

Request and Politeness Strategy by Native Dayanese at OKU South Sumatra Indonesia

Yeasy Agustina Sari¹, Suhono^{2*}, Ferdian Utama¹, Umi Yawisah²

¹English Language Department, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Metro Lampung, Indonesia

²English Language Department, Institut Agama Islam Ma'arif NU (IAIM NU) Metro Lampung, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Suhono, E-mail: suhono120708@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: October 14, 2018

Accepted: December 19, 2018

Published: January 31, 2019

Volume: 8 Issue: 1

Advance access: December 2018

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

This study aims to find out the type of request strategy and type of politeness strategy in request made by Native Dayanese at OKU South Sumatra. This study was a purely qualitative study. Twenty Native Dayanese have participated in this research. To get the data, the researchers used *Discourse Completion Test (DCT)*. In analyzing data the researchers used Trosborg Theory and Brown Levinson. The result showed that category ability/willingness was mostly used by Native Dayanese to ask request, for instance *Majuat*, *Hijuat*, *Pandaiat*. The word *Majuat* used for ask to the interlocuter who has high status, while the word *Hijuat* and *Pandaiat* used for ask to the interlocuter who has middle and low level. Furthermore, mostly Native Dayanese used Negative Politeness in performing of politeness strategy in request.

Key words: Native Dayanese, Request Strategy, Politeness Strategy in Request

INTRODUCTION

Recently, a number of native local languages have decreased gradually. The UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger (2011) cites that there were approximately 3000 endangered languages across the globe and those most at risk of extinction are Indigenous Language (UNESCO, 2011). Every year there were local language in Indonesia was endangered condition. Along with 731 local language at Indonesia, 5 was unsafe Lauder in (Sobarna, 2007). This situation happened because many factors, for instance the original local language were not used continuously, either native language itself or fellow of tribes (Ruskhan, 2017). Other previous research about local language was discussed by Zalwia and Upe. They declared that GU Language at Lakudo district Buton Tengah Indonesia endangered condition (Zalwia & Upe, 2018).

According to Aprezo Maba Dayanese as language at OKU South Sumatra was rarely used by Native Dayanese, only few people who used this language to communicate each other (The result interview, 11 May, 2018). Hence, it was much needed in studying and recognition of Dayanese or Daya Language as one of heritage preservation efforts since the existence of Dayanese can not be separated from the existence of its speakers in the context of space and time and ecology. Related to the preservation of local languages Indonesian government provides opportunities to the local language to survive as a first language and intercourse language. In the Constitution, Section 1 asserted that "Regional language is a language used Indonesian generation in areas within the territory of the Republic of Indonesia". Then in

Section 42, Verse (1) stated that "the regional government shall develop, nurture, and protect the local languages and literature in order to keep its position and function in the life of society (PP 57-2014).

Preservation of local language can be done through use language continuously and comprehension of linguistic rule aspect (Hester & William, 2017), for instance in Pragmatic of request strategy of Daya Language. Request strategy is now such familiar term that every people cannot ignore interaction of communication, especially in politeness-making and request-making. Requesting has been extensively studied in the literature due to its frequent use (Brown, 1992) Request, which is aimed at persuading the Hearer to perform certain action, is a speech behaviour action (Kotorova, 2015). Consequently, Request strategies are developed to interact depending on social context in each culture. There were some researches that have conducted about request strategy, the first Wandin who studied *Request Strategies Used By The Students of SMPN 3 Pati* (Austin & Urmson, 2009). The aim of this study was to find out the type request strategy by Students of Junior High School and to find out the contribution of social variables power, distance and gender to the choice of request. The second was Maros and Halim studied speech act of requesting on the alerters which referst to the discourse features used in initiating a conversation (Maros & Halim, 2018). The third was Al Shawesh and Yahya studied request strategies among the Arab international students and Malaysian employees at a university in Malaysian. The aim of this research was to analyze request strategy which was preferred by arab inter-

national students and Malaysian employees (Al-Shawesh & Hussin, 2015). The fourth was Ishikawa studied Gender Differences in Request – A Statistical Analysis of American English (Ishikawa, 2013). The aim of this paper is to explore the gender differences in requests in American English. While this present study takes the difference on local language, that was Dayanese at OKU Selatan as the object of the study. Furthermore, this present study used Trosborg and Brown and Levinson theory to analyze the data. Investigating of request and politeness on local language, for instance Daya Language at Indonesia were important to be studied to keep preservation of local language.

Pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to speech situations. It deals with static, abstract entities such as sentences and propositions, from verbal acts or performances that take place in particular situations at particular times (Leech, 2016). It relevant with Farnia who explained that Pragmatic involves contextual norms which refers to of interaction and share within a speech community in order to establish and maintain successful communication among language users (Farnia, 2015).

Request as an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to perform or stop performing some kinds of action (Ellis, 1994). It is defined as an act of requiring the other(s) to do something performed through utterance(s) in interaction. As the speaker makes a request, s/he desires the hearer's expenditure of time, energy or material resource. In other words, requests impose the speaker's interest on the hearer. Thus, requesting is considered one of the most sensitive illocutionary acts in communication. While Levinson (1987) asserted that Request as Face and Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) because the speaker imposes his or her will on the hearer. They suggested that when people want to do an FTA, they might try to mitigate its effect on the hearer's face. Depending on the seriousness or weightiness of the FTA, the speaker chooses different strategies. Request has identified by Kulka (1991) as the request schema which includes requisite goals subject to a cultural filter, linguistic encoding (strategies, perspective and modifiers), situational parameters (distance, power, legitimization) and the social meaning of the request according to cultural and situational factors (Barron, Gu, & Steen, 2017). According Leech cited by Tolan gives the detail of directive verbs that usually occur in the construction sentence "S verb (O) that X" or "S verb O to Y", they are request, ask, beg, bid, command, demand, forbid, recommend, tell, order, advise, suggest, and invite (Toolan, 2016). Furthermore, (Trosborg, 1995) Classified categories of request strategies, for instance.

CATEGORY I – Indirect Request

Strategy 1 – Hints

Mild: The speaker can leave out the desired action altogether.

e.g. *I have to be at the airport in half an hour*

Strong: The speaker can mention his/her wish partially

e.g. *My car has broken down. Will you be using your car tonight?*

CATEGORY II – Hearer-oriented conditions (Conventionally Indirect)

Strategy 2 Questioning hearer's ability/willingness

a. Ability

This depends on the hearer's capacity in performing the act.

e.g. *Maybe you could help John dig the garden tomorrow?*

b. Willingness

This depends on the hearer's willingness in performing the act.

e.g. *Would you lend me a copy of your book?*

Statements of ability and willingness

Hearer can not give any excuses because speaker has conveyed that he/she considers this condition is fulfilled and anticipates compliance

e.g. *Mary, you can clear the table now.*

Strategy 3 – Suggestory formulate

When employing suggestory formulae, speaker has anticipated the refusal from hearer. But hearer must invent his/her own reason to refuse because the hearer-based preparatory condition is questioned.

CATEGORY III – Speaker-based conditions

Strategy 4 – Statements of speaker's wishes and desires

e.g. *I would like to have some more coffee.*

Strategy 5 – Statements of speaker's needs and demands

e.g. *I need a pen.*

CATEGORY IV – Direct Request

Strategy 6 – Statements of obligation and necessity

The speaker uses his/her own authority in stating his/her desire.

e.g. *You should/ought to leave now.*

Strategy 7 – Performatives

Performative verb is considered more/less polite (ask vs. command)

e.g. *I ask/request/order/command you to leave.*

Strategy 8 Imperatives

The imperative is the grammatical form directly signaling that the utterance is an order (this can be also added by adding tags and/or the marker *please*)

e.g. *Open the door, please.*

Elliptical Phrases

This is phrases in which only the desired object is mentioned.

e.g. *Two coffee, please.*

Furthermore, Brown & Levinson (1992) explained that politeness strategy related to face management, the strategy chosen by the speaker or hearer to perform FTA linguistically shows the politeness. Politeness refer to the four highest-level strategies (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record) as 'super-strategies'. The type of Politeness strategies involve bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. (Brown & Levinson, 1992) explain four highest-level strategies (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record) as 'super-strategies'. Hence, the researchers explored

the type of request strategy and type of politeness strategy in request made by Native Dayanese at OKU South Sumatra.

FIELDWORK METHODOLOGY

This research was qualitative research that employs descriptive method. The participant of this research was twenty Native Dayanese at OKU South Sumatra. The data of this research was Native Dayanese result of DCT in written form. It would be taken from all sample of this research. In collecting data the researchers used Discourse Completion Test (DCT). Schneider & Barron (2014) asserted that it was the way to ask participants to respond in writing to series of situations as they would in real life. DCT, much like a written questionnaire (Liu, 2004). It includes brief descriptions on specific situations followed by a blank space meant to be filled by respondents with suitable answers or responses. The researchers used the Indonesian situation so that it would be suitable and more real.

