



AN ETHNOPRAGMATICS STUDY OF APOLOGIZE SPEECH ACTS IN JAVANESE

KAJIAN ETNOPRAGMATIK TINDAK TUTUR MEMINTA MAAF DALAM BAHASA JAWA

Endang Sri Maruti¹⁾, Teguh V Suharto²⁾, Nur Samsiyah³⁾

^{1,2,3}Universitas PGRI Madiun, Jl. Auri No 6, Kota Madiun

¹Email: endang@unipma.ac.id,

²Email: suharto_teguh@unipma.ac.id,

³Email: nursamsiyah@unipma.ac.id

Submitted: 02-03-2021, Reviewed: 24-04-2021, Accepted: 30-10-2021

<https://doi.org/10.22202/JG.2021.V7i2.4731>

Abstract

Apologies are usually made by someone if they make a mistake. However, apologies for the speech community in Java are not only done after the speaker has made a mistake for a speech or action taken to the speaker, sometimes before doing or telling something that is considered wrong or taboo. In the Javanese speaking community, apologizing tends to be stated in advance even though what is actually said or done is not necessarily wrong. The focus of this research is the speech act form apologizing to the Javanese community in the area of Beringin Village, Lakarsantri District, Surabaya City. This study has a qualitative descriptive approach with an ethnopragmatic design. Research data in the form of situations, events, and communicative actions containing apologies obtained from 46 research subjects through observation and in-depth interviews. The data analysis method is the equivalent and split method with techniques for direct elements, such as missing techniques, dressing techniques, and expansion techniques. The results of this study: (1) the form of speech to apologize is different in modes and components; (2) The form of apologizing is componentially an open form, but in expression, in the same sentence, components that indicate the level of sincerity or other purposes are also inserted other than for the purpose of apologizing.

Keywords: apology, ethnopragmatic, expressive, speech mode

Abstrak

Permintaan maaf lazimnya dilakukan seseorang jika melakukan kesalahan. Akan tetapi, permintaan maaf bagi masyarakat tutur di Jawa tidak hanya dilakukan setelah penutur melakukan kesalahan atas tuturan atau tindakan yang dilakukan kepada petutur, kadang-kadang sebelum melakukan atau menuturkan sesuatu hal yang dianggap salah atau tabu. Pada masyarakat tutur bahasa Jawa, meminta maaf cenderung dinyatakan terlebih dahulu meskipun sebenarnya hal yang dituturkan atau dilakukannya belum tentu salah. Fokus penelitian ini adalah bentuk tindak tutur meminta maaf pada masyarakat Jawa di wilayah Kelurahan Beringin, Kecamatan Lakarsantri, Kota Surabaya. Penelitian ini berpendekatan deskriptif kualitatif dengan rancangan etnopragmatik. Data penelitian berupa situasi, peristiwa, dan tindakan komunikatif yang mengandung permintaan maaf yang diperoleh dari 46 subjek penelitian melalui observasi dan wawancara mendalam. Adapun metode analisis data adalah metode padan dan agih dengan teknik bagi unsur langsung, seperti teknik lesap, teknik ganti, dan teknik perluas. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa bentuk tutur untuk meminta maaf dibedakan berdasarkan modus dan



komponennya. Bentuk meminta maaf secara komponensial merupakan bentuk yang terbuka, namun pengungkapannya, dalam kalimat yang sama pula diselipkan komponen-komponen yang menandakan tingkat ketulusan ataupun juga maksud lain selain untuk maksud meminta maaf.

Kata kunci: *permintaan maaf, etnopragmatik, modus tuturan, ekspresif*

1. INTRODUCTION

In Javanese speech, apologizing tends to be stated first despite there is nothing wrong with what has spoken and done. For example, when someone asks an address, the person will say “*Ngapunten Pak, dalemipun Abah Kholil pundi nggih?*” (*I’m sorry sir, can you tell me where Mr. Kholil’s house is?*). Politeness principle is closely related to a community’s cultural values, for something considered as polite by one community might not prevail in other communities (Chaer, 2010). Another example is related to burping after eating. For Javanese people, burping is impolite, whereas in Batak and Manado it is a common thing and is not taboo. It strengthens sociologists’ opinion that language behavior of speech community members is a reflection of the community’s cultural values. Therefore, there is a close relationship between language behavior and cultural values.

Someone usually conducts a speech act of apologize if he/she has done something wrong; however, it is not the fact (Murphy, 2015). Apology can be politically utilized. Apology in Javanese speech society is not only expressed after the speaker (*Penutur/Pn*) made a mistake in his/her words to the opponent (*Petutur/Pt*); it is sometimes done before conducting or speaking something that is considered wrong or taboo. Apology has different functions depending on the speakers and it has effect on strategies employed (Ahmed, 2017).

Pragmatics according to Penelope & Levinson (1987) studies relationship between language and contexts. Context, in this case, becomes a determinant factor of a speech. It is similar to Geoffrey (1983) stating that pragmatics is a study on the meaning of speech situations. In pragmatics, there are terms of *Prinsip Kerja Sama* (PKS) (cooperation principles) and *Prinsip Kesantunan* (PK) (politeness principles). Proverbs in PKS are generally followed in correct language use practice (Hadi, 2013). Then, PK occurs to explain why speakers often speak indirectly in conveying their meaning (Borris & Zecho, 2018).

There are many previous studies on speech act of apologize. Chamani (2014) has studied forms of apology in Persian language based on gender. Apology in the perspective of sociolinguistic study has been carried out by Afghari (2007). In Japanese, apology has been studied by Dina (2013). Sun (2019) explored apology in speech and dialogue on television. Study in speech act of apology has been carried out in learning process (Eslami-Rasekh & Mardani, 2010; Mufliharsi, 2017). Anshori (2018) found various forms of expressive request of apologize during holiday. Apology among Javanese people has previously been studied; however, it was apologize in English (Hikmah, 2017).

Based on previous research results, there is a gap in a research about speech act of apologizes in Javanese people who speak Javanese; therefore, the current study is different. Motive in apologize affects the forms and patterns. The speech act of apologizes is not only locus expressed due to mistake motive it could be illocutionary or perlocutionary speech acts that has purposes other than apologize. It depends on several factors, namely context, social, and cultural factors.



