PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

IDENTIFYING THE FEATURES OF TEACHERS' VERBAL VIOLENCE IN ACEH SCHOOL

Muzir[1], Tengku Silvana Sinar[2], Eddy Setia[3], Amrin Saragih[4]

[1] Linguistic Doctoral Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences,Universitas Sumatera Utara,

Medan,

[2.3] Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sumatera Utara,

Medan,

[4] Department of Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri

Medan, Medan.

[1]muzirhusin@gmail.com. [2]tengkusilvana@usu.ac.id.[3]eddy12457@yahoo.com,

[4]amrin_saragih@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The present study identifies the features of verbal violence uttered by the teachers to students in two schools in Lhokseumawe Aceh. The design of this study was qualitative research with phenomenology paradigm. The data of this study were in the oral utterances of teachers to students who represented verbal violence in learning at school. The data collection methods were observation and in-depth interviews to find out directly the features of teacher's violence words and phrases to students at school. The findings of this study indicated that verbal violence of teachers to the students rangedfrom insulting on the human body parts, addressing nicknames on animal and spirits, harassing, threatening, and cursing the students. The practical implication of the study forlanguage teachers or students in Aceh and other parts of Indonesia is that teachers' spoken language should communication especially in educational setting at school.

INTRODUCTION

Verbal violence in this study is defined as acts of language speech intentionally or unintentionally when a teacher reprimands and scolds his or her students by using harsh words,calling negative nicknames, cursing or yelling and threats in the school.

This study examined verbal violence communication of the use of teacher speech acts against students in two schools in Aceh, Indonesia. The purpose of this study is to investigate the speech act types of verbal violence used by six Acehnese teachers towards their students in association with the pretext of disciplining students in the learning process. The reason why the language used is called as verbal violence is related to Brendgen, et al (2006), Gadit, Teicher, *et al* (2011) in Lane (2003) statements about the definition of verbal violence as the use of critical behaviour not only of spoken words, but also of the voice tone, facial expressions, and body language including belittling, scolding, cursing, insulting, blaming, shouting, threatening, ridiculing, humiliating, cursing, scapegoating, creating negative comparisons, teasing, calling negative nicknames, and criticizing.

Based on observations at two schools in Aceh, it is common for the teachers to use and call nicknames or ridiculous words towards the students in their spoken language communication inside or outside the classroom settings. Some interviews had been conducted to investigatewhy the teachers used insulting and frightening words or exaggerating the students' mistakes. They said those words were not to insult, or threaten the students. The words were only uttered in incidents stemming from students' attitudes themselves that often deviated and disrespected school rules such as neglecting their assignments, chatting with friends, sleeping during the lesson, making noise inside the class, yelling, or running here and there, fighting or teasing outside the class.

So the teachers emotionally handle the disobedient students in ways to determine discipline to the mat school. On the other setting, the students were also interviewed to check and ask what words used by the teachers when insinuating and issuing their annoyance. By these interviews and observations in the classrooms, this study collected 136 words and phrases considered as verbal violence. Therefore, this study needs to be conducted to describe the factual situation about verbal violence acts happening at the two schools in Lhokseumawe, and to hinder continuous verbal action of teachers from threatening students, and to make them realize about the impolite way of spoken language communication especially in educational setting at school.

The research about verbal violence began to flourish in America in the 90s when Vissing, Straus, Gelles, and Harrop (1991) in Brennan (2003) used the definition of verbal aggression that combines the characteristics of verbal aggression due to communication actions that cause psychological impacts on others verbal, for example, calling nicknames or spelling words of ridicule towards the speaker, or nonverbal communication such as slamming doors or destroying things and silencing or sulking. A few years later, Goldberg and Goldstein (2000), Goldberg, Pachas, and Keith (1999) defined verbal aggression communication as 'verbal violence', which is any language or commentary intended to humiliate, intimidate, or act disrespectfully, resulting in feelings of inferiority, falling self-esteem, goals and ambitions are inhibited. Sociolinguistics as a discipline connects language with society and pragmatics as a discipline studies the meaning of speech or language contextually (read Yule, 1996: 3),this means how someone uses language in communicating with social communities based on the context of their existence. Social constraints of

