



Realization Principle of Politeness in Internet Discussion among Three Hindus of Indonesian Discussion Group

AUTHORS INFO

Wayan Pageyasa
Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka
pageparadev@yahoo.com
+6285285591150

ARTICLE INFO

ISSN: 2502-6909
Vol. 1, No. 2, November 2016
URL: <http://usnsj.com/index.php/JEE/article/view/JEE012>

© 2016 JEE All rights reserved

Abstract

This study aims to gain a deep understanding of the realization of the principle of politeness in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group. Realization of politeness principle consists of compliance and violations. The research paradigm was qualitative. The method used was the pragmatic content analysis and inductive procedures. The research data was in the form of quotations dialogue in internet discussion that contains the realization of the principles of politeness. The data was obtained from the written record dialog in Internet discussion in three Hindu Indonesia group discussions. The results showed that in general the principle of politeness tends to be obeyed. It means that those involved in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group were generally considered polite in speaking.

Keywords: realization, politeness principle, internet discussion

A. Introduction

The application of the principle of politeness in society is crucial. Through the application of this principle, using language can provide coolness amid the turmoil of society as a result of differences in principles and beliefs alive. However, the application has not seen optimal yet, particularly in discussions on the internet.

Language in the discussion on the internet cannot be separated from the context of the cultural and social background. Therefore, a user language cannot act arbitrarily in language regardless of the cultural context and social background (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 626-627). In harmony with this, the importance of understanding the context has also been addressed by Gumperz on the topic Context and Communication (Eerdman et al., 2002, p. 82-83), and also an explanation by Hartley (1999, p. 34) on the importance of considering the social context in communication. Accordingly, Kramsch (1998, p. 56) also discusses the need to consider two types of context, namely the context of the situation and cultural context. It is in line with what is proposed by Achmad HP (1994, p. 75) that the discourse as language recording are used both in the context of social and cultural contexts. To understand the discourse, it needs the understanding of the social context and the cultural context.

Based on some opinions about the importance of understanding the context, it can be said that the understanding of the context of the main prerequisite for communication. Users who do not heed the language in the context of communication are the language users that failed to

communicate. The relationship between context and politeness is that an understanding of the context of communication helps a person to be able to choose a language appropriate to phrased politely. In addition, by understanding the context, a person will also understand whether the language of the partner he said politely or not. A speech may be called manners in a context, and can be considered not polite in other contexts.

By understanding the context, a person also understands and can apply politeness. By applying politeness, the relationship will be harmonious among communication participants. It is in line with the opinion of Wardhaugh (1986, p. 233) that one of the most important communication functions, as outlined by the theory of ethnography and ethnomethodology, is to maintain the continuity of the relationship between communication participants. The language uses as a tool contains rules that govern how people should communicate so that interpersonal relationships wearer maintained.

So, in connection with a communication function, then there is one principle that must be implemented, namely the principles of politeness. Thus, the importance of the realization of politeness in communicating. However, based on preliminary studies on the archipelago Hindu Network Discussion Forum on March 15, 2011, and in Cakrawayu discussion group on April 30, 2011, observed much use of language that does not concern this politeness principle.

Based on the description, the use of language on the Internet, particularly in the discussion group is deserved to be investigated. This study examines the realization of politeness in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group, namely Group Manawa Bhakti Vedanta, Hindu Network Discussion Forum Nusantara, and Cakrawayu. Realization question is compliance and violation of the principle. The main theories are referred to in this research is the theory of politeness principle by Leech. Reasons for study only in three group discussions is because, among dozens of Indonesian Hindu discussion group, only three of the group were high and popular. The foundation manages the three of the group, so vision and mission are trustworthy. Each group has more than 2,000 members.

Furthermore, consideration of doing research on a Hindu-based group that is because there is some cultural value system that turned out to be relevant to the Hindu principles of politeness. In Hindu culture, there is ahimsa or non-violence (Prabhupada, 1986, p. 541). That is, one should not harm or harm to others, including in terms of language. It is consistent with the principles of politeness.

