

The politeness of criticism speech acts in Japanese and Minangkabau films

Nuria Haristiani^{1*}, Amelya Septiana¹, Nor Fariza Mohd. Nor², and Nagata Ryota³

¹Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudi No.229, Isola, Sukasari, Bandung City, West Java 40154, Indonesia

²Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

³Hiroshima University, 1 Chome 3-2 Kagamiyama, Higashihiroshima, Hiroshima 739-8511, Japan

ABSTRACT

Criticism tends to be a face-threatening speech act that can endanger social relationships if not managed using appropriate strategies, especially in the intercultural context. This study aims to compare and contrast the politeness of criticism speech acts used in Japanese and Minangkabau languages as depicted in film series. The data on criticism speech acts in this study were collected from eleven Japanese film series with a total duration of 538 minutes and eight Minangkabau films with a total duration of 535 minutes. The collected data were formed into a set of data cards, classified based on the criticism speech acts strategies by Nguyen (2005), and analyzed based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. The data classification in Japanese and Minangkabau was validated through the expert judgment process. The findings indicated that the Japanese and Minangkabau languages employed the same set of criticism speech act strategies but had different tendencies. In Japanese, speakers tend to use indirect strategies as their main criticism speech act strategy by 'asking/presupposing,' 'correction,' and 'advice for change.' Meanwhile, in Minangkabau, speakers tend to use direct strategies by using 'negative evaluation,' 'expression of contradiction,' and 'disagreement' strategies. Regarding the politeness strategy, off-record politeness strategies are more dominantly used among Japanese speakers. In contrast, Minangkabau speakers use bald on-record politeness strategies in criticism speech acts, reflecting their communication culture. The findings of this study provide a deeper understanding of criticism speech acts and politeness strategies. The study is expected to contribute to the area of research on intercultural communication and sociolinguistics.

Keywords: Criticism speech acts; Japanese; Minangkabau language; politeness

First Received:

30 June 2022

Revised:

19 April 2023

Accepted:

25 May 2023

Final Proof Received:

27 May 2023

Published:

31 May 2023

How to cite (in APA style):

Haristiani, N., Septiana, A., Nor Fariza, M. N., & Nagata, R. (2023). The Politeness of criticism speech acts in Japanese and Minangkabau films. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 131-148. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i1.58272>

INTRODUCTION

The way someone expresses communication strategies and uses language with speech partners to convey messages is known as speech acts (El-Dakhs, 2020; Saleem et al., 2021). Speech acts are actions performed via utterance (Nasser, 2022), which are determined psychologically by the speaker's ability to deal with certain situations and

are influenced by the situation behind a particular speech (Minchin, 2011; Myers-Scotton, 2020). When communicating or carrying out speech activities, speakers not only convey messages but also build good interactions with their interlocutors (Cooren, 2015; Malyuga et al., 2019). For interactions to be properly created, speakers need to apply certain communication strategies to convey

* Corresponding Author
Email: nuriaharist@upi.edu

messages to the interlocutors through direct or indirect speech (Takamiya, 2018). The way in which someone expresses communication strategies and uses language with their speech partners to convey messages is known as speech acts.

One of the speech acts that is often misunderstood in communication, especially in cross-cultural communication, is criticism (Hosseinizadeh, 2019; Kittler, 2018) because it often creates unpleasant effects on the speech partner. Criticism speech acts tend to be threatening and are closely related to the concepts of face and politeness which vary among societies and cultures (Chelangat, 2019; Xafizovna, 2022). Moreover, in the context of criticizing, cultural differences also affect how an individual criticizes, with regards to choosing the appropriate expressions and strategies as well as politeness standards based on the culture (Paltridge, 2006). Therefore, speakers need to use appropriate speech act strategies and pay attention to politeness in criticizing with the aim of not offending the other person's feelings (Peng, 2020).

Several relevant previous studies have explored speech acts including criticism speech acts in cross-cultural contexts involving Japanese, Indonesian and regional languages in Indonesia. These studies cover various aspects, such as studies of directive speech act strategies in Japanese and Minangkabau focusing on politeness (Putri & Haristiani, 2021), Japanese and Javanese greeting terms (Rahayu et al., 2023), refusal speech acts in the context of politeness between native Japanese speakers and Japanese Indonesian language learners (Nurjaleka, 2019), interlanguage apology and complaint speech acts in Japanese and English (Tamanaha, 2003), expressions of reference used in Malay and Japanese speech acts (Okubo et al., 2022), speech acts from a referential perspective in German and Japanese (Matoba, 1996), and a study of Japanese language apology speech acts by Javanese and Sundanese Japanese learners (Savana & Meisa, 2021). Regarding politeness, Japanese speakers tend to use negative politeness strategies, while other contrasting languages such as Chinese, English, Indonesian, and Sundanese prefer positive politeness strategies (see e.g., Abe, 2006; Haristiani et al., 2021; Ikeda, 1993; Nurjaleka, 2019). Although many studies on speech acts have been conducted in various contexts, research specifically focusing on criticism speech acts in cross-cultural contexts remains limited. It is particularly crucial and still uncommon to compare languages with the same honorific language system, such as Japanese and regional languages in Indonesia, including Minangkabau. Comparing these two languages – Japanese and Minangkabau – and their culture is invaluable for providing a deeper understanding of speech acts from a politeness point of view, particularly regarding criticism of speech acts and

the politeness strategies used in various international languages in general.

Minangkabau people are an ethnic group of people living in the Minangkabau highlands of West Sumatra, Indonesia who are very concerned about ethics and manners in speech and social relations. They hold a cultural concept of politeness called *kato nan ampek* (four words) as rules and guidelines in speaking and acting, including when criticizing. Chaniago and Alfikri (2022) disclosed that the *kato nan ampek* concept referred to the four communication styles practiced by the Minang people, namely *kato mandaki*, *kato manurun*, *kato mandata*, and *kato malereng*.

Kato mandaki is a rule of communication that is used to interact with someone older than the speaker. *Kato mandaki* is characterized by the specific use of grammar, clear expression, and special first, second, and third-person pronouns. The special pronouns, for example, include *ambo* for the first person, *mamak*, *inyiak*, *uda*, *tuan*, *etek*, *amai*, and *uni* for the second person (elders), and *beliau* for the third person. The second communication style is *Kato menurun*, a communication style to interact with someone younger. This communication style is characterized by the use of correct grammar with shorter sentences and special first, second, and third-person pronouns, like *Uni/uda*, *Awak den* or *Awak aden* for the first person, *Awak ang* for the second person (male) and *Awak kau* for the second person (female), while *Awak nyo* is used for the third person (Chaniago & Alfikri, 2022).

The third communication rule is *Kato mandata* which is a polite form of speaking to peers. This is equivalent to a common language such as slang. The first, second, and third-person pronouns used in *kato mandata* are also special, such as *Aden* or *Den* for the first person, *Ang* for the second person (male) or *Kau* for the second person (female), and *Inyo* or *anyo* for the third person. Lastly, *Kato malereng* is a communication style that is used when communicating with someone who is respected by the community or by the custom in the Minangkabau society. This communication style includes the use of appropriate grammar and more proverbs such as parables, allegories, or satire. The first, second, and third-person pronouns used in *Kato malereng* are also special. *Wak ambo* or *Awak ambo* is used for the first person, while the title and kinship title given by the family to the second person is *Angku*. *Baliau* is used for the third person (Chaniago & Alfikri, 2022).

Similar to the Minangkabau language, the Japanese uses a certain way of expressing politeness in communication. Japanese is one of the languages that possess an honorific language system and put an emphasis on politeness in communication (Obana, 2020), especially when Japanese people need to criticize their speech partner (Peng, 2020). In Japanese, a variety of honorific languages to

show respect to the speech partner is called *Keigo*. *Keigo* is divided into *sonkeigo*, *kenjougo*, and *teineigo*. *Sonkeigo* is an honorific style of speaking to honor the speech partner or the person being spoken to by elevating the degree of the person. For example, in a sentence such as '*bucchou wa irasshaimasuka?*' (Is the manager available?), *irasshaimasuka* is the honorific form of *ita* (be/available) and is used in this situation to honor the 'manager.' *Kenjougo* is another variety of honorific language used to show respect to another person or a person who is the topic of conversation by demeaning the speaker. For example, in a sentence such as '*watakushi wa Indonesia kara mairimashita*' (I came from Indonesia), *mairimashita* is the demeaning form of *kita* (came) and used in this situation to honor the hearer. *Teineigo* is the most basic form of honorific language in Japanese, which is composed by adding an auxiliary verb *-masu* or copula *-desu* at the end of a word or sentence. For example, in '*hon o yomimasu*' (reading a book), *yomimasu* is a polite form of *yomu* (read). This concept of honorific languages in Japanese is reflected not only in special expressions but also in personal pronouns that can also be seen in criticism speech acts (Obana, 2020).