speech are connected with people's awareness of relational setting in interaction (Tobing, Panggabean, and Sinar, 2016). Verbal violence research through the use of speech acts theory is supported by several references such as Cutting (2002), Thomas (2002), and Leech (2014).Speech act states the intentions and desires between speakers naturally to create and maintain certain social relationships. Speech act is a piece of speech produced as part of social interaction. Some theories of speech acts that are popularly used as references are Austin's (1962), Searle's (1969) and Leech's (1993). Speech act is discussed under Pragmatics discipline. It indicates that the language used by someone in the communication can be studied internally (pragmatic linguistic aspects) and externally (sociopragmatic aspects). Internal studies are limited to the internal structure of language which will produce language perians, without any connection with other problems outside the linguistic aspect (Leech, 1983: 10-11).Sociopragmatic study examines the use of language in a cultural society in certain social situations. It is a study of local conditions and more specific local conditions regarding the use of language and examines speech adjusted to the situation in a particular environment.

Fairclough (1989) examined the analysis of verbal violence from the perspective of critical discourse analysis that saw languages a social praxis and social factors such as power relations that can influence someone using various speech acts. In social interactions the use of speech involves power relations and which can reflect the ideology and social relations that participants have.

In relation to the phenomenon of verbal acts of violence research in Indonesia, Wijana (1996: 19) acknowledges that illocution act identifies the speakers, and analysis is needed to find out the teacher's intention to use speech acts and speaking strategies in the learning process. A teacher uses performative act verbs in each of his utterances. Furthermore, Santoso (2010) claims that the perpetrators and victims are interrelated and each action of the perpetrators and victims influence each other. It can be interpreted that the position of the perpetrator is not always "bad" and the victim is not also "good". Which is always the main trigger for the emergence of violence, not only students but also teachers often trigger violence, both of which influence each other. A teacher who has qualities is expected to be able to realize the creation of change towards an educated and liberated society. Parents give full confidence to the school for the purpose that children who get an education become a proud human. With so the two parents of students, namely teachers in schools should be someone who is able to create a comfortable atmosphere in the school environment as a place that has been believed to be the safest and best for children. In fact, expectations do not match reality.Teacher and student violence is starting to occur and seems to be a natural occurrence in the community (solopos.com, 2014).

Furthermore, Simpen (2011) admits that there are several factors that cause a person to commit verbal violence, namely economic factors, hurt factors, disappointment, and frustration. He also remarks that in Indonesia, homes, schools, workplaces and offices are places where verbal violence occurs, and those who carry out verbal violence were due to the authorities or those who

had power, such as father to son, teacher against students, superiors to subordinates, and others.

Research conducted by Ambarwati (2013) focuses on the functions of verbal violence that occured in the traditional markets in the City of Denpasar Bali with the objects of the research were traders and prospective buyers and the factors that triggered the use of verbal violence in traditional markets. The research found out that verbal violence in traditional markets was classified based on the functions of speech act concepts in pragmatic theory, namely assertive, directive, commissive and declarative. The weakness of verbal abuse research by Ambarwati is that expressive speech acts were not found. This was likely to happen because the data source taken in communication was limited in the market.

Rionaldi (2014) furthermore examines the functions of violence perpetrated by teachers against students, including: physical violence, namely: a function of violence that was found to cause injury or injury to students such as: hitting, kicking, and slapping. Then the psychological violence committed by the teacher against students was violence by insulting, harassing, criticizing or throwing out words that hurt feelings, hurt only the student's self, reduced self-confidence, made students feel humiliated, small, weak, ugly, useless, even helpless. Actually, violence on these students was a harsh act carried out against students in schools under the pretext of disciplining students resulting in physical, psychological and sexual arousal or suffering. Rionaldi's research and this research have differences in terms of research problems, namely Rionaldi discusses the function of verbal and non-verbal violence.