This research focus is on the form of speech act of apologizes in Javanese people in Beringin Village, Lakarsantri Sub-district, Surabaya City. Surabaya is a multi-ethnic and culturally rich city. Various ethnic groups can be found in Surabaya, such as Malay, Chinese, Indian, Arabic, and European. There are also Indonesian ethnic groups, such as Madura, Sunda, Batak, Kalimantan, Bali, and Sulawesi. These ethnic groups mingle with native Surabaya and form a cultural pluralism that becomes a characteristic of the city. Surabaya population mostly dominates by native people and Madurese. The people are congenial and have open speaking style. Although Surabaya people seem to have rough tempered, they are democratic, tolerant, apologetic, and helpful (Adipitoyo, 2011). Based on the problem, the research aims to identify and provide the forms and factors influencing speech act of apologizes in Javanese language.

2. METHOD

The research was a descriptive-qualitative research with ethnopragsmatics design. The research data derived from 46 research subjects with the following criteria: Surabaya native and/or newcomers from other cities who have settled in Surabaya for at least 15 years, able to communicate actively and passively in Javanese, physically and spiritually normal, and an adult (minimum 15 years old) who could understand correctly the use and rules of language.

The research data were speech act of apologize texts in Javanese language. The research data were in the form of situation, events, and communicative acts that contain apology. The data generated from participative and non-participative observation activities according to Denzin & Lincoln (2011) or *simak libat cakap* (participatory observation) technique of Sudaryanto (1993). Next, the participative observation method carried out through researcher participation in speech events occurred in the community at Beringin Village, Lakarsantri Sub-district, Surabaya City. The non-participative observation method conducted by not directly involved or played role in a communication interaction. Data collection technique employed was recording technique using paper sheets to write all necessary things in the research and took notes on data classification. The data collection instruments consisted of data cards and data classification sheets of research focus attached with data contexts and codes as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. Data Card

Data 1
Date and Time:
Context:
Speech:
Kinesic:

Communication background recorded as scientific data required orthographic transcription technique by transcribing merely sounds that have a meaning into Latin inscription.

Table 2. Data Classification Sheet

No Data	Speech	Context	Code
1	Atia: <i>Sing sabar ae ya Mbak!</i> (sambil	Enda has finished her private lesson and wants	(Bn.Md.1)

166 | Endang Sri Maruti, Teguh V Suharto, Nur Samsiyah/ JG.2021.V7i2/(164-182)



- | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------|
| | menepuk pundak En). <i>Aja kapok lo ya! Arek-arek iku ancene mbuh kok, tambah gedhe tambah mokong.</i> | to say goodbye to Atia. At that time, Atia's kids were not studying seriously. | |
| 2 | Sadi: <i>Tulung banget ning, sepuranana sakabehe luputku, salah, kliru, lan kurang sarta kebacutku!</i> | Sadi feels guilty because Mari's husband gets sick because of him | (Bn.Md.2) |
| 3 | Uma: <i>Aduh, sik lara ya tanganmu? Gak penak tenan aku Pak.</i> | Three days ago, Uman was unintentionally grazed Yadi because his motor's lights were not working. This event caused Yadi's right hand scratched. | (Bn.Md.3) |
| 4 | Fia : <i>Aku mau keturon je, sepurane ya?</i> | Fia promised to pick Rati up at school, but she fell asleep | (Bn.Md.4) |

Data validity test carried out by expanding the duration of observation, perseverance, accuracy, and triangulation. Data analysis employed flow model that contained data reduction, data presentation, verification, and inference. The data analysis methods included identity method and distributional method with direct element division technique, such as deletion, substitution, and expansion techniques. The deletion technique carried out by deleting (removing) certain elements of related lingual units. For example, in a direct speech used to apologize, if one of key words (such as "sorry") is deleted then is the meaning of the sentence still remains or has it changed. The substitution technique applies by substituting certain element of related lingual units with certain other elements outside the related lingual units. For example, in a speech of apologize that initially uses *ngoko* lexicons and substitutes with *krama* lexicons, then it will produce different effect. The expansion technique carries out by expanding related lingual units to the right or left and the expansion uses certain elements. For example, there is only one word used to apologize in data, then the researcher adds other elements or words; consequently, the speech form is changed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. Research Results

The forms of speech act of apologize could be categorized in two, namely: (a) mode and (b) component.

1. Speech Act of Apologize based on Mode

Mood is influenced by suprasegmental elements, i.e. tone, pressure, and intonation. Based on the three elements, the forms of speech act of apologize had ten categories.

a) Imperative Speech Act

People generally use a subtle request sentence to apologize so the opponent receives their apology. Occasionally, however, apologies are conducted with imperative mood, which is by ordering, Pn told Pt to forgive Pn.

- (1) Atia: *Sing sabar ae ya Mbak! (sambil menepuk pundak Enda). Aja kapok lo ya! (Bn.Md.1) Arek-arek iku ancene mbuh kok, tambah gedhe tambah mokong.*
'Yang sabar aja ya Mbak! Jangan kapok lo ya! Anak-anak itu memang kok, tambah besar tambah nakal.'



'Be patient ok! Don't give up! Kids are like that, they are naughtier when they get bigger.'

Enda: Iya bu, ndak pa-pa. Sudah terbiasa...hehehe

'It's ok ma'am, I get used to it....hehehe'

Atia apologizes to Enda by telling Enda to be patient and asks her not to give up teaching her children. It strengthens by Atia patted Enda on the shoulder. Atia's next speech act further confirms the mistakes of her children who are naughtier every day.

b) Rhetorical Interrogative Speech Act

Apologizing indirectly can be done by using rhetorical questions. Pn asks question that requires no answer from Pt.

(2) Uma: *Aduh, sik lara ya tanganmu? (Bn.Md.3) Gak penak tenan aku Pak.*

'Aduh, masih sakit ya tanganmu? Saya benar-benar merasa tidak enak Pak.'

'Is your hand still hurt? I'm really sorry Sir.'

Yadi: *Iya-iya, wis gak pa-pa kok.*

'Iya iya, sudah tidak apa-apa kok.'

'It's Ok, I'm fine'

Uman's question is actually a veiled apology. This rhetorical question has a clear editorial. It indicates by the question that is not mentioning about his mistake but his bad feeling. Pn expects Pt's understanding.

c) Explicit Performative Speech Act

Following are speech act data indicating that Pn apologizes to Pt.