Criticism of speech acts, as a form of language variation, can be expressed both in written and oral forms (Wibowo, 2022). Criticism speech acts require the speakers to adopt a particular stance, which is influenced by how they express their criticism. Criticism speech acts could also be observed in audio-visual media (Barón & Celaya, 2022), one of which is films. Films demonstrate real speech as expressed by the characters in the films as well as body language and gestures that can be observed directly (do Nascimento, 2019). In addition, films can also represent phenomena and social realities that occur in real life (Moura & Bispo, 2020).

Prior studies on speech acts suggested movies as good data sources for study on discourse analysis since they are similar to real-life phenomena (e.g., Rizki & Golubović, 2020). When examining criticism speech acts, prior studies have emphasized the importance of positive, clear, and accurate criticism, as it can influence behavioral changes in individuals. Positive criticism speech acts help in avoiding conflicts between interlocutors (Globočnik et al., 2022). Several studies also revealed other types of speech act strategies employed in criticism such as direct and indirect strategies (Hosseinzadeh, 2019), humor strategies, criticizing in unclear language, and developing empathy (Peng, 2020). In terms of politeness, the criticizing strategy is characterized by speaking frankly without small talk or with a positive politeness strategy (Halawa et al., 2019; Nofrita, 2016), using greeting words and employing declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentence types (Alfersia, 2016; Halawa et al., 2019;

Nofrita, 2016). Furthermore, research on criticism speech acts has been carried out in several contexts, such as exploring the relationship between teachers and junior high school students using Leech's theory (Peng, 2020), examining how English students in Vietnam criticize their peers (Nguyen, 2008), and analyzing criticism within the context of race and power among diverse ethnic groups in Hawaii (Marlow, 2010).

Past studies that have been described examined the criticism speech act strategies and their relation in several contexts. These contexts include the relationship between teachers and junior high school students (Peng, 2020), native speakers and foreign language learners at universities, doctoral students and supervisors (Li & Seale, 2007), and Facebook and novels (Nofrita, 2016). These studies have examined several target languages, including English (Nofrita, 2016), Arabic (Darweesh, 2011), Indonesian (Halawa et al., 2019), Persian (Hosseinzadeh, 2019), Iranian (Farnia & Sattar, 2015), Vietnamese (Nguyen, 2005; Hoa, 2007), English (New Zealand) (Nguyen, 2013), Chinese (Cao, 2005), and Javanese (Gunawan, 1996). In terms of politeness, past studies have examined politeness in two types of speech acts, namely prohibition and criticism, in the Indonesian context (Halawa et al., 2019). Some prominent variables explored in these studies include age, gender, and the degree of relationship between the participants.

However, previous studies that have explored criticism speech act strategies in various contexts have revealed a gap in research when it comes to examining the specific forms and strategies of criticism speech acts and comparing them across different languages and cultures. Although some studies were carried out in comparing Japanese and other national languages, a comparative study investigating the criticism speech act strategies and expressions between Japanese and other languages that similarly possess honorific language systems, such as the Minangkabau language, is rare. Moreover, none of the mentioned studies investigated the strategies of criticism speech acts from the politeness perspective while also highlighting the cultural characteristics in cross-cultural contexts. It is noteworthy that Goddard and Wierzbicka (2007) emphasized the importance of cross-cultural studies to minimize cultural misunderstandings and conflicts.

Based on the discussion and gap from previous research, this study aims to investigate criticism speech acts strategies in Japanese and Minangkabau languages. By analyzing the results through the lens of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, we aim to gain insights into the distinctive characteristics of criticism speech act strategies in these two languages. In addition, the number of Japanese language learners in Indonesia is the second highest in the world, and the number of

Japanese language learners who are Minangkabau language native speakers is rather significant (The Japan Foundation Survey, 2020) and this number continues to increase every year (Kawai, 2015). Therefore, this study is considered valuable as a reference to enhance intercultural communication competence which has become an important mission of higher education (Taguchi, 2014) and for Japanese language learning in general.

METHOD

A qualitative descriptive method was employed in this study to analyze the verbal data containing criticism speech acts in eleven episodes of Japanese films with a total duration of 538 minutes and eight Minangkabau films with a total duration of 535 minutes. The data sources of Japanese and Minangkabau films are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
The Japanese and Minangkabau Films Used as Data Source

Title	Year	Duration
Japanese film		
Great Teacher Onizuka (11 episodes)	2012	538 minutes (± 9 hours)
Minangkabau films		
Surau and Silek	2017	90 minutes
Surau Tingga	2019	46 minutes
Miang di Kampung Surang	2019	49 minutes
Bungo Basalo Duri	2020	45 minutes
Panyambung Iduik	2020	100 minutes
Sapayuang Sassok Kumayan	2021	75 minutes
Dendang Parintang Rusuah	2021	60 minutes
Lego Balai di Ujuang Sanjo	2021	70 minutes
Total duration		535 minutes (± 9 hours)

Some considerations were taken into account in the selection of the Japanese and Minangkabau films. Firstly, the selected films include many scenes with numerous criticism speech acts that serve various functions. As asserted by Rizki and Golubović (2020), the film is considered appropriate as a medium for linguists to study speech acts and functions because film effectively delivers messages which sufficiently reflect communicative interaction. Secondly, the films selected for this study were chosen among the most popular films on the streaming platform, Crunchyroll. As for Minangkabau films, they were selected over multiple years due to limited production. The films are less popular than those in Indonesian, resulting in fewer productions in a year. However, it has been noted that the use of the Minangkabau language in these films did not show a significant change. The

reason could be due to the fact that the difference in the production between the films was only about a span of a year.

In addition, obtaining other data sources such as talk shows or reality shows is challenging because there are no reality shows or talk shows specifically using the Minangkabau language. Due to this reason, using such data sources may cause data imbalance, and it will be difficult to determine how criticism speech act strategies are employed in both languages. Therefore, talk shows and reality shows are not advisable as data sources. Moreover, the films used in this study are considered realistic as they depicted the daily life of both the Japanese and the Minang people, making them an effective and communicative medium for studying speech acts (Rizki & Golubović, 2020).

The data collected from the films were then categorized based on a classification of criticism realization strategies and modifiers adapted from Nguyen (2005). The analysis involved methods and techniques, including observation, data recording, data transcription, and note-taking. Data cards were used to record the results of the transcription data based on the dialogue in the films. The data were also validated through scrutinized observation.

There were 611 data on criticism speech acts that included direct and indirect criticism speech act techniques identified in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages, according to Nguyen's framework for criticism speech acts (2005). Additionally, the data were categorized into six sub-strategies of direct criticism speech act strategies namely negative evaluation, disagreement, expression of contradiction, problem identification, statements of difficulty, and consequences, and into ten sub-strategies of indirect criticism speech act strategies namely correction, indicating standard, lecture, demand of change, request for change, advice for change, suggestion for change, expression of uncertainty, and asking/presupposing (Nguyen, 2005).

To gain further insights into the politeness strategies and cultural differences between the Japanese and the Minangkabau languages, an analysis was conducted on the similarities and differences of criticism speech act strategies in Japanese and Minangkabau. The data were also analyzed using Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy theory (1987), including its four main strategies namely bald on record, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, and off record. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory was employed in this study because it is considered the most suitable theory to comprehensively analyze and describe the politeness strategies of both the

Japanese and Minangkabau languages, including the cultural aspects. In addition, this study aims to focus on bald-on-strategy, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategies, which are not addressed in other politeness theories (e.g. Azis, 2000; Grice, 1975; Leech, 1983). The reason for adopting Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory in this study is to facilitate comparisons with previous findings regarding speech acts in Japanese and Indonesian – and Indonesian regional languages including the Minangkabau language. These previous studies applied the same politeness theory framework in their analysis (Borris & Zecho, 2018; Haristiani & Danuwiyaja, 2017; Haristiani et al., 2021; Rosari, 2016) strengthening the analysis in the present study.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To reiterate, 611 data on criticism speech acts were collected in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages. Each speech act strategy in the two languages was then classified into two main categories namely direct and indirect criticism speech act strategies, including their respective sub-categories. Each type of strategy is discussed in the following sub-sections.

The Strategies of Direct Criticism Speech Acts in the Japanese and Minangkabau Languages

Table 2 presents the distribution of direct criticism speech acts strategies in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages. A total of 312 direct criticism speech act strategies were found in both languages, with 95 strategies in Japanese and 217 strategies in the Minangkabau language. The data of this study show that the Minangkabau language used direct criticism speech act strategies with a much higher frequency compared to Japanese. In Japanese, the four most commonly used strategies were 'negative evaluation' (43,16%), 'disagreement' (21,05%), 'statements of difficulty' (16,84%), and 'consequences' (7,37%), respectively. While in the Minangkabau language, the four most commonly used strategies were 'negative evaluation' (31,8%), 'expression of contradiction' (20,74%), 'disagreement' (17,51%), and 'problem identification' (11,98%), respectively. The data indicate that both languages share a similarity in expressing direct criticism through the use of negative evaluation as the main strategy. However, besides negative evaluation, Japanese tends to express disagreement and state difficulty as their direct criticism speech act strategies, whereas Minangkabau tends to express contradiction and disagreement strategies to express direct criticism. Only the four most frequently used sub-categories of

strategies namely 'negative evaluation,' 'disagreement,' 'expression of contradiction,' and 'statement of difficulty' will be further analyzed in this section.

