

CROSS-CULTURE COMMUNICATION IN SOCIAL INTERACTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH VARIATION USED BY ART SHOP ATTENDANTS

Oleh: I Nengah Laba
Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Bali Internasional

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the study of factors influencing Cross-Culture Communication in Social Interactions. A total of 50 art shop attendants were surveyed and observed based on judgment sampling method (Llamas, 2007: 13; Estes, 2007:168-169). The research was conducted in the two famous tourist objects in Bali, Sanur and Kuta area. These two areas come into consideration due to the fact that people from different countries who have different culture and social backgrounds engaged and interacting with one another for multi purposes. The research method applied in this study is a descriptive-qualitative research using ethnographic methods (Moleong, 2011:34; Bungin, 2008:23; Estes, 2007: 171). This method involves careful and systemic observation of social and language practices. Data collection involves the assembling of a corpus of spoken data and elicitation process to investigate particular language forms (Llamas, Mullany, and Stockwell, et al 2007:14-15). Elicitation process and descriptive-qualitative analysis show that the factors influencing Cross-Culture Communication in social interactions are target, argument, language, knowledge, natural setting, interlocutors, and general convention which also caused the use of English variation. Implications are discussed for education and hospitality industry along with suggestions for future research.

Key words: cross-culture communication, variation, hospitality

1. INTRODUCTION

Language plays a very vital role in social interactions, particularly in the process of cross-culture communication. An Art Shop attendant, for example can only communicate with tourists and other travelers from different social and cultural background by means of language. This is in line with the function of language as an index of the culture in which language also serves as a tool to depict the cultural background of the interlocutors engaged in communication.

Tourism developments affect the dynamics of the community in using English language. In this regard, Beratha (2004:68) reveals a cross-culture communication both regional and global levels is occurring in Bali. Furthermore, Beratha states that the development of tourism requires a knowledge of how communicate and interact with people from different culture. From this perspective, an Art Shop attendant also needs to understand the origin and cultural background of tourists visiting the shop before determining a language form.

The form of language used in communication should not be judged simply by right or wrong, but it must be based on "valid" or not. In social interactions, communication validity is determined by a speech event in which strongly influenced by context of situation. This speech event involves certain communication factors such as time, place and the energy of the interlocutors. Fishman (1972:437) formulates it in a statement of, "Who speaks what language to whom and when ". Thus, any language variation is influenced by several factors. These factors may include sex, education, age, social and cultural background, economy as well as gender. Two main problems in this study are as follows: (1). What are the factors that influenced the use of English variation in cross-culture communication?, (2). What are the meanings contained in English variation used by the Art Shop attendants?The objectives of the study are:

- a. to identify, analyze, and explain the factors that influenced the use of English language variation in cross-culture communication.
- b. to identify, analyze, and explain the meaning generated in the choice of English variation used by Art Shop attendants.

The result of this study is also expected as a reference to the development of English language learning based on the understanding of cross-culture communication.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study involves cross-culture communication in social interactions depicted by art shop attendants and foreign visitors coming to the shop and the uses of English variation. The research method applied in this study is descriptive-qualitative research using ethnographic methods (Moleong, 2011:34; Bungin, 2008:23; Estes, 2007: 171). This method involves careful and systemic observation of social and language practices. The data is collected through the process of observation and research instruments in the form of pre-prepared questionnaires and open interviews. The research is conducted in Sanur and Kuta area from February to May 2012. The process of interaction among groups of speakers takes place naturally in the contexts of diverse topics. Since the objective of this study is to examine communication in social interactions, a judgment sampling technique was used in this research and the total of 50 respondents were administered and observed (Llamas, 2007: 13; Estes, 2007:168-169). With this technique the researcher knows in advance the type of speakers required for this study, e.g. social variables. In collecting the data, the researcher uses several instruments such as tape recorder, camera, and questionnaire. In addition to these three instruments, the researcher is the main instrument as participant observation through field notes and open interviews (Litosselti, et al. 2010:146). In accordance with this study design, data collection is carried out using interviews, field observations and documentation (Bungin, 2008:77-78). Data collection involves the assembling of a corpus of spoken data and this includes elicitation process to investigate particular language forms (Llamas, Mullany, and Stockwell, et al 2007:14-15).