Another study was conducted by Arsih (2010) entitled "Phenomenological Studies: verbal violence (verbal abuse) in adolescents." The study was based on a database that was successfully collected through a questionnaire. It was found out that the adolescents were treated with verbally abused by their parents such as naming their children by animal names when scolding or angry. Meanwhile, the results showed the other side that the children felt sad, vengeance, and paid back using verbal abuse to their own parents. Those who were bullied at the time felt immediately want to counter while some were able to ignore those violence words but are unable to do so to their parents.

Hufad (2013) examined about violence in his research entitled "Violent behaviour: Analysis according to cultural systems and educational implications". He cleared up the phenomenon of empiricism of violent behaviour in a cultural perspective and its complications in education. In his description, facts and actions were found out on function of violence, the relationship of violent behaviour with a number of products, and the educational implications as problem-solving efforts.

Hejlm (2014) in his writing talked about the important role of critical discourse analysis of certain religious hegemony in social interactions reported by several media. According to him, the mass media have carried out discursive construction, reproduced and transformed inequality in the religious sphere.

Therefore, a critical analytical discourse approach is needed in the discussion of religious sociology that is always charged with certain powers and ideologies. Some of these studies on verbal violence that have been carried out by the previous researchers are in line theoretically and methodically with this research the verbal violence of Acehnese teachers against students at school. Therefore, it is conducted more in-depth research on verbal violence, especially in the context of theschool's teaching-learning in order to describe the features of teachers' verbal violence in Aceh.

RESEARCH METHOD
This study employeda phenomenology paradigm to explain phenomena that occur in a situation using natural verbal violence in the community. This paradigm is used by Creswell's (2017: 10-11) in qualitative research. The main purpose of qualitative research is to interpret the meanings that other have about this world and the phenomenology paradigm observes at the researcher's subjective experience of the various types of empirical data (subjects) that it discovers. Moreover, the result of qualitative research is the discovery of a model that is built from several pieces of information which are then categorized so that it functions a pattern that is eventually developed into a model (see Creswell, 2017: 87).

It was conducted based on the phenomena of language occuringat a Junior High School in Lhokseumawe, Aceh Province to describe the features of the verbal violence type of Acehnese language that teachers carried out against students in the learning process.

The research data were the verbal utterances such as words and phrases expressed by teachers and students containing verbal violence at school. The settings were inside and outside classroom. The methodsof data collections were observation outside schools and interviews with the teachers and students. The sources of research data were from recorded speeches inside classrooms and taken from eight teachers of Natural Science, Mathematics, Bahasa Indonesia, Social Studies, English, Pancasila, Sports Education and Guidance Counsel Courses. The researcher had the role as a key instrument-assisted with a cellphone recording device, handycam, and data recording device. Furthermore, the two methods were basically complementary to explore the information needed in conducting the research. The information collected was sourced from informants selected purposively, but still based on the criteria stated (see, Creswell, 2017: 253).

Colleting datafrom interview was done purposively involving 8 informants (teachers) who were chosen to represent the teacher party. Twenty two Junior High School students in Lhokseumawe were used as informants when they had school breaks. All the informants were native Aceh residents who spoke Acehnese language intheir daily communication.Data analysis technique in the observation typeinvolvedlistening and note-taking of the recorded teachers' language to select, to abstract, and to transform them into table display.

RESULTS
Features of Verbal Violence in Acehnese Language
In the Acehnese language, there are words that actually and literally mean ordinary, but in certain contexts, these words are often used by people to insult, berate, curse, give a nickname which give a bad effect to others. Based on the analytical observation in this study, there were some types of words that featured verbal violence. These words were committed by teachers and students in the learning process at school. The findings of verbal violence in Acehnese language can be classified as follows:

It usually include threats, offensive language, comments with harsh words, uses of swear words, yelling, shouting, teasing, ridiculing, passing nasty remarks,

Cause of Teacher Verbal Violence against Students in the Learning Process at School

In this section, the writer discussed verbal violence data that is adjusted to the research formulation and objectives. The first problem in this study is about the form of verbal violence uttered by teachers to students in the learning process at school. The theory used in this discussion is the theory put forward by Brown and Levinson, (1987) regarding speech acts.