Table 2

The number of direct criticism speech act strategies in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages

Direct Criticism Strategies	Japanese	Percentage (%)	Minangkabau	Percentage (%)
Negative Evaluation	41	43,16	69	31,80
Disagreement	20	21,05	38	17,51
Expression of Contradiction	6	6,32	45	20,74
Problem Identification	5	5,26	26	11,98
Statements of Difficulty	16	16,84	21	9,67
Consequences	7	7,37	18	8,30
Total	95	100	217	100

'Negative Evaluation' Strategy

'Negative evaluation' strategy is a strategy that is generally expressed through negative evaluations (Nguyen, 2005). Examples of direct criticism speech acts with negative evaluation are presented in the following sections.

(1) Japanese (FJ/1/GTO1)

Kyō wa 5 fun okurete.. Mezurashii ne.

Doresuappu shite fuku o erabu no ni nagai

jikan ga kakarimasu. Kyōshi to shite no anata

no kenshin wa mada fusoku shite imasu.

"It's rare today to be 5 minutes late. Take a long time to dress up and choose clothes. Your dedication as a teacher is still lacking."

(2) Minangkabau (FM/14/LB)

Dak ado taratiak kau ko. Urang minang tau jo kato nan ampek.

"There is no ethics of yours. The Minang people know in four words."

The statement in example (1) was conveyed by the principal to one of the teachers who arrived late to school. This behavior, however, is uncommon for the teacher. The utterance is delivered by the speaker who has higher power status (principal) than the speech partner (the teacher). On the other hand, the Minangkabau speech in example (2) was uttered by an uncle (the speaker) to his nephew (interlocutor) because of the interlocutor's attitude

which was considered to lack ethics and manners. The nephew entered the house without permission during the village elder's presence (Panzarino, 2019; Svenning, 2018; Svenning et al., 2021).

From the two examples, the principal and the uncle used negative evaluations when criticizing. This tendency to use negative evaluation in this film is attributed to the close relationship between the speaker and the hearer (Czyżowska et al., 2019; Torres, 2019). Accordingly, when someone observes something inappropriate or someone's incompetence, they do not hesitate to cast a negative evaluation on the other person (Carlsson & Shoemaker, 2019; D'Cruz, 2020; Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2018). This finding is consistent with past studies revealing that negative evaluation was a common strategy to criticize someone's inability. This criticism strategy is acceptable, especially when the speaker has a close relationship with the hearer (Buckingham & Goodall, 2019; Fong et al., 2018; Weiner, 2018).

'Disagreement' Strategy

Disagreement is an utterance that describes the speaker's attitude toward the choice made by the speech partner (Nguyen, 2005). The data that show the criticism speech act with a direct disagreement strategy can be seen in examples (3) and (4).

(3) Japanese (FJ/1/GTO1)

Hontōu ni benkyōu shimasuka? Sukunakutomo karera ni kyūjitsu o ataenasaiyo.

"You're really going to study? At least give them a day off."

(4) Minangkabau (FM/14/LB)

Kini sakolah se lah dulu, kalo lah gadang baru cari pitiah.

"Just go to school now, when you're older, just look for money."

The utterance in example (3) was conveyed by a teacher to the principal who did not allow students at the school to hold a yearly summer holiday festival at the school. The utterance is considered direct criticism speech act because the criticism uttered by the teacher (speaker) clearly demonstrated illocutionary power, namely criticizing (Benhabib, 2018; Jauhari & Purnanto, 2021; Rosyidi et al., 2019). Meanwhile, for the Minangkabau data as shown in example (4), a mother (speaker) appeared to reprimand her child (the interlocutor) because the child wanted to earn money for their family needs without having to accept charity from others. The attitude of the interlocutor is not approved by the speaker because the child is still in elementary school (underage) and

is not considered to have the obligation to earn a living for the family.

The tendency to use the 'disagreement' strategy arises because the characters in the film have a close relationship between the speakers and the interlocutors (Aikin, 2019; Burdick, 2021; Rühlemann & Gries, 2021). Therefore, when someone observes something inappropriate, for example, the child's incompetency, they do not hesitate to cast a disagreement with that person (Iversen, 2019; Khoirunnisa & Hardjanto, 2018; Tawilapakul, 2022). This corroborates with the findings from previous studies which mentioned that disagreement is a common strategy to express a differing opinion from a speaker. Disagreement is acceptable, especially when the speaker has a close relationship with the speech partner (Frank, 2021; Saleem et al., 2021; Spear, 2019).

'Expression of Contradiction' Strategy

The expression of contradiction is usually manifested by the negation word 'no' or the performative 'I disagree' or 'I agree,' with or without modals (Nguyen, 2005). The data demonstrated the direct criticism speech act with the expression of contradiction can be seen in examples (5) and (6).

(5) Japanese (FJ/86/GTO4)

Ganbari sugi tte, kekka ga zenzen dame jya nai? Genjitsu wa sonna ni amakunai yo.

"Big effort with a small payoff? reality isn't that sweet."

(6) Minangkabau

(FM/195/MDKS)

Ang tu ndak akan pernah basatu jo paja tu, kau tu sasuku. Lai jaleh, Vita!

"You will never be with him. You and he are tribesmen. Don't you understand?"

In example (5), a student expressed criticism to his homeroom teacher who always interfered with the student's personal problems. The utterance is included in the direct criticism speech act because it is conveyed directly and can be easily understood (Burns et al., 2018; Hosseinizadeh & Rassaei, 2019; Wu & Fitzgerald, 2021). The utterance also possesses elements of illocutionary power conveying the intended meaning to the speech partner (Adams, 2020; Caponetto, 2021; Siregar, 2021).

In the Minangkabau data (example (6), the strategy to criticize directly) is included in the category of expression of contradiction. It is included in the direct criticism speech act as an 'expression of contradiction' because the speech

contains a negation marker 'not' as shown in example (5) stating 'reality isn't that sweet' (Dedoncker et al., 2019; Lang, 2018). Furthermore, in example 6, a father (as a speaker) spoke to his daughter (the speech partner) because his daughter wants to marry a man who comes from the same tribe as their family. This creates conflict because, in the Minang culture, it is not allowed to marry someone from the same tribe (Dewi et al., 2019; Ramanta & Samsuri, 2020; Utomo, 2020; Valentina & Safitri, 2022). The utterance is delivered by the speaker who has a close relationship with the speech partner (father to daughter). This speech act also indicates a sense of resentment towards the other person (Rosenblum & Muirhead, 2020). Criticism often aims to express the speaker's displeasure with the speech partner's actions. As a result, the speech partner is expected to modify his/her attitude in the forthcoming dialogue (Caturay, 2019; El-Dakhs, 2020; Ruytenbeek, Verschraegen, & Decock, 2021).

'Statements of Difficulty' Strategy

Statements of difficulty are typically expressed using structures such as "I find it difficult", and "It is difficult to understand...", or directly state the difficulties that are being faced by the actions of the speech partner (Nguyen, 2005). The data regarding direct criticism speech acts that demonstrate the use of the 'statement of difficulty' strategy can be seen in examples (7) and (8).

(7) Japanese (FJ/132/GTO)

Nani mo shiranai kuse ni, aijō o komete asonde imasu. Hontou ni uzain dayo.

"You don't understand how we feel, toying with affection. You really are annoying."

(8) Minangkabau (FM/34/RNB)

Ka sampai bilo awak kaco itu Uda, parasaan iduik bana lah taraso dari kini

"How long are we going to be like this, Uda. Our life is hard until now."

The conversation in example (7) occurred when the speaker was irritated by what the interlocutor is doing. The criticism was conveyed directly without any hedging. The utterance carries elements of illocutionary power, allowing the meaning to be easily understood by the speech partner (Caponetto, 2021; Siregar, 2021). The speaker directly expressed his criticism about the attitude of the speech partner and directly conveyed his annoyance and irritation (Gisladdottir et al., 2018; Richards, 2022). The criticism above manifests the

speaker's discomfort caused by the interlocutor's behaviour (Borris & Zecho, 2018; DeFrank & Kahlbaugh, 2019; Pang et al., 2019; Venkataramanan & Rajamohan, 2019).

The Minangkabau data in example (8) were uttered by the speaker who has a close relationship with the speech partner. Therefore, it is not unpleasant for the speaker to convey the difficulties and unpleasantness experienced due to the speech partner's action (Aikin, 2019; Gisladdottir et al., 2018; Rühlemann & Gries, 2021). This example also indicates a sense of resentment towards the other person and is consistent with the findings of Depraetere et al. (2021), El-Dakhs (2020), and Park et al. (2021), who reported that criticizing often aims to show the speaker's disapproval for the speech partner's argument and to encourage the speech partner to clarify the conversations for the speaker.