(3) Bu Muijad : *Pak, tulung Bu Juri dipunsanjangi mboten sah*

sms kula melih nagih utang. Kula lak pun janji sasi ngajeng.

'Pak, tolong Bu Juri diberitahu untuk tidak sms saya lagi untuk menagih hutang. Saya kan sudah janji bulan depan.'

'I'm sorry sir, could you please ask Mrs. Juri for not sending me another text to collect my debt. I have promised her to pay it next month''.

Juri: *Ngene kie aku malih ora penak karo sampeyan. Peh, tenan aku njaluk sepura sing akeh. Aku ngrumangsani tenan yen salahku wis akeh neng sampeyan. (Bn.Md.5)*

'Begini ini saya menjadi tidak enak sama kamu. Peh, serius, saya minta maaf yang banyak. Aku merasa sekali kalau salahku sudah banyak ke kamu.'

'I feel bad with you. I seriously apologize. I feel like I have so many mistakes to you.'

Juri's speech act directly mentions the purpose to apologize to Mrs. Muijad for his mistake (as well as his wife's mistake). The structure of the speech act is completed by mentioning subject, predicate, and object. Therefore, in the speech act, Pn informs her intention directly and



openly to Pt. It is consistent with Gunarwan (2007) stating that explicit performative speech is a speech that directly state its intention.

d) Deletion Performative Speech Act

The speech act of apologize is a type of sentence with a request mood, which is apologize. It is consistent with Padmosoekotjo (1958:78) who put apology sentence in *paminta* sentence or 'request'. In the speech act of apologize, however, Pn did not indicate a direct asking, instead it is explicitly expressed by not mentioning a subject and predicate.

(4) Nona: *Bu, ngapunten hlo nggih?* (Bn.Md.7)

'Bu, maaf lo ya?'

'I'm sorry ma'am?'

Sati : Yes?

Nona: I didn't mean to hit your head.

Sati : Oh, *gak pa-pa..*

'Oh, It is ok.'

The above narrative occurred when Sati and Nona were praying in the mosque. Sati prayed behind Nona. During her prayer, Nona's feet hit Sati's head. Nona apologized to Sati directly by saying *ngapunten* although she greeted her first by saying *Bu*. The speech act is a deletion performative speech. Nona actually wanted to state the information, which was she wanted to apologize to Sati; however, Nona did not state it completely; she just said *nyuwun* or an asking sentence. Nona's complete speech act will be:

(4a) Nona: *Bu, kula nyuwun ngapunten hlo nggih?* (Bn.Md.7a)

'I'm sorry Ma'am?'

e) Expansion Performative Speech Act

Similar to deletion performative speech act, expansion performative speech act contains indirect illocution. This type of speech act is an indirect expression of N's apology (Suhartono, 2004:114).

(5) Suno: *Bapak-bapak, Ibu-ibu, wonten mriki kula minangka*

wakilipun keluarga Pak Wano, badhe ngaturaken gunging panuwun kagem sedherek sedaya ingkang sampun paring pambiyantu. Kula ugi badhe nyuwun agunging pangaksami, estu-estu nyuwun gunging pangaksami, utaminipun kagem almarhumah. (Bn.Md.8)

'Bapak-bapak, Ibu-ibu, di sini saya sebagai wakil dari keluarga Pak Wg, akan menyampaikan banyak-banyak terimakasih kepada saudara semua yang sudah memberikan bantuan. Saya juga meminta maaf yang sebsar-besarnya, benar-benar meminta maaf, terutama untuk almarhumah.'

'Ladies and Gentlemen, on the behalf of Mr. Wg family, I would like to sincerely thanks to all of your assistance. I also want to apologize and truly apologize for the Late.'

Pelayat: *nggih...*

'Yes....'

The above performative speech act is expanded because it is a requisite in *Jawa Krama* language chosen by Pn in apologizing. At first, Pn thanks the audience and then he apologizes by still using Javanese *Krama Inggil*. In Javanese *krama*, besides the selection of smooth lexicon, the sentence structure should be perfect; thus, it shows high politeness.

f) Speech Act of Statement of Request

Speech act of apology is request speech act and it is generally in the form of request sentences. Request sentences illustrate the attitude of Pn who wants Pt to do something.

(6) Tuno: *Pak, aku kae kok ora oleh surat undangan E-KTP ya saka kelurahan?*

‘Pak, saya kemarin kok tidak dapat surat undangan E-KTP ya dari kelurahan?’

‘Excuse me Sir, why did not I receive E-KTP invitation from the village?’

Sami: *Walah, Pak, kesupen kula. Kula ingkang kliru, kula ingkang lepat, sepisan melih, nyuwun ngapunten lo nggih. (Bn.Md.9) Kula kinten njenengan pun ngurus teng Gresik.*

‘Walah, Pak, saya kelupaan. Saya yang salah, sekali lagi, saya minta maaf lo ya. Saya kira Anda sudah mengurusnya di Gresik.’

‘Oh My God, I forgot. It is my fault; I apologize. I thought you have done it in Gresik.’

Tuno: *Ya, akhire aku ngurus dhewe neng kana Pak.*

‘Ya akhirnya saya mengurus sendiri di sana Pak.’

‘Yes in the end I have to do it by myself in Gresik Sir.’

The above data shows that Pn used the word *nyuwun* instead of *njaluk* despite they are the same age. It is influenced by social relation factor, which is position. Tuno is a village official who should serve the people well yet he made a mistake. Therefore, he apologizes directly and uses more polite language.

g) Speech Act of Statement of Desire

Statement of desire leads to a speech act that indicates Pn’s wish on a situation conducted by Pt. It has characteristic of explicitly stating the word *pengin* or want as illustrated in the following data.

(7) Kadi: *Yak apa Cak kabare?*

‘How are you bro?’

Sudi: *Alhamdulillah.. Aku mreng mau pengen njaluk sepura nyang pean Cak. (Bn.Md.11) Wingenane aku wis salah paham mbek pean.*

‘Alhamdulillah, actually I’m here because I want to apologize to you. Yesterday, I misunderstood you’.

Kadi: *Ya padha-padha Cak, penting saiki padha apik maneh.*

‘It’s ok, everything is alright now, that’s the matter.’