Analysis of the forms of verbal violence uttered by the teacher to students in the learning process based on data obtained from the field. The following are the answers of respondents (students) at SMP Negeri 1 Lhokseumawe with the distribution of answers as follows: TP; Never, J; Rarely, KK; Sometimes, S; Often. namely as in the following frequency distribution table:

Table 1 Distribution of students' response to the questionnaire

NO	Statement	TP	J	KK	S
1	Teachers like to curse in Acehnese in class such as papma, paleh that, aramjadah, etc. at will to harm students in the class.	22,7 %	4.54 %	31.78%	40.86 %
2	The teacher couldn't control his hands, so they almost slapped him	4.54 %	13.62%	36.32%	45.4%
3	The teacher likes to make fun of the students who make a mess in the classroom	18.16 %	0%	36.32%	45.4%
4	teachers like to scare students in class into obedience	0%	13.62%	31.78%	54.48%
5	teachers like to yell at students when students talk in class	0%	9.08%	27.24%	64.56%

6	the teacher looks at students with cynical / sharp glances	4.54%	9.08%	36.32%	49.94%
7	the teacher likes to ignore student questions in class if there are students who ask questions in class	27.24%	18.162%	45.4%	9.08%
8	the teacher taunts the unclothed student at school.	13.14%	8.76%	35.04%	39.42%
9	the teacher likes to hit the table when students are making noise in class	27.24%	13.62%	49.94%	9.08%
10	teachers love to give nicknames to students in class	9.08%	13.62%	40.86%	36.32%
11	Teachers often berate naughty students in class to fellow teachers so that other teachers know	13,62%	9.08%	40.86%	36.32%
12	the teacher calls students dirty words such as the names of animals, spirits / supernatural beings, etc., if there are students who irritate the teacher or students who are disliked	22.7%	13.62%	36.32%	27.24%
13	When students talk in class, the teacher scolds them with harsh words etc.	18.16%	18.16%	40.86%	22.7%
14	Teachers like to threaten and mock students who don't want to do homework.	9.08%	18.16%	49.94%	22.7%
15	The teacher likes to cross students' faces with a marker when the student is sleepy in class.	18.16%	27.24%	31.78%	22.7%
16	the teacher scolded students with dirty words that did not hear learning in class	18.16%	9.08%	40.86%	31.78%
17	The teacher gives ridiculous names in the form of spirits when students make mistakes in class.	13.62%	18.16%	36.32%	31,78%
18	The teacher likes to equate students with something, whether in the form of an animal, object or other with the intention of mocking	9.08%	22.7%	40.86%	27.24%

	students who make mistakes in class				
19	teachers often equate students with things in the form of objects, animal traits or spirits when students do disturbances in class.	18.16%	22.7%	31.78%	27.24%

.

Based on the table above, it shows that verbal violence behavior is the dominant behavior by teachers based on respondent data (students) at SMP Negeri 1 Lhokseumawe.

The results of the data analysis based on the table above show that the respondent's (student) acknowledgment of the teacher's verbal abuse against students in school is the highest with the answer that the teacher often uses verbal violence against students as much as 36.36%, then the answer is that sometimes the teacher uses verbal violence. as much as 27.29%, and by answering never as much as 22.72%, and the lowest as much as 13.63% with the answer rarely used verbal violence against students in the learning process at school.

Thus, based on the answers to the table questionnaire above, it can be concluded that the teacher's language behavior with students is an asymmetric language behavior, namely the teacher as the ruler and the student as the authority. The implication is that the speech of students tends to be more polite than the speech of the teacher. And partly the teacher's speech does not lead to verbal violence in the learning process at school even though the teacher's speech is not classified as polite in the learning process.