The Strategies of Indirect Criticism's Speech Acts in the Japanese and Minangkabau Languages

Indirect criticism speech acts are speeches that imply problems with the choice, action, and performance of the speech partner (Nguyen, 2005). There are a total of 299 instances of indirect critical speech act strategies used in Japanese and Minangkabau, with 200 instances found in Japanese and 99 instances in Minangkabau. The results indicate that a preference for indirect criticism speech act strategy is preferred in Japanese compared to Minangkabau. In contrast, the Minangkabau speakers demonstrate a higher frequency of using direct criticism speech act strategies.

Table 3 shows that the main indirect strategies of criticism speech acts used in both languages are different. In Japanese, asking/presupposing (24.5%), corrections (18.5%), requests for change (10.5%), and indicating standard (10%) strategies were used with the highest frequency respectively, whereas in the Minangkabau language, the strategies most used were corrections (27.27%), suggestions for change (13.13%), lectures (12.12%), and expression of uncertainty (10.1%) respectively. In this section, only the four relatively highest used sub-categories of strategies namely 'correction,' 'indicating standard,' 'request for change,' and 'asking/presupposing' will be analyzed further.

Table 3

The number of indirect criticism speech acts strategies in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages

Indirect Criticism Strategies	Japanese	Percentage (%)	Minangkabau	Percentage (%)
Correction	37	18,50	27	27,27
Indicating standard	20	10,00	4	4,04
Lecture	15	7,50	12	12,12
Demand of change	17	8,50	2	2,02
Request for change	21	10,50	6	6,06
Advice for change	19	9,50	13	13,13
Suggestion for change	10	5,00	5	5,05
Expression of uncertainty	12	6,00	10	10,10
Asking/presupposing	49	24,50	20	20,20
Total	200	100	99	100

Based on the data presented in Table 3, it can be seen that the “asking/presupposing” strategy is more dominantly used in Japanese. This is due to the tendency of Japanese society to prioritize harmony and to be more reluctant in openly criticizing their interlocutors (Takanashi, 2004). In line with this, Makihara (2012) emphasized that in communication, there is a possibility of threatening the face of the speech partner, hence, Japanese people prioritize consideration in disclosing information to the speech partner in order to avoid or minimize the FTA (Face Threatening Act). In contrast, the Minangkabau people used “correction” strategy more frequently. This is because the Minangkabau culture encourages immediate correction or criticism when someone is displeased or in disagreement (Yanti, 2020). However, Minangkabau people still maintain politeness by continuing to use polite expressions such as *Kato nan ampek* (Chaniago & Alfikri, 2022).

‘Correction’ Strategy

Corrections are all utterances that have the aim of correcting errors by affirming specific alternatives for the choice of the speech partner (Nguyen, 2005). The data showing the indirect criticism speech acts of the ‘correction’ category can be seen in examples (9) and (10).

(9) Japanese (FJ/32/GTO2)

Kono okane wa kanashimi kara ki o sorasu koto wa arimasen. Kanashinara, jibun no chichioya ni ai ni itte kudasai.

“This money will not distract you from sadness. If you’re sad, go see your own father.”

(10) Minangkabau (FM/55/SDS)

Kalah karno dicurangi, ndak terlalu memalukan, tapi cubo tadi ang tinju pas urang basorak, pasti jatuh paja tu.

“Losing to being cheated on isn’t that embarrassing, but if you had punched him earlier while people were cheering, he’d have fallen for sure.”

In example (9), the speaker criticized the attitude of the interlocutor who thinks that money is everything and money can help him cope with his sadness. This example is considered an indirect criticism speech act because the speech is conveyed in an unclear and convoluted manner (Arifin et al., 2019). This indirect criticism speech act strategy is categorized as a correction strategy because the speaker provided an alternative to the interlocutor for him to overcome his sadness. The speaker suggested that the interlocutor should speak to his father to reduce his sadness in a much better way (Ide & Kawahara, 2022; Jdetawy & Hamzah, 2020).

Furthermore, example (10) from the Minangkabau data was uttered by a *silat* (Indonesia’s traditional martial art) coach (speaker) to his protege who lost the match because he allowed his opponent to attack him. He, nevertheless, did not take advantage of the available opportunity to counterattack his opponent. The criticism speech act in this ‘correction’ category is demonstrated in the utterance “*Kalah karno dicurangi, ndak terlalu memalukan, tapi cubo tadi ang tinju pas urang basorak, pasti jatuh paja tu.*” (Losing to being cheated on isn’t that embarrassing, but if you had punched him earlier while people were cheering, he’d have fallen for sure). This utterance was delivered by a speaker who has more power than the speech partner. In other words, the speaker who is the coach has the authority to ‘reprimand’ his student.

The criticism delivered in an indirect manner is considered a repair technique or face-saving technique, which is manifested through the sub-strategy ‘correction.’ This approach allows the hearer to take corrective action on her or his own (Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2020; Tereszkievicz,

2021). These findings are corroborated by Decock and Depraetere (2018), Gisladdottir et al. (2018), and Peng (2020), who reported that indirect criticism can mitigate the face-threatening act to the speech partner and minimize potential harm to his/her self-esteem. As a result, it is deemed more effective and acceptable.

'Indicating Standard' Strategy

'Indicating standard' is a category of indirect criticism speech act strategy which is typically expressed as collective obligations rather than personal obligations to the speech partner, or as rules that are generally agreed upon and applied to all (Nguyen, 2005). The data showing the indirect criticism speech act of 'indicating standard' strategy are shown in examples (11) and (12).

(11) Japanese (FJ/26/GTO1)

2-4 kumi no tannin ni narimasuyone? Dakara hitsuyounandesu.

"You're going to be the homeroom of class 2-4 right? Therefore, you need this. It's not like any other class."

(12) Minangkabau (FM/13/LB)

Caliak lah, baa pakaian adiak uda kini? Mode tu Ratu kalua ko? Ndak ado gadiah minang nan mode iko pakaiannyo do.

"Let's see how do your brothers and sisters look, is it like this when you leave the house? There is no Minang woman who looks like this."

The Japanese speech in example (11) was conveyed by a senior teacher to his junior teacher who will be the new homeroom teacher of class 2-4 while handling some medicine. This utterance is considered an indirect criticism strategy because it is expressed indirectly and vaguely (Decock & Depraetere, 2018; Deveci & Binbuğa Kınık, 2019). The utterance in example (11) has two distinct illocutionary powers, making it difficult for the listener to grasp the purpose of the utterance directly (Adams, 2020; Caponetto, 2021). The first illocutionary power is expressed in the form of a question, while the second illocutionary power aims to convey criticism. The speaker intentionally handed over the medicine as a symbol to indicate that the interlocutor needed to be cautious in teaching classes 2-4 because students in this particular class are well known troublemakers in the school. The utterance falls under the category of indirect criticism speech acts, as it utilizes the symbolism of medicine to deliver criticism and serve as a reminder for the interlocutor.

The Minangkabau speech in example (12) was conveyed by an older sister (speaker) to her younger sister by the name of Ratu. The speaker commented on her sister's dress which looked inappropriate. The close relationship between the sisters allowed the older sister to implicitly criticize her younger sister by indicating the standard of the social customs in dressing.

'Request for Change' Strategy

A 'request for change' is a strategy that involves making a request, expressing a desire, or seeking a change in the choice or performance of the speech partner (Nguyen, 2005). The data illustrating the indirect criticism speech acts of 'request for change' can be observed in examples (13) and (14).

(13) Japanese (FJ/25/GTO1)

Me no mae ni kabe ga attara, anata wa sore o otosanakereba narimasen, samonakereba nani mo tadashiku kawarimasen ka? Sou daro?

"When you face a wall, then you have to tear it down, otherwise nothing will change, right?"

(14) Minangkabau (FM/295/DUK)

Iduik kito emang sederhana, tapi jan sampai kito maruluh nak.

"Our life is simple, but don't let us complain."

The speaker in the Japanese language in example (13) indirectly criticized his student regarding the hostile family situation in the student's family that prevents the student from communicating with his parents. However, the interlocutor (student) was already aware of the underlying issue without the teacher explicitly mentioning it. Furthermore, the student also possesses knowledge of how to solve the problem.

The criticism conveyed by the speaker in example (13) is categorized as an indirect criticism speech act strategy because it was delivered in an ambiguous and convoluted manner (Deveci & Binbuğa Kınık, 2019; Ide & Kawahara, 2022). The speech act possesses two illocutionary power, making it difficult for the speech partner to comprehend (Lewiński, 2021; Rosyidi, Mahyuni, & Muhaimi, 2019). The criticism is expressed through an analogy, where the problem is analogized as a 'wall.' The speaker indirectly advises the interlocutor through another analogy: "Should tear it down." The speech act strategy is considered an indirect criticism speech act of 'request for change' because the speaker conveys the criticism through a request regarding the interlocutor's attitude and decision.

The Minangkabau speech in example (14) was conveyed by parents (as speakers) to their children

(as speech partners), who frequently complain about their poor family conditions. The speaker opined that although the family is poor, they still have sufficient food for their needs. Therefore, the speaker feels that his child should refrain from complaining about their family situation every day. Indirect communication style can also be attributed to a distinction between high and low culture. In an indirect communication style, direct conveyance of meaning is considered impolite, prompting individuals to conceal their true intentions to maintain politeness and preserve the hearer's face (Buckingham & Goodall, 2019; Hosseinizadeh & Rassaei, 2019; Lang, 2018; Tawilapakul, 2022).