The Category Classification of Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

Table 1: Classification category of DCT

Status		DCT items
Lower to higher	Close	DCT 1 (situation 1)
	familiar	DCT 2 (situation 2)
Higher to lower	Close	DCT 3 (situation 3)
	familiar	DCT 4 (situation 4)

All respondents were asked to write expression of request in responding the situations of Discourse Completion Test (DCT). The situations as follow:

DCT 1:

Anda memiliki seorang dosen yang akrab dengan anda. Suatu hari anda menemuinya ketika ia sedang sibuk bekerja untuk meminta beberapa file ebook dan meminjam buku barunya yang akan anda gunakan untuk menyelesaikan tugas perkuliahan yang waktunya mendekati untuk harus dikumpulkan. Bagaimana ungkapan permintaan tersebut?

DCT 2:

Anda seorang mahasiswa di sebuah universitas. Anda sedang melakukan bimbingan proposal skripsi dengan dosen pembimbing yang terlihat sedang sibuk. Setelah beberapa kali dijelaskan tentang proposal skripsi anda, namun anda masih mengalami kebingungan. Anda meminta pembimbing anda untuk menjelaskannya lagi. Bagaimana ungkapan permintaan tersebut?

DCT 3:

Anda seorang wali kelas di sebuah Sekolah Menengah Atas. Anda sangat akrab dengan ketua kelasnya. Suatu hari, anda memintanya untuk mengumpulkan foto siswa seluruh kelas tersebut. Bagaimana ungkapan permintaan tersebut?

DCT 4:

Anda adalah seorang guru Bahasa Inggris di sebuah Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan. Saat ini, di sekolah anda

terdapat beberapa mahasiswa PPL dari sebuah universitas yang sedang menggantikan anda mengajar. Sebagai guru pembimbing di sekolah anda memintanya untuk selalu mengumpulkan RRP sehari sebelum mahasiswa tersebut mengajar. Bagaimana ungkapan permintaan tersebut?

In technique of analyzing data, the researchers analyzed subject by doing some activities, for instance;

1. Classifying the request expressions based on the classification of request based on Trosborg's theory of request strategies.
2. Categorizing each data based on the category of requests strategies on the theory of Trosborg. They are as follows:
 - a. Category 1: Indirect Request
 - b. Category 2: Hearer-oriented condition
 - c. Category 3: Speaker-based condition
 - d. Category 4: Direct Request
3. Analyzing the request strategies applied by the characters based on Trosborg's theory. It covers the request strategies of Hinting Strategies, Ability/Willingness, Suggestory Formulae, Wishes, and Desires/needs.
4. Analyzing the politeness strategies based on Brown and Levinson theory (1987) which is consisted four strategie.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Type of Request Strategy Used by Native Daya Language

After analyzing the data the researchers found the type of request strategy that was used by Native Dayanese, namely (1) Hints, (2) Ability/willingness/Permission, (3) Wishes/desires, (4) Needs/demands, (5) performatives. All data were analyzed by the scenario DCT situation. At the request analysis result, the researchers classified based on strategy Trosborg Theory and classified by Discourse Completion Test (DCT) Beebe and Cumings theoretical scenario which consists of "lower to higher status" and "higher to lower status".

Request Strategy of Lower to Higher Status

Discourse Completion Test (DCT) theoretical scenario of this status consist of situation 1 "close relationship", namely requested number of books and files e book to the teacher and situation 2 "familiar relationship", namely asking for explanation of research proposal.

Situation 1 (DCT1)

Ability/willingness

In this strategy, the respondent used interrogative sentence modality, such as *Majuat, haga* (could) to reveal request strategy. Respondent used some supportive moves on utterance to reveal politeness expression. Besides respondent also used apology expression. Here are some results of category request strategy in Ability/Willingness:

= *tabik buk. Nyak kilu maaf pai ngucak. Wat waktu becehita hambok? Majuat nyak nginjam buku matematik si bahyu duni gusi?*

In this strategy, the respondent used supportive moves of apology as an example of a sentence: “*tabik buk. Nyak kilu maaf pai ngucak* “. Then respondent also use checking on availability, for instance: “*Wat waktu becehita hambok?*” Furthermore, respondent express request of

Ability/willingness, for instance: “*Majuat nyak nginjam buku matematik si bahu duni gusi.*”

Statements of Speaker’s Wishes and Desires:

In this strategy the respondent used the statement of the speaker’s wishes and desires strategy, as in the word “*Haga*” (want) to reveal wishes and desires, For instance:

“*maaf, nyak ngucaki gusi; nyak haga nginjam buku ni gusi*”

(*maaf saya mengganggu anda, saya ingin meminjam buku anda*)

In this situation, the respondent used statements wishes and desire to reveal request strategy. The word ‘*haga*’ as the character of statement of the speaker’s wishes and desires strategy. The respondent also used supportive move of apology, for instance “*maaf, nyak ngucaki gusi*”. Respondent used the word “*haga*” (Want) on as head act to reveal an expression of desire to borrow book.