Elicitation process done to sort out and simplify the data required in accordance with research problem. The results of the data elicitation are in the forms of words, phrases, sentences, phrases which are varied. Particular data is processed and analyzed with the approach of a sociolinguistic theory. The data is presented in a structured and systematic way to facilitate the analysis of the meaning lies behind socio-cultural phenomena in the communication depicted by the art shop attendants and the foreign visitors. Data analysis was performed using content analysis proposed by Berelson in Bungin (2008: 155-156). The data is presented according to the research problems using formal and informal methods (Sudaryanto, 1993:145). The interdependence of the language and culture are like two sides of a coin, the two are complementary. In this context, and when the language is defined as a communication tool it contains the elements of culture. Thus, language users are reflecting the culture and the culture of its own making can be disclosed or communicated by means of language. This is the initial basis of the process of cross-cultural communication. Gumperz (1972: 15) explicitly states that "the linguistic diversity in human societies is directly related to density of communication and communication is not governed by fixed rules; it is a two-step process in the which the speaker first takes the stimuli from the outside environment, evaluating and selecting from among them in the light of his own cultural background, personal history, and what he knows about his interlocutors'.

This statement indicates that the diversity of language in society and a communications link is not governed by standard provisions, but is a reciprocal process in which the speakers will be stimulated by external factors and adjust to the cultural background and understanding of the interlocutors.

Associating with cross-culture communication, Wierzbicka (1991a: 69) states that; (1) in different societies and different communities, people speak differently; (2) these different ways of speaking are profound and systematic; (3) these differences reflect different culture values, or at least different hierarchies of values; and (4) different ways of speaking, different communicative styles can be explained and made sense of, in terms of independently established different cultural values and cultural priorities. Exposuring the relationship between language and culture expressed by Wierbicka, it shows that the differences or language variations is mainly influenced by the background of the socio-culture of the interlocutors. Wierbicka further revealed that differences in speech and communication styles can be described the culture or at least defining a hierarchy of cultural values. This description suggests that the study of cross-culture communication is related to the study of cross-culture understanding which are closely related to the sociolinguistic study. In line with this and referring to the basic concept of intercultural communication, Grundy (2000:229) remarks that "intercultural pragmatics relates to how members of different cultural groups and React to accommodate socio-pragmatic differences". Grundy further explained that the way to communicate in a social structure is also strongly influenced by the context of the situation and the accompanying cultural affiliation. This

statement indicates that the groups of people who have different cultures have to consider and act in accordance with the socio-cultural differences so that the cross-culture communication is realized more effectively. This means that cross-culture communication can be defined as a form of communication involving interlocutors or people with different socio-cultural backgrounds.

The heterogeneous background of Art Shop attendants and tourists visiting Bali is a potential cause of English variation used in tourism sphere. According to Chaer (2004) Language variation is often caused by social interactions performed by individuals or groups of people from very diverse areas and the versatility of the language itself. This diversity is due to the influence of age, socio-economic background, gender, and the context of situation in the speech event. Labov's theoretical definition of language variation is "different ways of saying the same thing". Bailey and Lucas (2007) conceptualize language variation is universally defined as conveying the same things in different ways of expressing them. Hudson (1980: 24) states that "a variety of a language is a set of linguistic items with similar distribution and in terms of a specific set of linguistic items or human speech patterns including sounds, words, and grammatical features can uniquely be associated with some external factors like geographical areas or social groups ". Hudson describes the variation of the language either in the form of sound, words, and grammatical features can be strongly influenced by external factors and he emphasized that the external factors becoming more dominant of the cause of language variation. According to Eckert (2004:107), the study of language variation is focused on the user's language in terms of social background and geographical location. Implicitly, this statement stresses that variations in the language use lies on and influenced by the social and geographical backgrounds of the interlocutors..