'Asking/Presupposing' Strategy

Asking/presupposing is a speech act strategy expressed in the form of rhetorical questions to raise the speech partner's awareness regarding the appropriateness of their choices (Nguyen, 2005). The data illustrating the use of indirect criticism speech act of 'asking/presupposing' can be observed in examples (15) and (16).

(15) Japanese (FJ/18/GTO1)

Hoka no dareka ni itte, anata wa tashika ni awaredesu. Jibun de dekiru koto wa nani mo arimasen.

"Telling someone else, you are pathetic indeed. Isn't there something you can do yourself?"

(16) Minangkabau (FM/284/DUK)

Tu lah, uniak lo anak kini ko, bahasonyo malantiak lantiakmirip bulu mato LCB pulo.

"It's also unique for today's children, the language is curly like LCB's eyelashes too."

The Japanese speech in example (15) was delivered by Onizuka (the speaker) to Fuyutsuki (the speech partner) and can be considered an indirect criticism speech act. The utterance falls under the indirect criticism speech act strategy because it is expressed in an unclear and vague manner. The utterance takes the form of a rhetorical question, thus classifying it as an 'asking/presupposing' speech act.

Furthermore, the Minangkabau data as illustrated in example (16) was uttered by a neighbor (speaker) to a neighbor's child (speech partner). The speaker felt that the child walked in an arrogant manner (malantiak/arrogant). The manner is akin to LCB's (an abbreviation for Laudya Cintya Bella, an Indonesian female artist) eyelashes. In example (16), the speaker intended to point out that the interlocutor behaved impolitely (Borris & Zecho, 2018; Jauhari & Purnanto, 2021). This behaviour should not be practiced when walking

because the child may meet someone older than him on the street. The utterance is delivered by the speaker who holds power and is older than the speech partner.

The Politeness Strategies of Criticism Speech Acts in the Japanese and Minangkabau Languages

According to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, the purpose of minimizing the harmful effects of criticism is to maintain a harmonious relationship with the other person or speech partner, ensuring that criticism is more readily accepted by others. Speakers should employ various strategies such as the bald-on-record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, and off-record strategy when conveying criticism, allowing it to be accepted fairly and properly.

Table 4

The Data of Politeness Strategy in the Japanese and Minangkabau Languages

Politeness Strategies	Japanese	Percent age (%)	Minangkabau	Percent age (%)
Bald on record	30	10,17	201	63,61
Positive politeness	47	15,93	48	15,19
Negative politeness	68	23,05	32	10,13
Off record	150	50,85	35	11,08
Total	295	100	316	100

As presented in Table 4, a total of 611 instances of politeness strategies were identified in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages, with 295 instances found in Japanese and 316 instances in the Minangkabau language. Table 4 also reveals that the primary politeness strategies used in both languages differed. In Japanese, off-record (50.85%), negative politeness (23.05%), positive politeness (15.93%), and bald-on-record (10.17%) strategies were used sequentially, whereas in the Minangkabau language, the strategies most frequently used were bald-on-record (63.61%), positive politeness (15.19%), negative politeness (10.13%), and off-record (11.08%). These findings suggest a preference for the bald-on-record strategy in the Minangkabau language, whereas the use of the off-record strategy is more prevalent in Japanese. Further analysis of

each politeness strategy used in both languages is presented in the following sub-sections.

'Bald on Record' Strategy

Brown and Levinson (1987) asserted that the bald-on-record strategy involves expressing intentions in a clear, direct, unambiguous manner, without hesitation or attempts to save the face of the speech partner (bluntly, without remedy). This strategy is characterized by directness, without offering choices to the speech partner, as the speaker prioritizes effective communication over preserving the interlocutor's face. The use of this strategy can be observed in examples (17) and (18).

(17) Japanese (FJ/17/GTO1)

Omae.. "demo demo" tte, bakka da naa..

"You say "but-but" and keep on sounding like an idiot."

(18) Minangkabau (FM/52/RNB)

Marasai bana hiduik kini, dulu di rantau jadi urang kayo. Habih ruko tabaka pulang kampuang bangsek. Mode tu bana hidup kini aa.

"Why is your life so miserable now? I used to live overseas so I was rich. After his shop caught fire, he returned home to his poor life."

The strategy used in the example (17) (Japanese data) involves a superior addressing his subordinate. The superior reproaches the employee for consistently providing excuses for his mistakes at work, likening his behavior to that of an idiot. The tendency to use the bald-on-record speech strategy in this situation stems from the power dynamic between the speaker and his interlocutor, allowing for clear and straightforward communication without unnecessary elaboration (D'Cruz, 2020; Jauhari & Purnanto, 2021; Xafizovna, 2022). A similar situation is observed in the Minangkabau data (example 18). The village head (the speaker) employed bald on record strategy when addressing his poor village residents (the speech partner). The village head, who holds authority, utilizes the bald-on-record strategy to criticize the poor residents (Chelangat, 2019; Saleem et al., 2021).

'Positive Politeness Strategy'

Positive politeness strategy is the strategy that is intended to protect the positive face of the speech partner, namely the desire for the speaker to be respected and understood by others (Brown &

Levinson, 1987). The data that used the positive politeness strategy are in examples (19) and (20).

(19) Japanese (FJ/40/GTO2)

Mou juubun desuyo. Kyōshi to shite anata wa dekiru koto o shimashita.

"That's enough, right? As a teacher you've done what could be done."

(20) Minangkabau (FM/31/DPR)

Nan penting lai meriah jadinya, niek di awak nyo, ndak di urang do.

"The important thing is that our videos are still lively. The term intention is in us, not in other people."

In example (19) (Japanese data), the speaker expressed disagreement with the interlocutor's attitude who appeared to want to know everything about his life. The positive politeness speech act strategy is employed in this case because the utterance was delivered by a speaker who has power over the speech partner. This allows the speaker to deliver the speech in a straightforward, clear, and frank manner. In example (20) of the Minangkabau data, the speaker criticizes the speech partner for consistently speaking ill of others while expecting others not to do the same to him. The speaker employs the positive politeness strategy given the higher authority or power that the speaker has over the interlocutor, to convey the criticism in a more considerate manner

Examples (19) and (20) fall under the sub-category of positive politeness strategy namely 'seeking agreement' with the speech partner. Seeking agreement with the speech partner is the fifth sub-strategy within the positive politeness strategies (Chelangat, 2019; Khoirunnisa & Hardjanto, 2018). By employing this sub-strategy, the speaker aims to reach a solution or mediation for the issues at hand while avoiding offense to the speech partner (Spear, 2019; Tawilapakul, 2022).

'Negative Politeness Strategy'

A negative politeness strategy is a strategy that is associated with protecting the negative face of the speech partner, namely the desire not to be bothered or for their space not to be violated by others. The negative politeness strategy is essentially aimed at fulfilling or saving the negative face of the speech partner. Examples (21) and (22) illustrate the use of the negative politeness strategy.

(21) Japanese (FJ/157/GTO7)

Nani mo tanoshī koto wa nai yo. Kare wa jinkō no tensai ni kare no kokoro o shihai sa semashita.

“Nothing fun. He let the artificial genius rule his mind.”

(22) Minangkabau (FM/90/SDS)

Ee ma gaek tu nyo, lamo bana ko ha.

“Ee why grandpa, it’s been so long.”

In example (21) (Japanese data), the speaker expresses annoyance towards his speech partner (his friend) for allowing his rival to take advantage of him. This speech act occurs when the speaker criticizes his friend, urging him to change his attitude. The negative politeness strategy is used in this situation due to the close relationship between the speaker and the speech partner. Hence, the speaker utilizes the speech act strategy to protect the speech partner’s negative face by defending them.

The situation described in the Minangkabau data in example (22) involves Adil and his friends (speaker) criticizing the grandfather (the speech partner) for making them wait for a long time for a meeting, despite having agreed on the meeting time earlier. Here, the speaker attempts to save the negative face of the speech partner by mitigating the harm of the utterance on the interlocutor’s face (Jdetawy & Hamzah, 2021; Martínez-Flor & Usó-Juan, 2020). The use of the negative politeness strategy also aims to save the speech partner’s face by acknowledging the challenges experienced by speakers (Pang et al., 2019; Venkataramanan & Rajamohan, 2019).

The examples in the Japanese and Minangkabau data above are categorized as indirect expression strategy which falls under the sub-category of the negative politeness strategy. The indirect expression strategy is employed to prevent disruption to the interlocutor’s face. It is the primary strategy within the negative politeness category and aims to preserve the interlocutor’s negative face, allowing them to maintain their freedom of action (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Kusumarini, Simpen, Budiarsa, & Laksana, 2021).