Situation 2 (DCT2)

Hint

The respondent used this strategy who does not want to state their intention explicitly. The strategy can be done by making a statement and asking a question which the hearer can understand what the speaker wants, for instance:

“*nyak kilu maaf bu, nyak at neduh lani cawa gusi jeno*”
(*Saya minta maaf bu; saya belum faham tentang penjelasan anda sebelumnya.*)

In the context of this situation, the respondent used softer of apology as the supportive move “*nyak kilu maaf bu*”. Then followed by head act of hint strategy, for instance “*nyak at neduh lani cawa gusi jeno*”, The respondent didn’t ask the hearer explicitly, but she asked to explain about her thesis.

Ability/willingness

In this strategy, respondent used interrogative sentence modality, such as *Majuat, haga* (could, would) to reveal request strategy. Respondent used some supportive moves to reveal politeness expression. Besides respondent also used an expression of apology. Here are some results Ability/Willingness category in request strategy:

“*nyak kilu tabik pak. Nyak pandai gusi sibuk kangak anyingni nyak pahu kilu tulung. Nyak*

kok nyukah belajar tapi masih mak neduh. Majuat gusi jelaskeni luwot guk nyak? Pengatu”

(*Permisi pak. Saya tahu anda sibuk. Saya telah belajar mencoba untuk memahami proposal thesis saya, tetapi saya masih belum faham. Dapatkah anda menelaskannya kembali kepada saya! Tolong*)

Respondent stated the utterance by using request strategy. In this strategy, the speaker used supportive moves of apology before head act in her utterance, for instance: “*Nyak kilu tabik bu*”, Then, speakers also uses supportive

move of preparation content, for instance “*Nyak pandai gusi sibuk anyingni nyak pahu kilu tulung* and “*Nyak kok nyukah belajar tapi masih mak neduh*” “, furthermore, the respondent used ability marker (*maju at*), in the sentence “*Majuat gusi jelaskeni luwot guk nyak?*”. Then, the end of the sentence of speakers expressed “*Pengatu*” word to show respect and begged for cooperative behavior.

Request Strategies by Category Higher to Lower

Discourse Completion Test (DCT) theoretical scenario of this status consist of situation 3 “close relationship”, namely requested asking the chief of the class to collect students’ photo and situation 4 “familiar relationship”, namely asking the students of PPL to collect lesson plan study.

Situation 3 (DCT3)

Ability/willingness

In this strategy, the respondent used interrogative sentence modality, such as *Hijuat* (could, would) to reveal request strategy. Respondent did not supportive moves. Supportive move has the function as marker to clear up the situation. Here are some results Ability/Willingness category in request strategy:

“*Hijuat niku ngumpulko gambah kantik sekelasmu?*”
(*Dapatkah kamumengumpulkan foto foto teman kelasmu?*)

In this strategy, the respondent used interrogative sentence modality, such as *Hijuat* (could, would) to reveal request strategy. However, the respondent did not use some supportive moves his utterance. In this case, the respondent directly expresses his utterance, because the respondent has higher status than his interlocutor, where interlocutor in this context is a student. The sentence, “*Hijuat niku ngumpulko gambah kantik sekelasmu?*” as head act also as category request strategy.

Statements of Speaker’s Needs and Demands

In this strategy, “the respondent used request strategy by using the word ‘*pahu*’ (need), for instance;

“*Linda, nyak pahu gambar ni kantik sekelasmu jemoh*”

In this strategy the respondent use supportive move ‘*Linda*’, then followed by statment of speaker’ needs and demands ‘*pahu*’ in the sentence “*nyak pahu gambar ni kantik sekelasmu jemoh*”. The word “*pahu*” as indication of using needs and demands category of request strategy.

Performative

In this strategy the respondent used performative strategy. This strategy was used to ask interlocutor to do something. Respondent used word “*cawakno*”, to ask something, for instance;

“*Rendi, tulung cawakno kantik sekelasmu ngumpulko gambar geluk*”.