Furthermore, in Hindu, there is also *Tattvam Asi*, which means me and you are the servants of God (Krishna, 2008, p. 11). So, it teaches about the similarity as a servant of God because both are servants of God, then the duly respectful and sympathetic. In Hindu culture Indonesia, there is *Tri Hita Karana*, which means three causes of happiness. Three causes are implemented in three harmony, namely: (1) the harmony of the relationship between man and God, (2) the harmony of the relationship between man and his fellow man, and (3) the harmony of the relationship between man and nature or environment (Ages 2007, p. 20). When referring to the harmony points (2), it is understood that the harmony of communication also requires harmony. In other words, harmonious communication is communication manners.

There is also the *Tri Kaya Parisudha*, which means three things that must be maintained and purified, namely: mind, language, and actions (Suhardana, 2006, p. 29). A person is said to be awake, and sacred language if not berate others, not to speak rudely, do not defamatory, and did not break a promise. It is in accordance with the principle of modesty. Moreover, in a work entitled *Sri Sri Siksastaka* compiled by Acyutananda and Jayasacinandana (1972, p. 20) there is a teaching that is also fundamental, namely humility (*trnad fire sunicena*), more tolerant than a tree and free of pride false (*taror fire sahisnuna*), and do not expect respect but are willing to give all respect to others (*amanina manadena*). Three points from the teachings of *Sri Sri Siksastaka* is in accordance with the principles of politeness.

Lastly, in Hinduism, there is also *Chess Paramita*, which means four noble deeds. The four acts it is *maitri* or friends, *karuna* or Compassion, *mudhita* or sympathetic, and *upeksa* or tolerance (Suhardana, 2006, p. 48-49). It is in line with the principle of politeness, especially *mudhita* relevant to *kesimpatian* maxims. Another consideration, there is a general assumption that the Bali postscript is a Hindu majority Indonesia has a smooth character, friendly, likes to work together, and polite language. At least, the impression was captured and expressed by people who never traveled to Bali. However, based on preliminary studies in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group was the observed discrepancy between the general perceptions which is the reality of the use of language, especially in the discussions. Already widely observed users of language do not concern the principle of politeness.

The general problem of this research is: how the realization of the principle of politeness in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group? The general problem is then broken down as follows. (a) How is the realization of the maxim of wisdom (tact maxim) in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group? b) How is the realization of maxims reception (approbation Maxim) in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group? (c) How is the realization of the maxim of generosity (generosity Maxim) in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group? (d) How is the realization of match maxims (maxim agreement) in the internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group? (e) How is the realization of the maxims of humility (modesty maxim) in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group? (f) How is the realization of maxims sympathy (sympathy maxim) in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group?

There are a number of experts who have written about the theory of politeness. Among them are Lakoff, Fraser, Brown and Levinson and Leech (Eelen, 2001, p. 2-13). Lakoff, as quoted by Rahardi (2005, p. 70), found that to make the speech is polite, there are three things to consider, namely: (1) formalities (formality) do not force, (2) indecision (hesitancy) means to make so hearer can determine option, and (3) the equation (equality) means to act as if you and your partner the same speech.

In other words, it can be stated that the speaker should not be forced, because naturally, everyone does not like coercion. Furthermore, the speaker gives the option to the hearer, because with so many options to answer or act, the partners will be comfortable. Likewise, speakers should try to "agree" to the hearer. With like-minded, said partner will also feel comfortable. Fraser distinguishes between civility (politeness) and respect (deference). According to Fraser, politeness is the property speech. Politeness means the speaker is not excessive in taking their rights or do not deny to meet its obligations. While homage is part of the activity that serves as a symbolic which means to express appreciation on a regular basis. If a person does not use the "slang language" to an official in his office, that person means respect to the officer's partner. However, behave respectfully doesn't mean behave courteously.

What is meant by the right here is something that belongs to the speaker or hearer, and the obligation is imperative that must be done by the participants of substitutions. Among the rights of speakers in a process of substitutions, it is right to ask, for example. However, this right is not without limits (Gunarwan, 2007, p. 188). So it can be concluded that in the communication, although the speaker has the right to speak, he is obliged to make the hearer comfortable. So is the hearer has an obligation to listen, besides the right to speak when his turn came.

Brown and Levinson (1996, p. 61-62) put forward the notion of politeness face (face). There are two aspects of politeness face, namely the face of the negative and positive face. The face of the negative self-image refers to any person who wishes that he appreciated the way let it free to act or let it free from the necessity of doing something. Furthermore, what is meant by advance positive is the opposite, namely referring to the self-image of every person desirous that what he was doing, what he has or what are the values that he believes, as a result of what was done or had it, recognized others as a good thing, which is fun, which is commendable, and so on.

Leech (1983, p. 132) proposed the theory of politeness based on the principles of politeness (politeness principles), which are translated into six maxims. The sixth maxim is tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. The principle of modesty is said by Grundy (2000, p. 145) as a phenomenon. He quoted Lakoff, Leech, and Brown & Levinson, that politeness principle has been considered to have far-reaching implications regarding the use of language, being the major determinant of language behavior, and is universal.

This study examines only the realization of the principle of politeness proposed by Leech. Realization of the principle is a real implementation of the principles, either compliance or violation. Consideration of these principles is chosen because of what Lakoff argued that a speech is said to be polite if he did not sound pushy or arrogant, speech that gives the option to the hearer, and the hearer feels calm, it is included in the maxims of politeness by Leech. So is the case with what is stated Fraser distinguishes between politeness and respect as well as an emphasis on the rights and obligations; Brown & Levinson with the theory of positive and negative face also are included in Leech's maxims. Moreover, what is proposed by Fraser and Brown & Levinson is a strategy, while what is examined (in this study) is studied the theory of maxims.

The realization of these principles includes compliance and violations. To facilitate the analysis made criteria adapted from Principles of Pragmatics by Geoffrey Leech (1983, p. 132) as follows.

Table 1. The Criteria for the Compliance of the Politeness Principle

No	Maxims	Speech Criteria
1	Wisdom	Benefit others
2	Reception	Self-harm
3	Generosity	Respect others
4	Modesty	Humbling oneself
5	Suitability	Agree opinions / ideas of others
6	Sympathy	Sympathy to others

The main objective of this research is to gain a deep understanding of the realization of the principle of politeness in internet discussion in three discussion groups Hindu Indonesia. The realization are: (a) the realization of the maxims of wisdom, (b) the realization of the maxim of acceptance, (c) the realization of the maxims of mercy, (d) the realization of the maxims of humility, (e) the realization of the maxim suitability and (f) the realization of the maxims sympathy.

B. Methodology

1. Research Design

This study used a qualitative approach. The method used was a pragmatic method of content analysis and inductive procedures. The categorization models that basis was a model Mayring (2011, p. 2). The data collected was obtained and analyzed, then grouped into categories defined previously. Aspects of text interpretation put into categories. Categories revised and verified along with the course of the analysis process.

2. Technique of Data Collection

To obtain data about the realization of the principles of politeness, researchers acted as an instrument of collecting data by using tools such as netbook devices, Internet devices, and printers. Netbooks and Internet devices were used for online into three discussion groups; printers were used to print the document (the outcome of the discussion). Examination of the validity of this research data used credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

3. Technique of Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted during and after data collection took place. During the data collection took place, it carried out activities to reduce the data, then create a summary, encode, select the data, summarize, and make tentative conclusions. The analysis after data collection referred to the analytical framework, namely the conclusion that the form of the findings of the documentation. The steps of the data analysis were: (1) data collection, (2) data reduction, (3) presentation of data, and (4) draw conclusions and verification.

C. Findings and Discussion

The research findings described in this section is the realization of the principle of politeness in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group. This realization included six maxims, which were wisdom maxim, acceptance maxims, generosity maxims, humility maxims, suitability maxims, and sympathy maxims. Each of these maxims is described compliance and infraction. The findings are presented in the following table.

Table 2. Findings on the Realization of the Politeness Principle

No	Group	Discussion Topics	Wisdom		Reception		Generosity		Modesty		Suitability		Sympathy		Notes	
			+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
1	BMW	Translation of Bhagavad Gita	19	12	22	9	20	11	22	9	19	12	27	4	✓	
2	BMW	Popularity Hare Krsna	7	7	6	8	6	8	6	8	6	8	7	7		✓
3	BMW	Vaikunta Loka	13	11	13	11	12	12	10	14	11	13	11	13		✓
4	BMW	Morality of Hindu	6	7	6	7	6	7	5	8	6	7	6	7		✓
5	BMW	Culture of Hare Krsna	8	11	2	17	8	11	6	13	5	14	5	14		✓
6	BMW	Atrocities in Lampung	8	12	8	12	10	10	5	15	7	13	9	11		✓
7	BMW	Prayer for Balinuraga	7	-	7	-	7	-	7	-	6	1	7	-	✓	
8	BMW	Teleconference Lampung Cases	7	3	7	3	7	3	6	4	7	3	6	4	✓	
9	BMW	The Law of Karma	13	19	12	10	13	19	10	12	15	7	12	10	✓	

No	Group	Discussion Topics	Wisdom		Reception		Generosity		Modesty		Suitability		Sympathy		Notes	
			+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
10	BMW	Leak Sanur	21	5	19	7	20	6	14	12	20	6	14	12	✓	-
11	CPB	Page Paradev Phenomenon	9	2	9	2	9	2	9	2	9	2	9	2	✓	-
12	CPB	Cremation	4	6	2	8	4	6	4	6	3	7	4	6		✓
13	CPB	Srila Prabhupada	4	6	3	7	4	6	3	7	3	7	3	7		✓
14	CPB	Radhastami	3	6	3	6	3	6	3	6	3	6	3	6		✓
15	CPB	Hare Krsna Lyric	3	7	3	7	3	7	5	5	4	6	5	5		✓
16	CPB	Opton Peaceful in Lampung	11	5	9	7	13	3	7	9	10	6	9	7	✓	-
17	CPB	Demonstration	20	1	19	2	20	1	19	2	20	1	20	1	✓	-
18	CPB	Lampung Heats Up.	6	1	6	1	6	1	4	3	4	3	4	3	✓	-
19	CPB	Arya Weda	11	4	12	3	12	3	12	3	12	3	12	3	✓	-
20	CPB	New Unrest	18	3	10	11	18	3	11	10	16	5	8	13	✓	-
21	JHN	Comments of Jusuf Kalla	9	9	7	11	13	5	7	11	10	8	8	10		✓
22	JHN	Demo for Lampung	11	8	9	10	15	4	11	8	14	5	14	5	✓	-
23	JHN	Balinuraga Attacked	18	5	17	6	20	3	17	6	20	3	17	6	✓	-
24	JHN	Tolerance	8	8	10	6	13	3	6	10	12	4	12	4	✓	-
25	JHN	Countermeasures of Unrest	10	12	4	18	5	17	6	16	9	13	10	12		✓
26	JHN	Kailasha	6	4	5	5	6	4	7	3	3	7	6	4	✓	-
27	JHN	Death ceremony (HK)	6	1	4	3	5	2	2	5	3	4	2	5	✓	-
28	JHN	Bhajan	10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-	✓	-
29	JHN	Church Inaguration	4	6	3	7	4	6	5	5	5	5	5	5		✓
30	JHN	Hindu Greeting	5	3	4	4	7	1	6	2	5	3	6	2	✓	-
Total			285	174	251	208	289	170	245	214	27	18	27	18	18	12

Notes

- BMW** = Discussion Groups Bhakti Manawa Wedanta
CPB = Discussion Group Cakrawayu Peduli Bali
JHN = Discussion Group Jaringan Hindu Nusantara
+ = compliance
- = violation

Based on the table in front, it appeared that the general principles of politeness tended to be obeyed. From Analysis of the total in 2754, there was 1618 comply and 1136 violated. If viewed from the analysis of each topic of discussion, then of the 30 topics of discussion, a total of 18 discussion topics that tend to adhere to the principle of politeness (+) and only 12 topics that tend to violate the (-).

From 18 discussion topics that tend to adhere to the politeness principle, there are two topics of discussion in which the results of the maxim analysis do not contain violations. They are Prayer for Balinuraga and Bhajan. On the topic of Prayer for Balinuraga, the violation is only found in the suitability maxim. As for the topic of Bhajan, no violation maxim is found. The table also shows that based on the analysis of the realization of the principle of six maxims of politeness, there is no maxim which tends to be violated.

A discussion of the realization of the principle of politeness in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group conducted every maxim as follows.

Realization of Wisdom Maxim

Compliance maxim of wisdom amounted to 285 and 174 infraction Leech (1983, p. 132) states that this maxim requires each participant to minimize the loss of others, or to maximize profits for others. If seen by inclination, it can be indicated that the maxim of wisdom tends to be obeyed. It can be interpreted that the speaker in internet discussion group in three general discussions of Indonesian Hindu are wise in speaking. In other words, in general, he said speakers tend to benefit partners. If the system is associated with Hindu cultural values in Indonesia, so these findings can be interpreted that the actors behave ahimsa because the discussion has been in discussions with a nonviolent language, so they do not harm their added partners. Then it could be said. In general, they have practiced Tri Hita Karana, especially regarding the harmony relationship between speaker and hearer. Furthermore, it can also be said that the general discussion actors have behaved in accordance with the Tri Kaya Parisudha, especially on waking and sacred language. With language like that, then the hearer will not be harmed.

Realization of Acceptance Maxim

The compliance maxim of acceptance is amounting to 251 and 208 infraction. Leech (1983, p. 132) states that this maxim requires each participant to maximize and to minimize the loss of self-advantage. If seen by inclination, it can be stated that the maxim of acceptance tends to be obeyed. It can be interpreted that the speaker in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group, in general, want to harm themselves for the sake of their partners. In other words, the speakers keep people happy and feel disadvantaged. It is in line with what was said by Watts (2003, p. 39) that modesty is the ability to please others (through the use of one's language). If it is associated with the value system of Hindu culture Indonesia, the findings can

be interpreted that the participants in general practice Tri Hita Karana, especially about the harmony relationship between speaker and hearer. Additionally, these findings also reflect that in general accordance with Sri Siksastaka, especially on humility (*trnad fire sunicena*) and do not expect respect, but willing to give all respect to others (*amanina manadena*). Humility means willing to harm them before the hearer. It also relates not to seek respect from others. By not looking for respect, then someone has sought to harm himself.

Realization of Mercy Maxim

Compliance maxim of generosity amounted to 289 and 170 infractions. Leech (1983, p. 132) states that this maxim recommends two things that condemn others as little as possible and bless others as much as possible. If seen by inclination, it can be stated that the maxim of generosity tends to be obeyed. It can be interpreted that the speaker in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group, in general, is not like they are willing to denounce or praise partners. In other words, the speaker is willing to respect partner. Apparently the speakers in the general context of the system still practice the Hindu cultural values, which is *ahimsa*, which means not to hurt others, which also includes not denounce others. In addition, it looks like practicing *Tatvam asi* that teaches about the similarity as a servant of God. Because both are servants of God, then it should respect each other. In addition, the teachings one of the *Trikaya Parisudha* teachings encourage people to purify words or utterance, the general still seem to be realized.

Realization of Humility Maxim

Compliance maxim of humility amounted to 245 and 214 of infraction. According to Leech (1983, p. 132), maxims humility leads every participant to maximize disrespect yourself or minimize respect to yourself. If seen by inclination, it can be stated that the maxims of humility tend to be obeyed. It can be interpreted that the speaker in internet discussion group in three general discussions of Indonesian Hindu are humble. They are willing to humble themselves to their partners. In other words, they are not arrogant. If it is associated with the value system of Hindu culture Indonesia, then these findings reflect that the teachings of Sri Siksastaka, namely *trnad api sunicena* (humility), *taror api sahisnuna* (more tolerant than a tree, free from pride false), and *amanina manadena* (do not expect respect but are willing to give all respect to others). In general, they are still practiced by the speakers.

Realization Match Maxim

Compliance maxims of match numbered 277 and 182 of infraction. Leech (1983, p. 132) states that the maxim of suitability outlines each participant to maximize compatibility between them, and minimize the mismatch between them. If seen by inclination, it can be stated that the maxim of matches tends to be obeyed. It can be interpreted that the speaker in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group matched with their partner. In other words, suitable means not argue. If it is associated with Hindu cultural values, then the findings can be interpreted that the speakers generally behave in accordance with *Catur Paramita*, particularly the fourth point, namely *upeksa* (tolerance). By keeping a match, then it can be called a speaker capable of tolerating differences of ideas.

Realization of Sympathy Maxim

Compliance with sympathy maxim numbered 271 and the offense 188. According to Leech (1983, p. 132), this maxim requires each participant to maximize the sympathy and minimize the antipathy to the partner. If seen by inclination, it can be stated that the maxim sympathy tends to be obeyed. It can be interpreted that the speakers in the discussion on the internet three Indonesian Hindu discussion group generally sympathizes with the partners. If it is associated with the value system of Hindu culture Indonesia, the findings can be interpreted that generally speaking has behaved *tattvam asi*, which is dear and sympathetic to all beings. It also seemed to behave in accordance with *Catur Paramita*, especially the third points, namely *mudhita* (sympathetic).

This study has limitations because the study is only on the realization of the principle of politeness by Leech. There are three types of politeness that are not assessed, namely politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson, Fraser, and Lakoff. In addition, there is an interesting and relevant to this politeness, but are not examined in this study, the relationship between the maxims of politeness principle by Leech with maxims in the principle of cooperation by Grice.

D. Conclusion

Conclusions of research on the realization of the principle of politeness in internet discussion in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group in general, the principle of politeness tends to be obeyed. From Analysis of the total 2754, there is 1618 of complying and 1136 violated. It means that the speakers involved in the discussions of internet in three Indonesian Hindu discussion group are generally considered polite in speaking. Recommendations of this study are divided into two, namely the recommendation of theoretical and practical recommendations. Recommendations theoretical research is necessary adding one more maxim to the principles of politeness, which is the maxim of tolerance. Furthermore, practical recommendation is broken down into five of the recommendations as follows: (a) Principles of politeness recommended for inclusion in the curriculum of Indonesian subjects to be taught in an integrative manner since Junior high school (SMP); (b) To other researchers: recommended to examine the relationship between compliance and violation of the principle of politeness with other principles, which is the principle of cooperation. In addition, it is also recommended to examine the linkage system of cultural values (besides Hindus) with language behavior which manifested itself in the realization of the principle of politeness; (c) To the lecturer's language: the results of this study is recommended to be used as embellishment of pragmatic teaching; (d) To the managers of internet discussion group: the results of this study is recommended to be used as input how moderate the discussion so that the internet discussion runs mannered; and (e) To the Hindu religious leaders: the results of studies recommended to be used as input in fostering to the people about the importance of polite language because apparently it is relevant to the value system of Hindu culture.

E. References

- Achmad H.P. (1994). "Gaya Berpikir, Latar Belakang Pendidikan, dan Kemampuan Menulis Mahasiswa IKIP Jakarta dalam Tiga Aspek Wacana: Keterpaduan, Keruntutan, dan Kelengkapan." *Disertasi*, IKIP Jakarta.
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. (1996). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eelen, Gino. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jarome Publishing.
- Eerdmans, Susan L., Carlo R. Prevignano, & Paul J. Thibault. (2002). *Language and Interaction: Discussion with John J. Gumperz*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company,
- Grundy, Peter. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gunarwan, Asim. (2007). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Kajian Nusantara*. Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya
- Hartley, Peter. (1999). *Interpersonal Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Jaman, I Gede. (2007). *Tri Hita Karana dalam Konsep Hindu*. Denpasar: Pustaka Bali Pos.
- Kramsch, Claire. (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krishna, Anand. (2008). *Tri Hita Karana: Ancient Balinese Wisdom for Neo Humans*. Surabaya: Anand Krishna Global Co-Operation.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Mayring, Philipp. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2), Art. 20;
- Prabhupada, Sri Srimad A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami. (1986). *Bhagavad-Gita As It Is*. Mumbai: The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.
- _____. (2007). *Pedoman Etika dan Pola Hidup Vaishnava*. Denpasar: Sampradaya Kesadaran Krishna Indonesia.
- Rahardi, R. Kunjana. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publisher.
- Suhardana, K. M. (2006). *Pengantar Etika dan Moralitas Hindu: Bahan Kajian untuk Memperbaiki Tingkah Laku*. Surabaya: Paramita.
- Swami, Acyutananda & Jayasacinandana Dasa. (1972). *Lagu-Lagu Para Acarya Vaisnava*. Jakarta: Pustaka Bhaktivedanta.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. (1986). *An Introduction of Sociolinguistics*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Watts, Richard J. (2003). *Politeness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.