‘Off Record’ Strategy

Off-record strategy is a strategy of doing FTA (Face Threatening Act) indirectly by letting the speech partner decide how to interpret the speaker’s utterance (Levinson, 1987 Examples (23) and (24) illustrate the off record speaking strategy

(23) Japanese (FJ/193/GTO9)

Doushite, dare ka sekinin bakari kimi tsuna surun desuka?

“Why do you always avoid responsibility?”

(24) Minangkabau (FM/192/MDKS)

Lai diajaan dek induak apak ang?

“Did your parents teach you?”

In example (23) (Japanese data), Onizuka (speaker) criticizes his students (speech partner) for their reluctance to fulfill their assigned responsibilities, opting instead to avoid them. The off-record strategy is employed in this situation as the speaker intends for the speech partner to recognize the underlying criticism, which is conveyed in the form of a question (Dhayef & Mohammed, 2022; Kelly et al., 2019).

In example (24) (Minangkabau data), the speaker criticizes the speech partner for possessing an ordinary stone that is considered sacred by the villagers, despite the belief that ridiculing or insulting the stone has no effect. The off-record strategy is employed in this situation to soften the directness of the speech (Depraetere et al., 2021; Kusumarini et al., 2021). Additionally, the speaker desires the speech partner to provide the intended or expected information (Burdick, 2021; Rosenblum & Muirhead, 2020).

From the findings of the above data analysis, it can be observed that both Japanese and Minangkabau languages share a similarity in the use of ‘positive politeness’ strategies, within criticism speech acts. These strategies aim to maintain familiarity values between speakers and their speech partners. Additionally, speakers from both languages employ negative politeness strategies to maintain social distance between themselves and their speech partners. However, there are notable differences between the two languages. The findings indicate that Japanese speakers tend to use ‘off-record’ strategies more frequently in criticism speech acts, while Minangkabau speakers predominantly favour ‘bald-on-record’ strategies.

The findings which indicated that Japanese mainly use “off-record” politeness strategies in criticism speech acts are in line with the results of previous studies (Obana, 2020). These findings also support previous results suggesting that Japanese communication tends to adopt an indirect or open communication style (*tatemaie*) when interacting with less familiar speech partners (Nguyen, 2008). Furthermore, Japanese communication exhibits a tendency towards employing more indirect criticism strategies generally (Nguyen, 2005). The tendency towards an indirect communication style is believed to reflect the preference for a high-context communication style (Halawa et al., 2010; Obana, 2020;).

The trend of the results also showed that when Japanese people criticize, they pay attention to the level of closeness in their relationship with the interlocutor. This is due to the communication

culture of Japanese society which is closely related to the concepts of 'uchi' (the inner circle/insider) and 'soto' (outer circle/outsider) (Obana, 2020). This is proven by the results that when Japanese people criticize someone they are not close to, they tend to be more formal (using *tatema*/courtesy) because the interlocutor is considered part of the *soto* (outer) circle. However, when Japanese people criticize someone with whom they have a close relationship, they tend to use an open communication style, expressing their *honne*/true feelings because the interlocutor is seen as part of *uchi* (inner) circle. Moreover, Japanese culture is known for being harmony-oriented society (Nguyen, 2008; Takanashi, 2010). Hence, even in criticism speech acts that often express dissatisfaction, Japanese people prefer to use indirect strategies to maintain harmonious relations with their interlocutors. This tendency reflects and manifests in Japanese culture since communication and culture are inseparable and have a reciprocal relationship that influences each other (Samovar et al., 2016).

On the other hand, the findings reveal that speakers of the Minangkabau language tend to employ 'bald-on record' strategies and use the 'negative politeness' strategy the least. This particular finding differs from the results of previous studies, which indicated that in Minangkabau communication, speakers often use figurative language, disguised language, or satire, thereby avoiding direct and rude impressions, especially when interacting with new acquaintances or individuals with whom they do not have a close relationship with the speaker (Thamrin & Gani, 2020). However, the findings of this study revealed that in the context of criticism speech acts, Minangkabau people tend to use direct strategies and rarely use reciprocal strategies through rhyme. This tendency contradicts previous studies reported that the cultural values and communication styles of the Minangkabau community, highlighting their inclination towards indirect communication (Pawito et al., 2020) and the use of reciprocation strategies (Arifin, 2020). However, the tendency of this study is supported by Dasrial (2019) who asserts that although the Minangkabau people have a polite language concept or style of communication, known as the concept of *Kato nan ampek*, its application in daily life is sometimes forgotten or overlooked.

Based on the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that there are significant differences related to speech act strategies and politeness strategies used in criticism speech acts in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages. The results of the study have shown that Japanese speakers tend

to use indirect strategies and 'off record' politeness strategies, while Minangkabau speakers prefer to use direct criticism strategies with 'bald on record' politeness strategies. In the context of cross-cultural communication, these contradictory differences can cause friction and misunderstandings. Hence, the findings of this study can be a point of reference expected to minimize these sorts of misunderstandings in communication, especially regarding criticism speech acts and speech acts in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages generally. The findings about politeness strategies used in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages are also beneficial to enhance cross-cultural communication understandings and communication competence for Japanese language learners including Minangkabau speakers.

CONCLUSION

This study explored the criticism speech acts by Japanese and Minangkabau speakers in the context of politeness in a cross-cultural setting. The findings show that both Japanese and Minangkabau people use direct and indirect speech act as strategies to criticize. However, the Japanese tend to use indirect strategies such as asking/presupposing, correcting, and requesting change. Meanwhile, Minangkabau people predominantly employ direct strategies such as negative evaluation, expression of contradiction, and disagreement when criticizing their speech partners. Regarding politeness strategies, both Japanese and Minangkabau language speakers used positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record, and bald records. However, there are differences where Japanese speakers tend to use off-record strategies, while Minangkabau speakers tend to use bald-on-record strategies in their criticism speech acts. These findings indicate a significant contrast in the strategies employed for speech acts of criticism, despite the languages sharing similarities in terms of possessing honorific language systems and communicative culture based on politeness.

Like any study, this study has several limitations. In this study, experts including native speakers were involved to ensure the accuracy of the data and the results. However, considering the rules and context of the films, the researchers suggest collecting more data that encompass diverse contexts, thereby representing various situations more comprehensively. Furthermore, when investigating politeness in the criticism speech acts in the Japanese and Minangkabau languages, it may be beneficial to incorporate more recent politeness theory (e.g. Principal of Mutual Consideration/PMC theory by Azis, 2000) to achieve a better

understanding and conduct a more in-depth analysis. Another factor that should be considered is the potential influence of gender differences and the impact of digital platforms such as social media, or other data sources such as talk shows or reality shows. Exploring these aspects can contribute to a deeper understanding of the strategies used in criticism speech acts in communication.

REFERENCES

- Abe, K. (2006). *Shazai no Nicchuu Taishou Kenkyuu [Comparative study on Japanese and Chinese Apology]* [Unpublished thesis, Hiroshima University]
- Adams, N. P. (2020). Authority, illocutionary accommodation, and social accommodation. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 98(3), 560-573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.2019.1621913>
- Aikin, S. F. (2019). Deep disagreement, the dark enlightenment, and the rhetoric of the red pill. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 36(3), 420-435. 10.1111/japp.12331
- Alfersia, A. (2016). *Tindak Tutur Mengkritik Dalam Bahasa Inggris Oleh Pembelajar Bahasa Inggris Di Indonesia Dan Penutur Bahasa Inggris Australia* [Unpublish doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gajah Mada].
- Arifin, S., Utari, P., & Hastjarjo, S. (2019). Communication style in media struggle, misbach communication style in early 20th century. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(5), 60-73. 10.18415/ijmmu.v6i5.1037
- Azis, E. A. (2000). *Refusing in Indonesian: Strategies and politeness implication* [Unpublished doctoral thesis, Monash University].
- Barón, J., & Celaya, M. L. (2022). 'May I do something for you?': The effects of audio-visual material (captioned and non-captioned) on EFL pragmatic learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(2), 238-255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211067000>
- Benhabib, S. (2018). 37. Defense of modernity: The philosophical discourse of modernity (1985): Modernity as rationalization and the critique of instrumental reason. In *The habermas handbook* (pp. 394-416). Columbia University Press.
- Borris, D., & Zecho, C. (2018). The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32-44. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v2n1.10>
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Buckingham, M., & Goodall, A. (2019). The feedback fallacy. *Harvard Business Review*, 97(2), 92-101.
- Burdick, S. M. (2021). *Voicing vulnerable wants in close relationships* [Doctoral dissertation].
- Burns, J. W., Gerhart, J., Post, K. M., Smith, D. A., Porter, L. S., Buvaendran, A., & Keefe, F. J. (2018). Spouse criticism/hostility toward partners with chronic pain: the role of spouse attributions for patient control over pain behaviors. *The Journal of Pain*, 19(11), 1308-1317. 10.1016/j.jpain.2018.05.007
- Cao, J. (2005). *A pragmatic analysis of the speech act of criticizing in primary and junior high school Chinese lecturer-student talk* [Doctoral dissertation, Northeast Normal University].
- Caponetto, L. (2021). A comprehensive definition of illocutionary silencing. *Topoi*, 40(1), 191-202. 10.1007/s11245-020-09705-2
- Carlsson, A. B., & Shoemaker, D. (2019). Shame and attributability. *Oxford Studies in Agency and Responsibility*, 6, 112-39.
- Caturay Jr, W. S. (2019). Say what?: Filipino ESL learners' semantic formula in expressing complaints. *The New English Teacher*, 13(1), 32.
- Chaniago, I. A., & Alfikri, M. (2022). Communication of Kato Nan Ampek cultural perspective in Minangkabau community in Medan Denai District, Medan City. *Daengku: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Innovation*, 2(4), 472-479. <https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.daengku1095>
- Chelangat, K. S. (2019). Pragmatic analysis of politeness strategies in HIV/AIDS discourse. a case study of Kalenjin (Kipsigis) speakers of Kericho county (Kenya). *International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 4(6), 100-105.
- Cooren, F. (2015). Speech act theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi055>
- Czyżowska, D., Gurba, E., Czyżowska, N., Kalus, A., Sitnik-Warchulska, K., & Izydorczyk, B. (2019). Selected predictors of the sense of intimacy in relationships of young adults. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(22), 4447.