To examine the meaning of English variation used by art shop attendants in cross-culture communication, it is necessary to discuss how the views of experts on meaning itself. Leech (1983) remarked that the study of meaning should be free from other subjects, except semantics. Leech further remarks that semantics can not also be separated from pragmatics in the use of language as a means of communication. The actual meaning is existed within the language forms becoming the study of semantics and the meaning raised on the 'surface' based on the context of situation of the communication is part of the sociopragmatic study. According to Lyons (1995), there are three kinds of meaning: 1) the meaning of the word, 2) the meaning of the sentence and 3) the meaning of utterances. Meaning of the word is lexical meaning described on dictionary. Lyons further explained that as a meaningful unit, words are said to have a composition of form and meaning. One form can imply several meanings (polysemy) or some forms can imply one meaning (homonymy). Meaning of the sentence according to Lyons is highly dependent on the grammatical structure of words that building the blocks of words. Halliday (1985) categorized meaning into four categories. They are experiential, interpersonal, logical and textual meaning. Experiential meaning is representing the real world or reality perspective based on the experience of the interlocutors. Interpersonal

meaning is seen as a process of social interaction. In this case the language is seen as an act, the language is not only an expression, but also as a form of social interaction between speakers and listeners. Logical meaning lies on the use of the word appears in grammatical structure, while the textual meaning is constructed by means of contextual relationships among the words in a text. Referring to the description of the meaning above, the meaning proposed by Halliday (1985) is the most appropriate theoretical background implemented in this study because Halliday conceptualized the analysis of meaning can not be separated from aspects of the speech event and context of use of the speech itself. In other words, the meaning is attributed to aspects of language use and socio-culture backgrounds of the interlocutors.

As an aspect of speech, language usage relatively changed according to the speech components in the socio-cultural context. Hymes (1972: 59-65) suggests the sixteen components of speech events which he claimed as universal components of speech. The sixteen components are classified into eight components known as the acronym of SPEAKING. These eight components include (1) setting and scene; (2) participant; (3) ends; (4) act sequence; (5) key; (6) instrument; (7) norms; and (8) genre. Hymes stated the eight components is integrated into the Ethnography of Speaking and changed it into Ethnography of Communication. Wardhaugh (1990: 10-11) stated the study of the relationship of language and socio-cultural context will result four possibilities. These may include social structure can influence and determine the structure of language; the structure of language and behavior can influence and determine the social structure; their relationship is reciprocal. Language and society influence one another; and the structure of language and social structure are not related at all because it stands on its own. This is the cornerstone of a comprehensive sociolinguistic study.

3. RESULT RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

The Data described below are obtained from interviews with the respondents and field observation.

No	Speech Event	English Variation		
1	Visitors approaching the Art Shop	<i>Yes, coming please and looking in the shop. What you want?</i>	<i>Hello, good morning. How are you? What you looking please?</i>	<i>Yes, sir. What you looking for? Please, come inside.</i>
2	Art shop attendants offering merchandises	<i>You want something?</i>	<i>What you looking for dar!. Can I help you?</i>	<i>Come here sir. Yes, this is a good one, good price, cheap.</i>
3	Visitors showing their interest to buy the merchandises	<i>Ok ok coming.</i>	<i>Thank you. I hope you buy this one.</i>	<i>Do you like this one?</i>

4	Art shop attendants showing merchandises	<i>You want this one. You want dress t-shirt?</i>	<i>Yes, coming inside please.</i>	<i>Sir, this one this is a good material. You can choose.</i>
5	Visitors would like to know more specific color	<i>What colour do you want?</i>	<i>What colour do you like?</i>	<i>What colour do you like? Come you choose.</i>
6	Visitors want to see certain size	<i>What size you like, L,M, XL. I will find for you.</i>	<i>What size do you want?</i>	<i>What size you like?</i>
7	Visitors want to see certain design	<i>What you like style?</i>	<i>What model do you like?</i>	<i>What design do you like, catoon, animal material. I have a lots stock.</i>
8	Visitors asking the price	<i>I give you 120 Rupiah</i>	<i>I will give you fix price.</i>	<i>I give you cheap price.</i>
9	Visitors bargaining the price	<i>You can less little</i>	<i>You can less my price.</i>	<i>No, this good price. Please, little bit more.</i>
10	Visitors accepting the given price	<i>Ok. Thank you</i>	<i>Ok. Thank you for your help.</i>	<i>Ok. Thank you.</i>
11	Visitors refusing the price	<i>Coming please. You buy. I give you good price</i>	<i>I hope you help for me.</i>	<i>Please buy one for me, for good luck because you are the first customer.</i>
12	Art shop attendants showing other merchandises	<i>You want T-shirt, singlet, dress</i>	<i>Maybe you need something else.</i>	<i>Yes, I have short, T-shirt, bag and I give you a cheap price honestly.</i>
13	Art shop attendants giving the change	<i>This you change</i>	<i>I give you change.</i>	<i>This is you change. Thank you very much.</i>
14	Art shop attendants interrupting the conversation of the visitors	<i>Hang on please. I want talking with you.</i>	<i>Excuse me, can I help you for looking something?</i>	<i>Yes, what you want. Please, tell me.</i>
15	Visitors explaining the price of the exactly the same merchandise is lower in other art shops	<i>Ok. I give you same price with other shop.</i>	<i>Ok. I will give you same price.</i>	<i>No, different darling, because this one a good material.</i>
16	Visitors requesting art shop attendants to send the purchased merchandises	<i>Ok no problem. I bring you to hotel</i>	<i>Ok. I will deliver your order.</i>	<i>Ok. I bring to your hotel and thank you for buying something in my shop.</i>