In this case, Pn emphasizes on his wish to apology. If the word “*pengen*” or “want” is removed, then the speech act becomes a request speech act like the previous discussion.



(7a) Kadi: *Yak apa Cak kabare?*

‘How are you man?’

Sudi: *Alhamdulillah.. Aku njaluk sepura nyang pean Cak.* (Bn.Md.11a)

Wingenane aku wis salah paham mbek pean.

‘Alhamdulillah, I’m here wanted to apologize to you. I misunderstood you yesterday’.

h) Understatement Speech Act

In understatement form, Pn has violated maxim of quantity. Penelope & Levinson (1987) explain that understatement form is realized by stating less than what it meant.

(8) Mawi: *We ki dijaluhi tulung ngunu ae ora isa, padhahal*

mung barang sepele ae. Lek aku isa budhal dhewe, gak bakalan aku njaluk tulung kowe.

‘Kamu itu dimintai tolong begitu saja tidak bisa, padahal itu hal sepele saja.

Kalau saya bisa berangkat sendiri, tidak akan saya menyuruh kamu.’

‘Why is it so hard to ask you a favor, it is just a simple thing any way. If I could go by myself, I won’t ask you’.

Suto: *astaga.* (Bn.Md.12)

Mawi: (silent)

This statement is to avoid things got worse; hence, Pn prefers to understate his speech. In addition to the ambiguous answer like the above, an understate speech act could use “*sepurane*” or ‘sorry’ without other explanation.

(8a) Suto: *sepurane.* (Bn.Md.12a)

‘sorry’

i) Overstatement Speech Act

This form is the opposite of understatement form. In the overstatement, Pn overstates his expression than necessary. Therefore, Pn violates maxim of quantity. It is in line with Brown dan Levinson (1989:219) opine that Pn overstatement is typically as presented in the following data.

(9) Jali : *Piye pak sidane surat-surate?*

‘How’s the documents Sir?’

Jano: *YangeneikiPak, sik durung isa ngurus. Apa anane ae, nek bener ya wis padha ngerti, nek salah ya tak kandhakna ae. Yak apa maneh, rak wis dadi carane awak dhewe. Aku nyuwun samudra pangaksama saestu ya Pak!*(Bn.Md.13)

‘Ya beginilah Pak, masih belum bisa mengurus. Apa adanya saja, jika benar sudah tahu semua, jika salah ya saya katakan salah. Bagaimana lagi, memang sudah jadi cara kita. Maaf yang sebesar-besarnya ya Pak’

‘As you can see Sir, I still have no time to take care of it. Just let it be, if it is right everyone knows it, if it is wrong I will say it is wrong.

What else could I do, this is how we deal with it. I’m truly sorry Sir.’

Jali : *Terus kapan?*



‘So when?’

Jano: *Sik gurung ngerti Pak.*

‘I still don’t know Sir.’

In the above narrative Pn overstates his apology, by saying *meminta maaf yang seluas-luasnya seperti luasnya samudera* (saying sorry by comparing to the vastness of the ocean), whereas in Bahasa Indonesia the correct sentence is *maaf yang sebesar-besarnya* and not *maaf yang seluas-luasnya*. Although the expression is often stated by Javanese people (usually in official event and using *krama* language), the above speech act indicates language mixing. The goal is to make Pt more lenient and finally wants to forgive Pn or at least, understand his mistake.

j) Early Warning Speech Act

Early warning speech act is a broad speech that consists of several different structures to trigger responses from Pt. Speech act of apologize that uses early warning is generally used by Pn who often makes mistakes and apologizes.

(10) Mika: *Paling awakmu wis waleh karo omonganku iki, ning aku kudu tetep ngomong.* (Bn.Md.14)

Mungkin kamu sudah bosan dengan ini, tapi aku tetap harus ngomong.’

‘I guess you must be bored with this, but I still need to say it’.

Rara: *Apa maneh?* (dengan nada sinis)

‘Apa lagi?’

‘What is it again?’

Mika: *Sepurane sing akeh ya! Aku janji ora bakal mbaleni maneh?*

‘maaf ya! Aku janji tidak akan mengulangi lagi’

‘I’m sorry! I promise I will not do it again’.

Rara: (silent)

The speech act (Bn.14) is an early warning speech act. Prior to her apology, Mika gives a cue or warning that she will do something that she has done many times. Since she is already aware of the problem context, Rara responded sarcastically to the early warning. Nevertheless, Mika continues her speech act to apologize to Rara.

2. Speech Act of Apologize based on Component

Based on the component, the forms of speech act of apologize could be divided in twelve categories:

a) Fenced Speech Act

Fenced speech act form in apologizing occurs when Pn uses particles, words, or phrases to express the degree of truth of its statement.

(11) Sadi: *Apa aku salah ta Cak? Ya nek ancene aku salah, ya*

yak apa maneh? Aku njaluk sepura Cak. (Bn.Kp.1) *Karepku ngono ya aku cumak takok ae. Terus apike yak apa?*

‘Apa saya salah ta Kak? Ya kalau memang saya salah, mau bagaimana lagi? Saya minta maaf Kak. Saya tadi Cuma bermaksud untuk bertanya saja. Terus baiknya bagaimana?’



‘Did I do wrong? If I’m wrong, what else should I do? I apologize, I was only asking, so what should I do then?’

In this regards, Pn uncertainty has two possibilities: first, Pn is not sure whether he did wrong to Pt and second, Pn is not certain whether Pt is willing to accept his apology. It is supported by Yule (1996) stating that Pn uses fence to cover inaccuracies of his speech.

b) Speech act of hesitancy

Speech act of hesitancy is marked with separation of non-lexical phonetic sounds. One syllable interjection, such as *er*, *uh*, *ah*, *ih*, and so on, can be inserted into this speech act marker.

(12) Mawi: *Bapak-Bapak Ibu-Ibu, ehm, kula nuwun ngapunten nggih telat, wau tesih ngurusi surat-surat riyin.* (Bn.Kp.3)

‘Bapak-Bapak Ibu-Ibu, ehm, saya minta maaf karena telat, tadi masih mengurus surat-surat dulu.’

‘Ehm, I’m sorry everyone, I’m late, I have to take care some documents’.