(*Rendi, tolong mintakan foto ke teman teman kelasmu sekarang*)

The sentence above the respondent used supportive move of name. For instance ‘*Rendi*’. Furthermore this sentence was followed by performative. It can be proven from the word ‘*cawakno*’ as one of characteristic of performative strategy.

Situation 4 (DCT4)**Ability/willingness**

In this strategy, respondent used interrogative sentence modality, such as *Pandaiat, haga* (could, would), as one of characteristic ability/willingness. Respondent used some supportive moves to express politeness. Besides respondent also used an expression of apology. Here are some results Ability/Willingness category in request strategy:

“semakung niku mulai ngajar, pandaiat niku ngumpulko rencana belajarmu guk nyak? Inyak pahlu pandai struktur evaluasi pembelajaran.

(“Sebelum kamu memulai pembelajaran, dapatkah anda mengumpulkan rencana pembelajaran kepada saya ? saya perlu mengetahui struktur evaluasi pembelajarannya)

In this strategy, the respondent used supportive move at before and after Head act. The first was supportive move of preparing content, for instance *“semakung niku mulai ngajar. “*, furthermore followed by the word *‘pandai at’* as the character of ability/willingness strategy in the sentence of *‘pandai at niku ngumpulko rencana belajarmu guk nyak?’*

The Type of Politeness Strategy Used in Request

After analyzing the data the researchers found the type of politeness strategy used in request, namely (1) Negative Politeness, (2) Combination Request, (3) Bald on Record, (4) Off Record, for instance;

Situation 1 (DCT1)**a. Negative Politeness**

Negative politeness was used to minimize the imposition of a face-threatening act (FTA) on a hearer and to satisfy a hearer's negative face. This strategy was realized into two ways, for instance be pessimistic and appologize.

Be Pessimistic

1. Maju at gusi nginjamko nyak buku hik ebook?
(would you lending me a couple of books and some e-books?)
2. Majuat niku ngumpuko belajar sehari-hari, pengatu?
(Would you please submit your daily lesson please?)

Apologize

1. Maaf, nyak ngganggu niku, nyak haga nginjam buku
(Sorry, I disturb you; I want to borrow your books)

Situation 2 (DCT2)**a. Negative Politeness**

Negative politeness was used to minimize the imposition of a face-threatening act (FTA) on a hearer and to satisfy a hearer's negative face. This strategy was realized into two ways, for instance be pessimistic and combination request. Negative politeness was used by students in this situation in asking their lecturer to explain their thesis proposal.

Be Pessimistic

1. pandai at tabik nyak? Mimbing proposalku
(can you help me? To guide my proposal)

Apologize

2. Nyak kilu maaf ratong telambat ulihni nyak mak bangkik badan. Hijuat at tabik nyak? Mimbing proposalku

(I'm sorry to come late because I'm still sick now, can you help me? To guide my proposal).

b. Combination Request

1. Nyak kilu maaf pak, pandai at niku njalasko hendi di nyak? Nyak at nehan pandai
(I am sorry mr, could you explain about this now? I really don't undrstand it.)

Situation 3 (DCT3)**a. Bald on Record**

Bald on record was politeness strategies that can directly express the respondent needs. The respondent tends to use this strategy because he/has has high status than interlocutor, for instance:

1. Kumpul ko foto untuk nyak
(collect your photo to me)
2. Pengatu jukko nyak foto mu jemoh
(please give your photo to me tomorrow)

b. Off Record

Off record utterance was an essentially direct use of language. The respondent said something more general. The respondent utterance in implicit contexts.

1. niku at pandai ngelengkapi persyaratan ni pai
(You have not completed your term and condition first)

Situation 4 (DCT4)**a. Bald on Record**

Bald on record was politeness strategies that can directly express the respondent needs. The respondent tends to use this strategy because he/has has high status than interlocutor, speaker use direct utterance to ask lesson plan for their students.