17	Art shop attendants asking visitors to wait.	<i>Ok. Waiting second minute. I will pick up something</i>	<i>Can you waiting, please.</i>	<i>Ok. Wait a minute. I will bring what you like.</i>
18	Visitors asking special discount	<i>Ok no problem. I can discount.</i>	<i>Ok I will give you good price.</i>	<i>Ok. Just little bit discount.</i>
19	Visitors have ever purchased merchandises at the art shop and willing to purchase other merchandises	<i>Ok. Coming back thank you. You shopping again</i>	<i>Thank you for you coming again. I hope you buy more in my shop.</i>	<i>Thank you, you come again. Please have a look again.</i>
20	Visitors leaving the art shop	<i>Thank you. See you. Come back again ya</i>	<i>Ok see you later</i>	<i>Thank you. Please you come again with me. Buy buy.</i>
21	Art shop attendants want the visitors revisit the art shop	<i>Ok come back again for shopping.</i>	<i>I hope you come again for buy something</i>	<i>Please, you come again. I'm waiting because you a good customer.</i>
22	Art shop attendants explaining the high valued merchandises	<i>This one so expensive because a good quality</i>	<i>This is good dress, different material. I hope you understand about this.</i>	<i>This one a new design and a good material.</i>
23	Art shop attendants explaining merchandises which are only sold at the shop	<i>This one rayon, this one catoon, which one do you like? Just in my shop</i>	<i>This dress only I sell in this shop. You cannot find in the other shop.</i>	<i>This thing just here in my shop, in other shop no have, only me.</i>

Empirical data above shows that English variation is unavoidable in cross-culture communication. For the purpose of this study, the focus analysis will be emphasized on factors influencing the use of English variation in cross-culture communication and language meaning in social context proposed by Halliday (1985). Six corpus data are discussed on this paper. The six data are as follows:

1. *Yes, coming please and looking in the shop. What you want?*
2. *Hello, good morning. How are you? What you looking please?*
3. *Yes, sir. What you looking for? Please, come inside.*
4. *You want something?*
5. *What you looking for, dar! Can I help you?*
6. *Come here sir. Yes, this is a good one, good price, cheap.*

Table 1

English Variation 1: *"Yes, coming please and looking in the shop. What you want?"*

Data	Language Function	Meaning
//Yes, coming please and looking in the shop. What you want?//	Vocative	interpersonal

On above speech, the art shop attendant uses positive sentence structure in requesting form, *"Yes, coming please and looking in the shop"*. This speech shows the language function of vocative in which the attendant has a target on the visitor to think, feel and react to the speech conveyed. The target itself is to make the visitor come into the shop to have a look on the merchandise. The speech is followed by an interrogative sentence; *"what you want?"* Though it could be considered impolite to use the direct question *"what you want?"* the attendant used it based on her knowledge of English and strongly influenced by her cultural and social background. So, the language interference of *"what you want?"* translated literally from *"mau apa?"* happens due to the natural setting of the speech event and the knowledge of the interlocutor. The speech *"what you want?"* indicates the meaning of interpersonal proposed by Halliday in which the speech is conveyed for the sake of social interactions that depicts the reality of the social relations between the attendant, representing Indonesian culture and the visitor, representing western culture shown on the usage of English variation.