Mr. Mawi as head of RT (neighborhood association) hesitantly apologizes to his people. Pn feels guilty because he makes his people waiting; thus, he apologizes. As he lets his people down, he hesitantly apologizes. He is doubt whether he will be forgiven by his people or they will just understand his late attendance. Therefore, he uses interjection of *ehm* to shows his doubts at the same time as a gap to attract Pt. If the interjection is omitted, then the speech act will be stricter and show no remorse.

(12a) Mawi: *Bapak-Bapak Ibu-Ibu, kula nuwun ngapunten nggih telat, wau tesih ngurusi surat-surat riyin.* (Bn.Kp.3a)

c) Agreement Speech Act

Agreement speech act is a speech where Pn asks Pt to agree on proposition proposed. This speech act indicates by a verb phrase of *tak kira* (in Javanese it is called *tembung andhahan utama purusa*).

(13) Sadi: *Tak kira masalah warisan omah wingenane, sing ndadekna sampeyan ambek Cacak mangkel mbarek aku Ning, ya aku njaluk sepura ae Ning.* (Bn.Kp.5)

‘Saya kira masalah warisan rumah kemarin yang menyebabkan Mbak dan Mas marah ke saya, ya saya minta maaf Mbak.’

‘I think the home inheritance issue causes you mad at me, I apologize’.

Mari: *Alah wis gak usah dipikir. Ndeloken Cacakmu kana lo, ben senengatine, ben ndang waras.*

‘Alah, sudah tidak usag dipikirkan. Jenguklah kakakmu sana biar hatinya senang dan lekas sembuh.’



‘Don’t think about it. Go visit your brother I think he will be happy and get well soon’.

d) Hybrid Speech Act

Hybrid speech act requires at minimum two sentence structures with different grammatical characteristics (Suhartono, 2004:119). It prevails in speech act of apologize. N must speaks more than one sentence with different grammatical characteristics as illustrated in the following data.

(14) Erin: *Iki ya apa sih, aku wis tandatangan nolak uji lab kok sik tetep dilakukan?*

‘Ini bagaimana sih, saya kan sudah tandatangan untuk menolak tindakan uji lab, tetapi kok masih saja dilakukan?’

‘What’s going on? I have signed to refuse the laboratory test but how come it’s still done?’

Fo: *Embuh Mbak, ya wis ngunu kuwi. Koyok ora ngerti biayasae ae.* (Bn.Kp.6)

‘Tidak tahu Mbak, ya memang sudah begitu. Seperti tidak tahu biasanya bagaimana.’

‘I have no idea, it is what it is. I guess you know how it usually works’.

Erin: *Ya kudune ora ngunu rek.*

‘Ya, harusnya tidak begitu.’

‘Yes, but it shouldn’t be like that’.

Fo: hanya senyum2.. (smiling)

e) Referenced and Attributed Speech Act

People apologize if something is wrong whether it is intentional or not. In this case, people apologize using speech that has a reference and known by both participants and it is called common knowledge (Clark & Clark, 1977).

(15) Enda : *Iku pesenanku ta Mas?*

‘Itu pesanan saya kah Mas?’

‘Is that my order?’

Mase: (sambil menuangkan nasi goreng ke kertas nasi dan siap membungkus). *Oiya, nggawe irisan lombok ya Mba? sik-sik..*

‘Oiya, memakai irisan lombok ya Mbak? Sebentar-sebentar..’

(pour the fried rice onto the rice paper and ready to package)

‘You want sliced chilies in your fried rice right? Wait a minute’.

(menuangkan kembali nasi goreng ke wajan). *Lomboke lali mbak he he he..* (Bn.Kp.7) *Nggawe telor ceplok pisan ta Mbak?*

‘Lomboknya lupa Mbak he he he.. Tambah telor ceplok kah Mbak?’

(pour the fried rice back into the pan).

‘I forgot the chilies hehhee. Do you want sunny side up egg Miss?’

Enda: *Gak sah, lombok ae Mas!*

‘Tidak usah, lombok saja Mas.’



‘No, just chili is fine’.

Mase: (dengan agak grogi) *Lomboke pira Mbak?*

‘Lomboknya berapa Mbak?’

‘(nervously), how many chilies do you want?’

Enda: *Ya wis kuwi ae!*

‘Ya sudah itu saja!’

‘That will be enough!’

There are three contents in a sentence production planning, namely: (1) proportional content, (2) illocutionary content, and (3) thematic structure. In the proportional content category, speaker determines what proposition he/she wants to say. In data (3) proposition to be revealed by Mase is that he made a mistake, which is he forgot to put sliced chilies in Enda’s fried rice order. Once he realizes his mistake, Mase tries to fix his mistake by pouring the to-be-packaged fried rice back into the pan. The illocutionary content chosen in the data is indicated by asking a question to Enda. The question is *Nggawe telur ceplok pisan ta Mbak?* This question is actually to cover his first mistake and to make sure he will not make the same mistake Mase asks Enda about her fried rice order.

The thematic structure is related to determination of various elements regarding grammatical function or semantics in a sentence. Speaker determines which one will be a subject and an object. To make sure He is not going to make more mistakes, Mase asks the amount of chili to be added to the fried rice using a sentence: *Lomboke pira Mbak?* Through this question, Mase distracts Enda from his mistake to put sliced chilies and tries to assert her that he really will put sliced chilies in Enda’s fried rice order.

f) Deictic Speech Act

In deictic speech act, the intended reference is clear. The reference, however, is not fixed or mobile (Yule, 1998:9).

(16) Bu Suni: *Wingi awakku rodok gak enak Bu, mriyang. Dadi aku gak isok teka arisan. Sepurane ya!* (Bn.Kp.8)

‘Kemarin saya kurang enak badan Bu. Jadi, saya tidak bisa datang ke arisan. Maaf ya!’

‘I’m not feeling well yesterday so I could not come to *arisan*. I’m so sorry’.

Bu Amin: *Ya, ora masalah kanggoku, ning dadi masalah kanggo sing oleh.*

Aku ya gak isok nempuhi. Padha ae Bu Sole ya malah dorung onok kabare.

Ya tidak jadi masalah buat saya, tapi jadi masalah bagi yang dapat. Saya juga tidak bisa menanggung. Sama saja, Bu Sole ya juga belum ada kabarnya.

‘It’s not a problem for me, but it is a problem for a person who gets the *arisan*. I cannot pay for it. Mrs. Sole as well, I have received no words from her’.