- Darweesh, A. D. (2011). Speech act of criticizing in MSA Arabic. Retrieved February, 28, 2018. from <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/681234>
- Dasrial, A. (2019). "Kato Nan Ampek" sebagai Adab Komunikasi Rang Minangkabau. *Online diakses pada tanggal 21 Oktober 2021* (<http://portalsumbar.com/berita/1195/kato-nan-ampek-sebagai-adab-komunikasi-rang-minangkabau.html>)
- Decock, S., & Depraetere, I. (2018). (In) directness and complaints: A reassessment. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 132, 33-46. 10.1016/j.pragma.2018.04.010
- Dedoncker, J., Vanderhasselt, M. A., Remue, J., De Witte, S., Wu, G. R., Hooley, J. M., ... & Baeken, C. (2019). Prefrontal TDCS attenuates medial prefrontal connectivity upon being criticized in individuals scoring high on perceived criticism. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, 13(4), 1060-1070. 10.1007/s11682-018-9927-8
- DeFrank, M., & Kahlbaugh, P. (2019). Language choice matters: When profanity affects how people are judged. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38(1), 126-141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X18758143>
- Depraetere, I., Decock, S., & Ruytenbeek, N. (2021). Linguistic (in) directness in twitter complaints: A contrastive analysis of railway complaint interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 171, 215-233. 10.1016/j.pragma.2020.09.026
- Deveci, C., & Binbuğa Kınık, B. N. (2019). Nationalist bias in Turkish official discourse on hate speech: a Rawlsian criticism. *Turkish Studies*, 20(1), 26-48.
- Dewi, S. F., Montessori, M., Saputra, R. A., Farsalena, S., Fatmariza, F., Febriani, R., & Yulika, F. (2019). The role of culture in cross-cultural marriage among Minangkabau women. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 20(9), 68-82.
- Dhayef, Q. A., & Mohammed, E. A. (2022). A contrastive study of Politeness in Island of Salts poems and Out poems. *Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 7, 66-76.
- D'Cruz, J. (2020). Trust and distrust. *The Routledge Handbook of Trust and Philosophy*, 10, 9781315542294-3.
- Do Nascimento, J. (2019). Art, cinema and society: sociological perspectives. *Global Journal of Human Social Science Research:(C) Sociology & Culture*, 19(5), 19-28. 10.34257/GJHSS
- El-Dakhs, D. A. S. (2020). How do celebrities respond to criticism in media interviews? The case of an Egyptian TV show. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1), 1712159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1712159>
- Farnia, M. & Abdul Sattar, H. (2015). A Sociopragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Criticism by Persian Native Speakers. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 2(3), 305-327.
- Fong, C. J., Schallert, D. L., Williams, K. M., Williamson, Z. H., Warner, J. R., Lin, S., & Kim, Y. W. (2018). When feedback signals failure but offers hope for improvement: A process model of constructive criticism. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 30, 42-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2018.02.014>
- Frank, D. M. (2021). Disagreement or denialism?" Invasive species denialism" and ethical disagreement in science. *Synthese*, 198(25), 6085-6113. 10.1007/s11229-019-02259-w
- Gisladdottir, R. S., Bögels, S., & Levinson, S. C. (2018). Oscillatory brain responses reflect anticipation during comprehension of speech acts in spoken dialog. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 12, 34. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00034>
- Globočnik Žunac, A., Tišler, P., & Sesar, V. (2022). Sustainable business communication management—are negative messages to be avoided or just communicated properly? *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems: INDECS*, 20(5), 500-513.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Brill.
- Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (2007). Semantic primes and cultural scripts in language learning and intercultural communication. *Applied cultural linguistics*, 105-124.
- Gunarwan, A. (1996, May). The speech act of criticizing among speakers of Javanese. In *The paper was presented in sixth meeting at South East Asian Linguistic Society, Not published.*
- Halawa, N., Gani, E., & Syahrul, R. (2019). Kesantunan Berbahasa Indonesia dalam Tindak Tutur Melarang dan Mengkritik pada Tujuh Etnis. *Lingua*, 15(2), 195-205. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lingua.v15i2.17738>
- Haristiani, N., & Danuwijaya, A. (2017). A cross-cultural sociopragmatic study-apology speech act realization patterns in Indonesian, Sundanese, and Japanese. In *The Tenth Conference on Applied Linguistics and The Second English Language Teaching and Technology Conference in collaboration with The First International Conference on*

- Language, Literature, Culture, and Education* (Vol. 1, pp. 313-318).
- Haristiani, N., Sopiyantri, A., & Danuwijaya, A.A. (2021). Apology speech acts in Japanese and Sundanese: Strategies, expressions, and awareness in a misunderstanding situation. In *Literacies, Culture, and Society towards Industrial Revolution 4.0: Reviewing Policies, Expanding Research, Enriching Practices in Asia*. Nova Science Publisherpp. 251–274.
- Hoa, H. T. X. (2007). Criticizing behaviors by the Vietnamese and the American: topics, social factors and frequency. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 23(3).
- Hosseinzadeh, S. H., & Rassaei Moqadam, H. (2019). Criticism strategies and their underlying cultural norms in online interactions: A study of native speakers of Persian and English. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 12(3), 267-287.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2018.1558273>
- Ide, T., & Kawahara, D. (2022). Building a Dialogue Corpus Annotated with Expressed and Experienced Emotions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11867*.
- Ikeda, R. (1993). *Shazai no taisho kenkyu: nichibei taisho kenkyu—face to iu shiten kara no ichikousatsu [A comparative study of apology: Japanese and Americans—An inquiry from the point of view of face]*. Nihongo Gaku (Special Issue: Apology Expressions), 12, 12-21.
- Iversen, L. L. (2019). From safe spaces to communities of disagreement. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 41(3), 315-326.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2018.1445617>
- Jauhari, E., & Purnanto, D. (2021). Politeness strategies in negative response to criticism in the Javanese Cultural Community. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(5).
- Jdetawy, L. F., & Hamzah, M. H. (2020). Linguistic etiquette: a review from a pragmatic perspective. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 14, 695.
- Kawai, T. (2015). *Getting to know Japan closer*. Delivered in a Talkshow event with the Young Japanese Consulate General in Medan at the Department of Japanese Literature, Andalas University, April 30, 2015.
- Kelly, J. R. (2019). *Leisure identities and interactions*. Routledge.
- Khoirunnisa, N. Y. L., & Hardjanto, T. D. (2018). Politeness strategies of disagreement by English native speaker students. *Lexicon*, 5(1), 19-27.
- Kittler, M. (2018). Do we understand each other? Discussing academic exchange from a cross-cultural communication perspective. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 48(3), 333-351.
- Kusumarini, I., Simpen, I. W., Budiarsa, M., & Laksana, I. K. D. (2021). Politeness strategy of Japanese hotel staff in Bali. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)*, 3(01), 9-28.
- Lang, J. (2018). “I am not criticizing you”: A constructionist analysis of an indirect speech act. *Chinese Language and Discourse*, 9(2), 184-208. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cld.00010.lan>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). Pragmatics, discourse analysis, stylistics and “The Celebrated Letter”.
- Lewiński, M. (2021). Illocutionary pluralism. *Synthese*, 199(3), 6687-6714.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-021-03087-7>
- Li, S., & Seale, C. (2007). Managing criticism in Ph. D. supervision: A qualitative case study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(4), 511-526.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701476225>
- Makihara, I. (2012). Grammar categories related to considerate expressions in Japanese. *Journal of the Center for International Education and Research, Gunma University*, 11, 1-14.
- Malyuga, E., Maksimova, D., & Ivanova, M. (2019). Cognitive and discursive features of speech etiquette in corporate communication. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(3), 310-318.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n3p310>
- Marlow, M. L., & Giles, H. (2010). ‘We won’t get ahead speaking like that!’ Expressing and managing language criticism in Hawai’i. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(3), 237-251.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630903582714>
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2020). Teaching speech acts in a second language. *Developmental and clinical pragmatics*, 13, 269.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431056-010>
- Matoba, K. (1996). Referential perspective in speech acts: A comparison between German and Japanese. *Contributions to the Sociology of Language*, 71, 411-446.
- Miceli, M., & Castelfranchi, C. (2018). Reconsidering the differences between shame and guilt. *Europe’s journal of psychology*, 14(3), 710.
<https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v14i3.1564>
- Moura, E. O. D., & Bispo, M. D. S. (2020). Sociomateriality: Theories, methodology, and practice. *Canadian Journal of Administrative*

- Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 37(3), 350-365.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.1548>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2020). Code-switching as indexical of social negotiations. In *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 97-122). Routledge.
- Minchin, E. (2011). Speech-Act Theory. The Homer Encyclopedia.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444350302.wbhe1363>
- Nasser, M. A. (2022). A corpus-based study of reviewers' usage of speech acts. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 9(1), 2125155.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2125155>
- Nguyen, M. T. T. (2005). *Criticizing and responding to criticism in a foreign language: A study of Vietnamese learners of English*. The University of Auckland.
- Nguyen, T. T. M. (2008). Modifying L2 criticisms: How learners do it? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(4), 768-791.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.05.008>
- Nofrita, M. (2016). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Mengkritik dan Memuji dalam Novel Padang Bulan dan Cinta di Dalam Gelas Karya Andrea Hirata. *Jurnal Pendidikan Rokania*, 1(1), 51-60.
- Nurjaleka, L. (2019). Giving reasons as politeness strategy in refusal speech act: A contrastive analysis on Japanese native speakers and Indonesian Japanese learners refusal speech act. *JAPANEDU: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran Bahasa Jepang*, 4(1), 16-25.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/japanedu.v4i1.17023>
- Obana, Y. (2020). *Japanese politeness: An enquiry* (1st ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429299469>
- Okubo, W., Nomoto, H., & Nakamura, S. (2022). *A comparison of speech act participants referring to expressions in Malay and Japanese*.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Continuum.
- Pang, J., Beach, E. F., Gilliver, M., & Yeend, I. (2019). Adults who report difficulty hearing speech in noise: An exploration of experiences, impacts and coping strategies. *International Journal of Audiology*, 58(12), 851-860.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2019.1670363>
- Panzarino, R. W. (2019). Impact of stuttering on communication attitude among adults who stutter and their life partner.
- Park, S., Cho, J., Park, K., & Shin, H. (2021). Customer sentiment analysis with more sensibility. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 104, 104356.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2021.104356>
- Pawito, P., Muktiyo, W., & Arifin, H. (2020). Nilai Budaya dan Gaya Komunikasi Warga Minangkabau, Jawa, dan Bugis. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 17(3), 249-261.
<https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v17i3.3775>
- Peng, Y. Y. (2020). A pragmatic study of junior high school teachers' speech act of criticism from the perspective of politeness principle. *English Language Teaching*, 13(4), 11-14.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n4p11>
- Putri, A. D., & Haristiani, N. (2021, November). Contrastive analysis of politeness strategies in directive speech act in Japanese and Minangkabau language. In *Fifth International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2021)* (pp. 47-52). Atlantis Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211119.008>
- Rahayu, E. T., Riyadi, S., Hartati, H., Stovia, A., Roiyasa, N., & Asriyama, W. F. (2023). Language Politeness Education through Language Behaviour Habits: Concerning the Indonesian and Japanese Viewpoints. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(2).
- Ramanta, H., & Samsuri, S. (2020). The values of local wisdom of Minangkabau culture in a Baralek Gadang traditional wedding. *Humaniora*, 11(3), 193-201.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v11i3.6625>
- Richards, J. C. (2022). Exploring emotions in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 53(1), 225-239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882209275>
- Rizki, S., & Golubović, J. (2020). An analysis of speech act of Omar Mukhtar's utterances in lion of the desert movie. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 7(2), 195-210. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6358>
- Rosari, M. (2016). Politeness strategies applied by the characters of The Great Debaters movie. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 19(1), 19-33.
<https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v19i1.309>
- Rosenblum, N. L., & Muirhead, R. (2020). A lot of people are saying. In *A lot of people are saying*. Princeton University Press.
- Rosyidi, A. Z., Mahyuni, M., & Muhaimi, M. (2019). Illocutionary speech acts use by Jokowi in first Indonesia presidential election dDebate 2019. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(2), 735-740.
- Rühlemann, C., & Gries, S. T. (2021). How do speakers and hearers disambiguate multi-functional words?: The case of well. *Functions*

- of Language, 28(1), 55-80.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/fo1.18050.ruh>
- Ruytenbeek, N., Verschraegen, M., & Decock, S. (2021). Exploring the impact of platforms' affordances on the expression of negativity in online hotel reviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 186, 289-307.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.10.004>
- Saleem, T., Unjum, U., Ahmed, M. I., & Qadeer, A. (2021). Social distance and speech behavior: A case of Pakistani English speakers' apology responses. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 8(1), 1890410. 10.1080/23311983.2021.1890410
- Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., McDaniel, E. R., & Roy, C. S. (2016). *Communication between cultures*. Cengage Learning.
- Savana, A. F., & Meisa, W. (2021). Japanese apology expressions by Javanese and Sundanese speakers. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 5(2), 497-504.
<https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v5i2.4609>
- Siregar, I. (2021). Epistemological Challenges Against Sociolinguistics. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 37-42.
- Spear, A. D. (2019). Epistemic dimensions of gaslighting: peer-disagreement, self-trust, and epistemic injustice. *Inquiry*, 1-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2019.1610051>
- Svenning, A., Panzarino, R., Vanryckeghem, M., & Vestner, T. (2021). Life partners' perceptions of the emotional, speech disruptive, and attitudinal correlates of stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 67, 105821.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2020.105821>
- Taguchi, N. (2014). Pragmatic socialization in an English-medium university in Japan. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(2), 157-181.
- Takamiya, Yumi. (2018). [Home] no motsu hitei-tekina kinō: Kaiwa no naka de daisansha o hihan suru sai ni tsukawa reru homekotoba ni tsuite). *Words*, 39, 70-86.
- Takanashi, Y. (2004). TEFL and communication styles in Japanese culture. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 17(1), 1-14
- Tamanaha, M. (2003). *Interlanguage speech act realization of apologies and complaints: The performances of Japanese L2 speakers in comparison with Japanese L1 and English L1 speakers*. University of California
- Tawilapakul, U. (2022). Face threatening and speaker presuppositions: The case of feminine polite particles in Thai. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 195, 69-90.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.04.016>
- Tereszkiewicz, A. (2021). Rejecting consumer complaints in customer encounters on Twitter—the case of English and Polish brand communication. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 17(2), 189-231.
- Thamrin, T., & Gani, M. H. (2020). Cultural value in phatic communication of Minangkabau society. *Jurnal Kata: Penelitian tentang Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra*, 4(1), 155-166.
<http://doi.org/10.22216/kata.v4i1.5272>
- Torres, S. (2019). On elastic ties: Distance and intimacy in social relationships. *Sociological Science*, 6, 235-263.
<https://doi.org/10.15195/v6.a10>
- Utomo, A. J. (2020). Love in the melting pot: ethnic intermarriage in Jakarta. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(14), 2896-2913.
- Valentina, T. R., & Safitri, C. (2022). Minang women in the patriarchy cultural maelstrom: viewed from the view of religion and culture. <http://doi.org/10.4108/eai.30-8-2021.2316280>
- Venkataramanan, K., & Rajamohan, H. R. (2019). Emotion recognition from speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.10458*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1912.10458>
- Weiner, B. (2018). The legacy of an attribution approach to motivation and emotion: A no-crisis zone. *Motivation Science*, 4(1), 4.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000082>
- Wibowo, W. (2022). *Konsep Tindak Tutur Komunikasi*. Bumi Aksara.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2007). Bodies and their parts: An NSM approach to semantic typology. *Language Sciences*, 29(1), 14-65.
- Wiranty, W. (2015). Tindak Tutur dalam Wacana Novel Laskar Pelangi Karya Andrea Hirata (Sebuah Tinjauan Pragmatik). *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 4(2), 294-304.
<https://doi.org/10.31571/bahasa.v4i2.97>
- Wu, X., & Fitzgerald, R. (2021). 'Hidden in plain sight': Expressing political criticism on Chinese social media. *Discourse Studies*, 23(3), 365-385.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445620916>
- Xafizovna, R. N. (2022). Discourse analysis of politeness strategies in literary work: speech acts and politeness strategies. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, 5, 123-133.
- Yanti, Y. (2021). Gender and Communication: Some Features of Women's Speech. *Journal of Cultura and Lingua*, 2(1), 33-38.
- Yoshimi, M. I. Y. A. K. E. (2022). Address terms as pronoun substitutes for speech act participants in Japanese and Javanese families. *Akita Eigo Bungaku*, 63, 13-28.
<https://doi.org/10.20569/00006006>