Table 2

English Variation 2: *"Hello, good morning. How are you? What you looking please?"*

Data	Language Function	Meaning
//Hello, good morning. How are you? What you looking please?//	Metalingual	Textual

The shop attendant uses English variation in *interrogative form* *"How are you? What you looking please?"*. In accordance with theory proposed by Newmark, this speech variation has the function of metalingual. It's indicated by the utterance of *"How are you? What you looking please?"*. The speech variation is oriented on the language itself which structurally functioned to get a response from the opponent interlocutor. In this case a response from the visitor coming to the shop. The speech is preceded by greeting *"Hello, good morning?"* The greeting of good morning is influenced by the natural setting of the event taking place in the morning. What it's meant by natural setting in this study is, the speech event is always under the circumstances of time, space and energy. Referring to the theory proposed by Halliday, the utterance of *"hello, good morning"* to this case is classified into textual meaning that relates to the contextual or to the speech situation.

Table 3
English Variation 3: *"Yes, sir. What you looking for? Please, come inside"*

Data	Language Function	Meaning
// Yes, sir. What you looking for? Please, come inside //	Vocative	Experiential

The speech of, "yes, sir. What you looking for? Please, come inside" has a vocative function. From field observation, it is envisaged that the shop attendant trying to persuade and influence the visitors to come into the shop. The target is to make the visitor get into the shop and look for something to purchase. The language meaning insisted in this speech is experiential meaning in which the interlocutor (shop attendant) shows her experience handling domestic guests by asking, "Ya, Pak. Cari apa? Silahkan masuk ke dalam". Then, it directly transformed into the speech of "Yes, sir. What you looking for? Please, come inside". *Experiential meaning is said to be a representation of the interlocutor's experience on the speech situation in line with social reality.*

Table 4
English Variation 4: *"You want something?"*

Data	Language Function	Meaning
// You want something?//	Metalingual	Textual

The shop attendant uses English variation of "You want something?", a positive statement in an interrogative tone. It is used by the interlocutors to reemphasize their intent. In this case the shop attendant's intent to ask whether the visitors want to buy something or not. The way of asking a question of "You want something?" can be said impolite referring to the culture of the foreign visitors. Because of the knowledge of the interlocutor is limited, the direct question is used and this can be very offended for the visitors. Besides the target of the communication described in data analysis 1, the knowledge of the interlocutor also strongly influence English variation in cross-culture communication. Language meaning existed in the statement of, "You want something?" is textual meaning. It is clear since the meaning is raised based on the social interaction depicted by the contextual relation of the words within one unite text. The question of, "You want something?" shows that the shop attendant thought the visitor is interested in purchasing something in the shop. So, the attendant relates words in text in more simple and precise way. This indicates that the use of language itself influence the use of English variation in cross-culture communication.

Table 5
English Variation 5: *"What you looking for dar!?. Can I help you?"*

Data	Language Function	Makna
// What you looking for dar! ? Can I help you? //	Esthetic	Logic

The English variation of "What you looking for dar!?" depicts the esthetic function of the language in which the shop attendant uses the metaphor of 'dar!' at the end of question to make the visitors to feel happy and

closed, so he is willing to purchase something in the shop. The language meaning conveyed in the statement is the meaning of logic which describes the language structure of "Can I help you?". It is said to be logic because the statement is in line with its usage in social context where the attendant uses the language in accordance to the speech event and the shop attendant offers help to the visitors

Table 6

English Variation 6: *"Come here sir. Yes, this is a good one, good price, cheap"*

Data	Language Function	Meaning
//Come here, sir. Yes, this is a good one, good price, cheap//	Vocative	Interpersonal

It is shown that the shop attendant uses the English variation of imperative argument in a statement of *"Come here, Sir"* to attract the visitors purchasing the merchandise. The statement is followed by, *"Yes, this is a good one, good price, cheap"* to make the visitors even eager to purchase things. This is classified into vocative functioned of the language since the attendant trying to persuade the visitors coming into the shop and interpersonal meaning is clearly seen in that statement in which the statement of *is not only meant to show the merchandises but also depicting the reality of the social interaction between the attendant and the visitors.*