1. Kumpulko rencana belajar mu semakin ngelajar
(submit your lesson plan before you teach)

b. Negative Politeness

Negative politeness was used by teacher to ask some lesson plan to students of PPL. It was used to minimize the imposition of a face threatening act on a hearer and to satisfy a hearer's negative face. This strategy was realized in Be pessimistic, for instance

Be Pessimistic

1. Kumpulko gambar untuk nyak
(collect photo to me)

The finding point out essential differences in the use Request and Politeness Strategy by Native Dayanese. As mentioned earlier, the category request strategy involve ability/willingness, Statement of Speaker's Need and Demand, Statement of Speaker's Wishes and Desires, Performative, and Hint. In category of ability/willingness can be proven in using the word (*Majuat, Hijuat, Pandaiat*)/(*could. Would*), in the sentence; *Majuat nyak nginjam buku matematik si bahu duni gusi?*”. Thusm the study agree with Trosborg,(1995) said that in each speech act of request usually used modal (could/would). Trosborg (1995) also give statement that request strategy can be categorized into ability/willingness (*could, would*), wihses/desires (*want*), obligation and Necessity (*Should*), etc.

On of the essential ideas in the finding of the study was the use of category ability/willingness almost used to ask request for interlocutor. The word *Majuat* used for ask to the

interlocuter who has high status, for instance “*kok nyukah belajar tapi masih mak neduh. Majuat gusi jelaskeni luwot guk nyak?*” while the word *Hijuat and Pandaiat* used for ask to the interlocuter who has middle and low level. While It was quite different from the result of previous research, Al-Shawesh & Hussin, (2015). They only found ability/willingness, imperative, and wishes/desires. Then category wishes and desires was more dominant use.

CONCLUSIONS

During the investigation the researchers found that mostly Native Dayanese used ability/willingness strategy. It can be proven from using the word *Majuat, Pandaiat, and Hijuat* to perform request. In request strategy at lower to higher status used category ability, and hint. While, in request strategy of higher to lower status used ability, statements of speaker's needs and demands, and performative. Furthermore related to politeness strategy Native Dayanese used negative politeness (be pessimistic and apologize), combination request, bald and record and off record.

REFERENCES

- Al-Shawesh, M. Y., & Hussin, S. (2015). Investigating the Request Strategies among the Arab International Students and Malaysian Employees at a University in Malaysia. *Arab World English Journal*, 17.
- Austin, J. L., & Urmson, J. O. (2009). *How to do things with words: the William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (2. ed., [repr.]). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Barron, A., Gu, Y., & Steen, G. (2017). *The Routledge Handbook of Pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Brown, P., & Levinson. (1992). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: UK: Oxford University Press.
- Farnia, M. (2015). Learner's English Proficiency and their Pragmatic Competence of Refusal Speech Acts Soudabeh Tabatabaei. *Byond Worlds A Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Education*, 3(1), 25.
- Hester, S., & William, H. (2017). *Language, Interaction and National Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Ishikawa, Y. (2013). Gender difference in request – a statistical analysis of American English in the NICT JLE corpus. *International Journal of Humanities and Management Sciences (IJHMS)*, 1(1).
- Kotorova, E. (2015). Expressing REQUEST in German and Russian: A Communicative-pragmatic Field Analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 206, 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.020>
- Kulka, B. (1991). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: The case of requests*. Clevedon: UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of Pragmatic* (1 st edition). London: Routledge.
- Levinson, B. (1987). *Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*. Cambridge: UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, S. (2004). *Pragmatic Strategies and Power Relations in Disagreement: Chinese Culture in Higher Education*. Universal-Publishers.
- Maros, M., & Halim, N. S. (2018). Alerters in Malay and English Speech Act of Request: A Contrastive Pragmatics Analysis. *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 24(1), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2401-06>
- PP 57-2014:Pembinaan Bahasa dan Sastra serta Peningkatan Fungsi Bahasa Indonesia. (t.t.). Diambil 29 Juli 2018, dari <https://ngada.org/pp57-2014.htm>
- Ruskhana, A. G. (2017). Kajian Bahasa as Sebagai Bahasa Yang Hampir Punah Di Distrik Makbon, Sorong, Papua Barat. *SAWERIGADING*, 17(1), 1–10.
- Schneider, K. P., & Barron, A. (2014). *Pragmatics of Discourse*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Sobarna, C. (2007). Bahasa Sunda Sudah Di Ambang Pintu Kematiankah? *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 11(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v11i1.39>
- Toolan, M. (2016). *Language, Text and Context: Essays in stylistics*. Routledge.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Walter de Gruyter.
- UNESCO. (2011). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Zalwia, S. M., & Upe, A. (2018). Modernisasi Dan Diskontinuitas Bahasa Daerah (Studi Kasus Penggunaan Bahasa Daerah Gu di Kelurahan Lakudo Kecamatan Lakudo Kabupaten Buton Tengah. *Jurnal Neo Societal*, 3(2).