Pronoun “-ku” in the word *awakku* stated by Bu Suni clearly refers to Bu Suni herself, and the word “aku” in a speech act of *aku gak isok teka arisan* also refers to Bu Suni. In this case, the deictic marker is employed to explain or to provide reason on what and who has made a mistake; therefore, he/she is the one who will apologize. It is also likely that the pronoun “-ku” is replaced by *awake anakku*; then, “-ku” still refers to Bu Suni, which is Bu Suni’s son/daughter.

g) Speech Act with Optional Structure

In the speech act with optional structure, Pt’s response is more important both verbal and non-verbal response. In apologizing, Pn surely expects Pt’s response.

(17) Bapa: *Mbak, ngapunten nggih, njenengan nganggur ta?*

(Bn.Kp.9) *Nyuwun tulung nggih, panjenengan rewangi masak-masak teng mrika, mboten wonten tiyange blas.*

‘Mbak, Maaf ya, Anda sedang senggang kan? Minta tolong ya, bantu memasak di sana, tidak ada orang sama sekali di sana.’

‘Excuse me miss, you are free right? Can I ask you a favor, could you help cooking over there, there is no one there.’

Erin: *O, inggih Pak. Mboten napa-napa kok.*

‘O, iya Pak. Tidak apa-apa kok.’

‘O, of course Sir. It’s fine.’

Bapa: *Ngapunten lo Mbak.*

‘Maaf lo Mbak.’

‘I’m sorry Miss.’

It is consistent with Yule (1996) arguing about a series of adjacent pairs that can be grouped into two parts. The first part contains a request and the second part is Pt’s response both positive and negative (rejection). Pt’s response also includes two things yet with reverse order to the one spoken by Pn. Pt’s response of “*o, inggih Pak*” indicates that Pt will do anything that Pn’s asked or ordered. Pt actually could respond this negatively by answering “*wadhuh, kula mboten saged Pak*” (I’m sorry Sir, I can’t), for example. However, the optional structure chosen by Pt is by willing to carry out the actions according to Pn’s wish. The second response by Pt is “*mboten napa-napa kok*”. It indicates response to Pn’s apology (or excuse) in the beginning of the speech. This response is comparable to the first positive response that Pt is willing to do what Pn ordered her to do and it is not disturbing Pt’s activities. Therefore, the speech act of apologize spoken with the speech act of optional structure has been positively responded by Pt.

h) Negated Speech Act

Negated speech act not only refers to speech act that contains negation marker, such as *ora*, *mboten ‘tidak’* (no), and *sanes ‘bukan’* (no), but also covers all types of negative speech act.

(18) Bu Mujad : *Pak, tulung Bu Juri dipunsanjangi mboten sah*

sms kula melih nagih utang. Kula lak pun janji sasi ngajeng.

‘Pak, tolong Bu Juri diberitahu untuk tidak sms saya lagi untuk menagih hutang. Saya kan sudah janji bulan depan.’

‘I’m sorry Sir, could you please ask Mrs. Juri for not sending me another text to collect my debt. I have promised her to pay it next month’.



Juri: *Ngene kie aku malih ora penak karo sampeyan. Peh, tenan aku njaluk sepura sing akeh. Aku ngrumangsani tenan yen salahku wis akeh neng sampeyan.* (Bn.Kp.11)

‘Begini ini saya menjadi tidak enak sama kamu. Peh, serius, saya minta maaf yang banyak. Aku merasa sekali kalau salahku sudah banyak ke kamu.’

‘I feel bad with you. I seriously apologize. I feel like I have so many mistakes to you.’

It is in line with Geoffrey (1983) stating that Pn communication activity prefers positive speech act to negated speech act. The existence of the words *malih ora penak* also indicates that Bu Mujad and Juri relationship is fine prior to the event. However, due to the misunderstanding, Juri feels bad to Bu Mujad and he apologizes. This negative situation causes Juri to apologize to Bu Mujad.

i) Affirmative Speech Act

Affirmative speech act is a speech that emphasizes approval of the proposition. In terms of apologizing, it affirms its proposition of desire to apologize.

(19) Sae : *Piye maneh Om, aku ya mung isa njaluk sepura, wong ancen ora sengaja.* (Bn.Kp.13)

‘Mau gimana lagi Om, saya cuma bisa meminta maaf, orang tidak sengaja.’

‘What else could I do, I could only apologize, I didn’t mean to.’

OmRo: *Ya angger kokdandani obrokku, omongna juraganmu.*

‘Ya asal kamu mau memperbaiki gerobak saya, bilang saja sama bosmu.’

‘As long as you fix my cart I won’t tell your boss’.

Before the narrative occurred, Sae’s truck accidentally hit OmRo’s noodle cart while backing away. OmRo was selling his noodle in front of the alley. The event has made OmRo’s cart overturned and damaged some of his equipments. Realizing his mistake, Sae apologizes to OmRo while helping him to take care of his goods. Sae’s regret is indicated by his speech act to apologize. In his speech act, he uses an affirmative word “*mung*”. Different to affirmative function used to affirm, this affirmative word indicates Pn’s insincerity and no seriousness in apologizing. It is evidenced by negative response from Pt. If the affirmative words of “*ya mungisa*” is omitted, then the speech act becomes more assertive.

(19a) Sae : *Piye maneh Om, aku njaluk sepura, wong ancen ora sengaja.* (Bn.Kp.13a)

‘Mau gimana lagi Om, saya minta maaf, saya tidak sengaja.’

‘What else could I do, I could only apologize, I didn’t mean to.’

j) Impersonal Speech Act

Impersonal form utilization as one of speech act of apologizes is an effort to maintain Pn’s as well as Pt’s negative face. By using impersonal in passive form will disguise the actor so as to reduce the threat to Pn’s negative face.

(20) Bu Ngade: *Bu, tulung apuranen tenan nggih, kula wingi kesupen saestu.* (Bn.Kp.14)

‘Bu, tolong maafkan saya, saya kemarin lupa beneran.’



‘Please forgive me ma’am, I totally forgot yesterday.’

Bu Ridu : *Halah, lali apa nglali?*

‘Halah, lupa apa nglupa?’

‘Did you forget or intentionally forget?’