The discussion above shows that English variation has been unavoidable in cross-culture communication. Based on the data analysis and field observation, the effectiveness and/or the non-effectiveness of cross-culture communication depicted in the use of English variation is *target prior to communication and social interaction. This is clearly shown by the art shop attendant and the visitors engaged in social interaction where the shop attendant targeted the visitors coming into the shop and the visitors targeted purchasing something in the shop in good price. In accomplishing their target, both the attendant and the visitors gave arguments depicting in their ways of persuading, offering, bargaining, etc. For giving an argument, they have to use certain form of language and this can be verbal or non-verbal language. The choice of either verbal or non-verbal language is influenced by interlocutors' knowledge and natural setting of the social interaction. In this study, the interlocutors are the shop attendants and the visitors coming to the shop. The concept of natural setting in Bali is known as the concept of Desa (place), Kala (time) and Patra (custom) which strongly influenced the flow of communication. In this context, the place and time of the speech event plays significant role in communication. It is depicted that the English variation is expressed strongly different in the area of Sanur and Kuta. Generally speaking, it is found out that English variation used by art shop attendants in Kuta area in more direct ways, e.g. *You want something?; You want T-shirt, singlet, dress ; and this you change and more indirect ways in Sanur area, e.g. What you looking for dar!. Can I help you?**

It is found out that there is a *general convention at the end of communication between art shop attendants and visitors.* This general

the effectiveness and/or the non-effectiveness of cross-culture communication depicted in the use of English variation is the *target prior to communication*. The analysis shows that the result of the study is the link of the target and general convention lies within the framework of cross-culture communication in social interactions is greatly influenced by the process of communication itself.

The process of communication is consisting of argument, language, knowledge, interlocutor and natural setting. This is theoretically conceptualized as Sociography of Talking depicted in Communication Triangle. The result of this study might be purposeful for people engaged in cross-culture communication such as English teachers and workers in hospitality industries to consider the concept of Sociography of Talking depicted in Communication Triangle in order to avoid misunderstanding and, particularly for English teachers, for the benefits of running English teaching process in different class settings

The findings of this study may not generalize the English variation used hospitality industry and the other limitation is that this study used limited data extracted only six spoken data of English variation. Moreover, the correspondents are mostly coming from the lower social backgrounds and research conducted in two areas. Therefore, this might not entirely reflect world wide cross-culture communication. Future research should take these limitations into consideration and can use data from several cross-culture communication perspectives such as using more formal communication settings.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Austin, J.L. 1976. *How to Do Things with Words*. Great Britain: J.W. Arrow Smith Ltd.
- Bailey, R. and Lucas, C. 2007. *Sociolinguistic Variation: Theories, Methods, and Application*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beratha, Ni Luh Sutjiati. 2004. *Semantik dalam Perspektif Komunikasi Lintas Budaya*. Dalam Aron Meko Mbete (ed) *Linguistika*, Volume II 20 Maret 2004. Denpasar : Universitas Udayana.
- Bungin, H.M.B. 2008. *Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.
- Chaer, Abdul dkk. 2004. *Sosiolinguistik Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Eckert, P. 2004. *Variation and a Sense of Place*. In: Fought, C., editor. *Sociolinguistic Variation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Estes, N.S. 2007. *Sociolinguistic Fieldwork*. In: Bailey, R. and Lucas, C. Editors. *Sociolinguistic Variation: Theories, Methods, and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, J. A. 1972. *Domain and the Relationship between Micro-and Macrosociolinguistics*. In: Gumperzs, Jhon. J and Hymes, D. editors. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Foley, W.A. 1997. *Anthropological Linguistics*. UK: Blackwell Publisher, Inc.
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing Pragmatics*. London : Oxford University Press Inc.

- Gumperz, Jhon. J. and Hymes, D. 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text : Aspect of Language in Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria:Deakin University.
- Hymes, D. 1972. *Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life*. In: Gumperzs, Jhon. J and Hymes, D. editors. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Hudson, R.A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Llamas, C., Mullany, L., and Stockwell, P. *et al.* 2007. *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. New York : Routledge.
- Llamas, C. 2007. *Field Methods*. In: Llamas, C., Mullany, L., and Stockwell, P. Editors. *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. New York : Routledge.
- Leech, G. 1983. *The Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group, Ltd.
- Littosselti, L. 2010. *Research Methods in Linguistics*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Lyons, J. 1995. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moleong, Lexy J.2011. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press
- Wardhaugh, R. 1990. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1991a. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantic of Social Interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter