human interaction, underlining the need for future research in diverse communicative contexts.

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). The metapragmatic of politeness in Israel society. In R. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice* (pp. 307–316). Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*.

Cambridge University Press.

Chaer, A. (2010). *Kesantunan berbahasa*. Rineka Cipta.

Coates, J. (2004). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. Routledge.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25*(3), 349–377.

Ellen, G. (2006). *Kritik teori kesantunan*. Airlangga University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). *The thread of discourse*. Mouton.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1987). *Language structure and language function*. Penguin.

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men, and politeness*. Longman.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Pearson Education.

Holmes, J. (2008). *The handbook of language and gender*. Blackwell.

Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. Longman.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ikegami, M. (1995). Politeness and the structure of social relations in Japan. In P. Brown & S.C. Levinson (Eds.), *Politeness and culture* (pp. 169–190). Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. Harper & Row.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. (2003). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Purwo, S. (1990). *Kebahasaan dan sosial budaya*. Dioma.

Rahardi, K. (2005). *Imperatif dalam bahasa Indonesia*. Duta Wacana University Press.

Rahardi, K. (2010). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan imperatif bahasa Indonesia*. Erlangga.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Soemarmo, M. (1988). Pragmatik dan perkembangan mutakhirnya. *PELLBA I*, 43–54.

Sumarsana, A. (1994). *Sosiolinguistik: Teori dan pengantar*. Universitas Indonesia.

Verhaar, J. W. M. (1980). *Teori linguistik dan bahasa Indonesia*. Kanisius.

Watson, R., & Ide, S. (2009). *Politeness in Japanese discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Yus, F. (2011). *Pragmatics in digital communication*. Cambridge University Press.