Context in above narrative is when Bu Ngade and Bu Ridu is talking about debt payment. Both are neighbors and very close. Feeling guilty, Bu Ngade immediately apologizes to her neighbor. The speech act of apologize used by N is a passive form, whereas the active form of *apuranen* is *sepurane*.

(20a) Bu Ngade: *Bu, sepurane tenan nggih, kula wingi kesupen saestu.* (Bn.Kp.14a)

‘Bu, maafkan saya, saya kemarin lupa benar.’

‘Please forgive me ma’am, I totally forgot yesterday.’

Although both are deletion performative forms, the active form emphasizes more Pn’s activeness to apologize than the passive form where Pn seems to tell Pt to do something. It is not surprising that Pt’s response is unpleasant and it even seems sarcastic. This inappropriate strategy causes Pn’s apology is unacceptable by Pt even though Pn has made his speech act more polite by using the word ‘*tulung*’ (please).

k) Metaphoric Speech Acts

In metaphoric speech acts, Pn assigns certain symbol as a comparison. This is in line with (Penelope & Levinson, 1987) delineating that through metaphorical speech acts, Pn has deeply violated maxim of quality.

(21) Nasi: *Saukuranenabi ae rakyanduwesalah ta Cak-cak, apamanehaku sing menungsabiasa ngene.* (Bn.Kp.15)

‘Seorang nabi saja bisa melakukan kesalahan, apalagi saya yang hanya manusia biasa.’

‘Even a prophet made a mistake let alone I am a human.’

Maru: *Ya ancene ngunu Cak. Aku ya dudu nabi Cak, aku ya nduweni salah mbek pean.*

‘Ya memang begitu Pak. Saya juga bukan nabi, saya juga mempunyai salah ke Anda.’

‘It is what it is Sir, I’m also not a prophet, I also have a mistake to you’.

A week before the above narrative, Nasi scolded Maru’s kid who fought with his kid. In realizing his mistake, Nasi apologizes to the kid’s parents, which is his close neighbor. Nasi’s statement that compares him to a prophet is a form of metaphor to save him from a threat. It is an indirect form of apology from Nasi to Maru. Maru responds it by saying the same thing, meaning that all ordinary people must have a mistake.

l) Elliptic Speech Acts

This elliptic speech act form is a form of violation to maxim of quantity by Pn. The violation occurs since Pn does not totally deliver the true information to be conveyed to Pt. It is illustrated by a speech when Bu Karno reprimands OmRo (chicken noodle seller) who offer his noodle by hitting *kentongan* (a slit drum made from bamboo). She considers it as disturbing her baby’s nap. Following is data on the use of elliptic form to apologize.



- (22) Kamo: *Om, wis ojok dithuthuk maneh ya! Bayiku turu.*
'Om, jangan dibunyikan lagi ya! Bayiku tidur.
'Sir, please don't hit your *kentongan* again! My baby is sleeping'
OmRo: *Ya gak isok ngono bu, terus daganganku lek gak payu piye? Caraku ben enek sing tuku ya ngene iki bu.Dadiya.....(Bn.Kp.16)*
'Ya tidak bisa begitu bu, lalu dagangan saya jadi tidak laku gimana? Cara saya untuk memanggil pembeli ya begini bu. Jadi, ya
'I can't do that ma'am, what if my noodle is not sold? This is how I attract my consumers. So...
Kamo: *Ya tapi ojok banter-banter Om!*
'Ya, tapi jangan keras-keras Om!'
'Yes, but please don't be too loud Sir!'

It is supported by Penelope & Levinson (1987) that elliptic speech act is fully supported by communication context aspects. It means that, based on context aspects, Pn estimates that Pt could understand the substance of her/his speech act that is not final. The aspects that are not final, despite their important roles, have contained politeness element. To save his face, Pn did not end his speech act because he feels that he did nothing wrong; therefore, he is hesitate to apologize. As a consequence, he cuts his speech acts. The complete form of the speech act is:

- (22a) OmRo: *Ya gak isok ngono bu, terus daganganku lek gak payu piye? Caraku ben enek sing tuku ya ngene iki bu.Dadiya.....(Bn.Kp.16a)*

b. Discussion

The research results revise the results of previous studies on speech act of apologizes. The previous studies only specify the forms of speech act of apologize from the component aspect, whereas the current research adds the form from its operational aspects. Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984) express that there are nine forms of speech acts, namely (1) imperative mood speech acts, (2) explicit performative, (4) fenced performative, (4) statement of necessity, (5) statement of desire, (6) formulation of suggestions, (7) preparation of questions, (8) strong gesture, and (9) subtle gesture. These forms are also supported by Gunarwan (2007). House dan Kasper (Watts, 2003) suggest that there are twelve forms of speech acts, namely: (1) refined speech, (2) consultative form, (3) fenced speech acts, (4) understaters speech acts, (5) condescending speech acts, (6) form of agreement, (7) early warning speech acts, (8) speech acts of hesitancy, (9) initial coverage speech acts, (10) impersonal speech acts, (11) overstaters speech acts, and (12) emphasized speech acts. The forms of implicature speech act according to Suhartono (2005) consist of (1) fenced speech acts, (2) deletion performative speech acts, (3) expansion performative speech acts, (4) *oratio oblique* speech acts, (5) hybrid speech acts, (6) referenced and attributed speech acts, (7) deictic speech acts, (8) optional structure speech acts, (9) conditional illocutionary speech acts, and (10) negated speech acts.



According to the aforementioned experts' opinion, there is no classification of speech act forms with clear basis. Therefore, the experts' forms of speech act have differences and similarities. Referring to this and based on the analysis results, this research classifies forms of speech act used to apologize. The classification uses operational and component aspects as a base.

Operationally, the speech act forms can be classified into 10 forms, namely (1) imperative mood speech acts, (2) rhetoric interrogative speech acts, (3) explicit performative speech acts, (4) deletion performative speech acts, (5) expansion performative speech acts, (6) speech acts of statement of request, (7) speech acts of statement of desire, (8) understatement speech acts, (9) overstatement speech acts, and (10) early warning speech acts. In the perspective of its components, speech act form could be classified into 12 forms, namely: (1) fenced speech acts, (2) speech acts of hesitancy, (3) agreement speech acts, (4) hybrid speech acts, (5) referenced speech acts, (6) deictic speech acts, (7) speech acts with optional structure, (8) negated speech acts, (9) affirmative speech acts, (10) impersonal speech acts, (11) metaphoric speech acts, and (12) elliptic speech acts. Speech acts based on its component are dominated by explicit form in stating the word of "*sepurane*" or "sorry" and its synonym. This result is consistent with Sari et al., (2020) suggesting that speech act option that is appropriate to maxim of cooperation can influence the achievement of conversation goal.

Various factors influencing the speech act of apologize, namely (a) context factor, and (b) socio-cultural factors. The context factors of speech act consist of (1) mistake/motive, (2) speech act topics, and (3) speech act situation context. The socio-cultural identity factors of participants comprise two types, namely: (1) social factor, and (2) Javanese cultural factors. This result support Al-Rawafi (2020) study stating that there are internal and external factors that affect the selection and production of apology among students in Islamic boarding school using Arabic and English.

The social factors include gender, age, socio-economic status. The Javanese cultural factor influencing the speech act of apologize is the existence of the four principles of harmony and respect, among others (a) *kurmat*, (b) *andhap asor*, (c) *empan papan*, and (d) *tepa slira*. This finding is similar to a research by Sun (2019) that apology not only helps to understand more the principle of cooperation and politeness, but also promotes cultural communication.

4. CONCLUSION

Operationally, the speech act forms can be classified into 10 forms, namely (1) imperative mood speech acts, (2) rhetoric interrogative speech acts, (3) explicit performative speech acts, (4) deletion performative speech acts, (5) expansion performative speech acts, (6) speech acts of statement of request, (7) speech acts of statement of desire, (8) understatement speech acts, (9) overstatement speech acts, and (10) early warning speech acts. In terms of its components, speech act could be classified into 12 forms, namely: (1) fenced speech acts, (2) speech acts of hesitancy, (3) agreement speech acts, (4) hybrid speech acts, (5) referenced speech acts, (6) deictic speech acts, (7) speech acts with optional structure, (8) negated speech acts, (9) affirmative speech acts, (10) impersonal speech acts, (11) metaphoric speech acts, and (12) elliptic speech acts. Speech acts based on its component are dominated by explicit form in stating



the word of “*sepurane*” or “sorry” and its synonym. Forms of speech act of apologize that could be easily analyzed are those forms that have lexicon marker in the form of word or phrase of ‘*sepurane*’ or ‘sorry’ and its synonym. Whereas, speech act of apologize that has no lexicon marker of ‘*sepurane*’ or ‘sorry’ must be analyzed more critically and deeply. This analysis is based on the speech act context and response from Pt when Pn delivers his implicit apology.

It can be concluded that the form of speech act of apologize based on the component is an open form by supporting the principle of cooperation. In its disclosure, however, components indicating level of sincerity in the principle of politeness or that has meaning other than apologize are tucked into the same sentence.

This research has some limitations. The research focuses only on visible speech act data. It has not covered realm of effect or response occurred due to the use of the form of speech act of apologize. Suggestion offered as an input for further research is the need to study speech act of forgiving in Javanese language.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Alhamdulillah for the conveniences and blessings for all the favors and gifts, so that this paper can be completed. Thank you also to all parties who have been involved and helped such as reviewers, editors, and journal managers so that this article can be prepared properly.

6. REFERENCE

- Adipitoyo, S. (2011). Morfofonemik Bahasa Jawa. *Surabaya: Citra Wacana*.
- Afghari, A. (2007). A Sociopragmatic Study of Apology Speech Act Realization Patterns in Persian. *Speech Communication*, 49(3), 177–185.
- Ahmed, A. H. (2017). *The Pragmatics of Apology Speech Act Behaviour in Iraqi Arabic and English*.
- Al-Rawafi, A. A. (2020). *Apologizing in Arabic and English: An Interlanguage Pragmatic Case Study of Students at an Islamic Boarding School in Indonesia*. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Anshori, D. S. (2018). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Meminta Maaf pada Masyarakat Muslim Melalui Media Sosial di Hari Raya. *Lingua*, 14(2), 112–125.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 196–213.
- Borris, D., & Zecho, C. (2018). The Linguistic Politeness Having Seen on The Current Study Issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32–44.
- Chaer, A. (2010). *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Rineka Cipta.
- Chamani, F. (2014). Gender Differences in The Use of Apology Speech Act in Persian. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(6), 46–63.
- Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and Language*.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage.
- Dina, G. (2013). *Strategi dan Kesantunan Tindak Tutur Meminta Maaf Bahasa Jepang dalam Serial Drama “Ichi Rittoru No Namida”*. Universitas Brawijaya.



- Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Mardani, M. (2010). Investigating the Effects of Teaching Apology Speech Act, with a Focus on Intensifying Strategies, on Pragmatic Development of EFL Learners: The Iranian Context. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 30(1), 96–103.
- Geoffrey, L. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Gunarwan, A. (2007). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Kajian Nusantara*. Penerbit Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Hadi, A. (2013). A Critical Appraisal of Grice's Cooperative Principle. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 3(1), 69–72.
- Hikmah, I. (2017). Ketika Orang Jawa Meminta Maaf dengan Menggunakan Bahasa Inggris dari Perspektif Tindak Tutur. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 5(2), 95–106.
- Mufliharsi, R. (2017). Pembelajaran Tindak Tutur Meminta Maaf pada Keterampilan Berbicara Bahasa Inggris Siswa Kelas VII. *Faktor Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 4(2), 177–184.
- Murphy, J. (2015). Revisiting the Apology as a Speech Act: The Case of Parliamentary Apologies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 14(2), 175–204.
- Penelope, B., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. *Journal of Women s Health*.
- Sari, R., Chairunnisa, S., Gultom, K., & Sitio, E. S. (2020). Principle of Cooperation in Human Conversation. *JELITA*, 1(1), 27–34.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Duta Wacana University Press.
- Suhartono. (2005). *Implikatur Percakapan dalam Tuturan Berbahasa Indonesia Lisan Informal Masyarakat Tutur Mojokerto*. 2005.
- Sun, Y. (2019). The Analysis of Apology Speech in Big Bang Theory from the Perspective of Politeness Principle. *2018 6th International Education, Economics, Social Science, Arts, Sports and Management Engineering Conference (IEESASM 2018)*, 1–5.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics. Terjemahan*. Indah Fajar Wahyuni. 2006. Pragmatik.