It was found based on the statement (1) that respondents (students) said teachers often used harsh words to harm students who were not liked 2) teachers often embarrassed students who were embarrassed in front of their friends in class (3) respondents said that teachers often berated students who were not liked, the teacher could not control their hands, so there were almost as many unexpected actions as, in statement (5) the respondent said that the teacher often mocked students who committed mischief in class, the teacher often frightened students in class so that they obeyed the teacher often yelled at students when students spoke in learning class, seeing students with cynical / sharp eye glances, teachers who often yell or yell at students in class, teachers sometimes ignore students' questions in class when there are students who ask questions in class the teacher often taunts students who are not neatly dressed at school the teacher sometimes hitting the table when students are making noise in the teacher's class sometimes -Sometimes giving nicknames to students in the teacher's class often threatens students if students do not make school assignments given by the teacher

Insulting on the Human Body Parts

The names of body parts, including the group is *ekkeuh* 'your poop', *matakeuh* 'your eyes', *ekpunggong* 'back dung', *geunteotkeuh* 'your fart', *ekgeunteot* 'fart' and *punggongkeuh* 'your back'. The formation of *ekkeuh* word 'your poop', *matakeuh* 'your eyes', and *ekpunggung* 'back dung' arethe lexical categories including basic and nouns or noun. The names of the body parts have some meaningas in the following table:

Table1.Body Parts as Featured Verbal Violence

Acehnese	English
Ekkeuh	Your poop!
Ek-punggong	Back dung!
Punggongkeuh	Your buttock!
Geunteotkeuh	Your fart!
Mata keuh	Your eyes!

These words are part of the body's organs which are naturally normal and do not touch the surface of the body. However, those words werecommittedby the teachers in their utterances when comparing or likening students. The purpose of treating the students is due to insult students when their emotional state cannot be controlled. The teachers made the students feel they are not appreciated and invaluable.

Mocking Nicknames on Animal and Spirits

There were several names of animal in Acehnese language often used in venting the displeasure of the speaker (Pn) to the interlocutor. In this study, the teachers mockedsarcastically the students with names of the animals like*bui* 'pig' (you are like '*bui*'), *asẻ* 'dog' (you are '*ase*'), *bẽn* 'monkey' (your face is like that '*ben*'), *bue* 'a type of monkey', *itẻk* 'duck', *manok* 'chicken', and *kamẽŋ* 'goat'.In terms of formation, *bui* 'pig', *asẻ* 'dog', *bẽn* 'monkey', *bue* 'a type of monkey', *itẻk* 'duck', *manok* 'chicken', and *kamẽŋ* 'goat' are words that belong to nouns but they portray the manners of these animals.

Table 2.Mocking Nicknames on Animals and Spirits

Acehnese	English
Bui	You just like a pig!
Asei	just like a dog!
Bein	just like a monkey!
Iteik	slow like a duck!
Manoek	You are just like a chicken!
Kameing	You are just like a goat!
Burong	You are just like a creature!
Ma op	Look like asatan!
Iblih	Look like a demon!
Antu	Look like a ghost, devil!

Several spirits were also used to express their anger such as *ma op, iblih, antu.* The nouns had the element of violence when the teachers had a tendency matching and comparing their students with some characters of animals or spirits. The teachers insulted or harassed their students, uttering the words that are considered as elements of verbal violence. These words indicating a prohibition on the opponents made their students the weak party, and negatively affected the students' feeling. At the teacher's side as perpetrator, they did not realize they committed verbal violence.

Harassing Words

The adjective class of words having the meaning of human nature featured about harassment. There were several words in Acehnese language commonly used by Aceh people inventing the displeasure of a speaker (Pn) to the interlocutor, and these words were used by the teachers to students such as *bangai*'stupid', *beueo*'lazy', *ngeut*'idiot, foolish', *teungeut*'overslept'.

Table 3. Harassing Words

Acehnese	English
Kah Bangai	You, stupid!
Kah Beueo	You, lazy!
Kah Ngeut	You, idiot, foolish!
Kah Teungeut	You,overslept!

All of the adjectives above if applied in the sentence by matching, comparing, or cornering the opposite party contain verbal violence and the students get hurt with their teachers when the teachers blame them by using these words. The commentsarethat these words are considered to violate the man affect their deeper sense. So these harassing words givea negative impact on the students.

Cursing Words

The teachers were in bad moods. This condition affected their etiquette. Since the power of inequality, theycould offend the feelings of the students in communicating. Those included in this group were: *paleh that*'very bad', *aneukbajeung*'children out of wedlock', *ramjadah*'illegitimate child', *pap mai*'your mom's pussy', *pukomai*'your mom's cunt', *papleumoh*'ox butt', and *ta eutpokpok*'a type of disease'. These words are often used by speakers to curse the opposite speaker. These words can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.Cursing Words

Acehnese	English
Paleh thatkah	very bad, you!
pap maikeuh	your mom's pussy!
Pukomai	your mom's cunt!
Aneukbajeung	children out of wedlock!
Ramjadah	you, illegitimate child!

| *pap leumo kah* | ox butt, you! |
| *ta eutpopok* | you, like spread pandemic! |

All swear words above are adjectives and are considered rude and violent. They violate the speech rules and give negative effect on the interlocutor (Pt).

ScoldingWords

The teachershademotionally bad temperament and got crisis on their human morality. The scolding words were forbidden because these wordscould offend the feelings of the studentswhen communicating with them. These were the words*jeuheut*'evil', *kuẻh*'cunning', *jahẽ*'evil' and *hanathẽdrō*'no heart' to scold the students. These adjectives words areoften used by speakers in deriding the interlocutor (Pt).

Table 5. Scolding Words in Acehnese Language

Acehnese	English
Jeuheut kah	You're an evil!
Kueih	You're cunning!
Jahei that	So much evil, you!
Hanatheidroe	You have no heart!

All of these adjectives indicate a prohibition on the speech made to someone (speaker). Its use is almost similar to cursing and the words are considered to violate the rules and have a negative effect on the opponents' talk (Pt).

f. Threatening Words Some teachersthought themselves had more power than students so there arouse the words threatening to the students.The aspects of inequality of coursecouldmake teachers do whatever they liked. They thought prohibitions and regulations had to be obeyed by students, because they were under the teachers' protection. While those included in this group were: *kaeukeuh*'you look', *matẻkeuh*'you die', *kuprẽhkeuh*'I wait for you' and *neueukeuh*'look'. In terms of form, *kaeukeuh*'look', *matẻkeuh*'you die', *kuprẽhkeuh*'I'm waiting for you' and *neueukeuh*'look'were words and belonged to the category of verbs or verbs often used by speakers to threaten opponents talk (Pt). These words have several components of meaning as in the following table:

Table 6. Threatening Words

Acehnese	English
Kaeukeuh	You watch!
matẻkeuh	See…you will be dead!
kuprẽhkeuh	I will wait for you
Neueukeuh	You see soon!

These words are verbs indicating a prohibition in a speech to someone (speaker). Their use is very fatal and threaten the safety of others and it isconsidered to violate the rules and has a great negative effect on the interlocutor.

Humiliating Words

As for the traits that were not good and even commendable always used by the speaker (Pn) of the speaker/interlocutor (Pt)werethe natures of humiliating words to cause ashamed and embarrassed to others. These words were not good and were not even justified to be used against the interlocutor (Pt). As for those included in this group were*puhayeu that*'what a great time', *ibensehbarang*'damaged thing', *kaeu ... (...)*.

Table 7.The Humiliating Words

Acehnese	English
Puhayeu that	What creature are you?
Ibehbarang	Like a damaged thing!
Kaẽu...	You re nothing!

The teacher's emotional feelings and attitudes to the students are decoded and all words above indicate a prohibition on speech uttered to someone (speaker). Its use is considered to violate the rules and provide a large negative influence on the speaker.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the features of teachers' verbal violence to students in the JHS in Lhokseumawe, Acehare: (1) naming human body parts,(2) naming animal and spirits in a negative nickname, (3) the harassing words,(4) the cursing words, (5) the scolding words, (6) the threatening words, and (7) the humiliating and isolating words.

As these features of Acehnese verbal violence at two schools in Lhokseumawe are considered as serious issues, it is recommended that teachers should be assessed by head master. Further research can also be undertaken to observe teacher and student verbal abuse in school setting.

Authors Contribution

The first author is the research group leader and the second is corresponding author. Each author has equally contributed to this article in different tasks from designing the research, searching the literature, collecting data, until interpreting the results and writing up the article.

REFERENCES

Allan, Keith and Burridge. 2006. Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ambarwati.2013. Kekerasan Verbal Bahasa Indonesia dalam Wacana Pasar Tradisional di Kota Denpasar. Jurnal Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia. Universitas Udayana.

Arsih, F.Y. 2010.Studi Fenomenologis Kekerasan Kata-Kata atau Verbal pada Remaja. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.

Austin, JL. 1962. How to Do Things with Words. Cambridge : Mass Harvard University Press.

Brennan, W. 2003.Sounding Off about Verbal Abuse. Occupational Health, 55(11), 22- 25.Retrieved fromthe ProQuest Nursing and Allied Health Source database.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. Language and Power. London; New York: Longman.

Creswell, John W. 2017. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. SAGE Publications.

Cutting, Joan. 2002. Pragmatics and Discourse a Resource. London: Routledge.

Goldberg, R. T. and Goldstein, R. 2000.A Comparison of Chronic Pain Patients and Controls on Traumatic Events in Childhood.Disability and Rehabilitation, 22, 756-763.Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline. com/loi.idre20

Goldberg, R. T., Pachas, W. N., and Keith, D.1999. Relationship between Traumatic Events in Childhood and Chronic Pain. Disability and Rehabilitation, 21(1), 23-30. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline. com/loi.idre20

Goodwin, R. D., Hoven, C. W., Murison, R. M., and Hotopf, M. 2003.Association between Childhood Physical Abuse and Gastrointestinal Disorders and Migraine in Adulthood.American Journal of Public Health, 93, 1065-1067. Retrieved from https://ajph.aphapublications.org/

Herman, Murni, S. M., Sibarani, B. and Saragih, A. 2019. Structures of Representational Metafunctions of the "Cheng Beng" Ceremony in Pematangsiantar: A Multimodal Analysis. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change., Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019. Retrieved from
https://www.ijicc.net/images/vol8iss4/8403_Herman_2019_E_R.pdf

Hutajulu, F.S.L. and Herman. 2019. Analysis of Illocutionary Act in the Movie "You Are My Home" English Subtitle. Journal of English Educational Study, 2(1), 29-36. Retrieved from: http://jurnal.stkippersada.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/JEES/article/view/371

Hufad, Ahmad.2013 . Perilaku Kekerasan: Analisis Menurut Sistem Budaya dan Implikasi Edukatif. Jurnal Mimbar Pendidikan, Vol.XXII, No.2.

Lane, T. 2003. Women Have Different Risk Factors for Verbal, Physical Partner Abuse. Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 35(2), 106-107. Retrieved from https://www.guttmacher.org/journals/psrh

Leech, G.N.1983. Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman.

Leech, G.N.2014.The Pragmatics of Politeness. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, Stephen. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nurjamily, Wa Ode.2015. Kesantunan Berbahasa Indonesia dalam Lingkungan Keluarga.Jurnal Humanika, No. 15 Vol. 3.

Pardede, H., Herman, and Pratiwi, H. 2019. An Analysis of Politeness Principle Maxims found in Big Hero 6 Movie.European Exoloratory Scientific Journal, 3(4), 1-7. Retrieved from: https://syniutajournals.com/index.php/EESJ/article/view/87

Pasaribu, S., Herman, Silalahi, D.E. (2019). The Speech Act between Teacher and Students in Teaching Learning Process. Multidisciplinary European Academic Journal, 1(1), 1-7. Retrieved from: https://www.syniutajournals.com/index.php/MEAJ/article/view/94

Rionaldi, Artur. 2014. Tinjauan Yuridis terhadap Kekerasan yang Dilakukan Oknum Guru terhadap Murid di Sekolah.Jurnal Fakultas Hukum Universitas Admajaya Yogyakarta.

Santoso. A. 2010. Statistik untuk Psikologi: dari Blog Menjadi Buku. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma.

Searle, John. 1969. Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpen, I Wayan.2011.FungsiBahasadanKekerasan Verbal dalamMasyarakat.Makalah OrasiIlmiah. .Pengenalan Jabatan Guru Besar Tetap di Universitas Udayana. Bali.

Tencer, H. L. 2002. Verbal and Emotional Abuse as Predictors of Change in Close Friendship in Early Adolescence.Society for Research in Adolescence. Retrieved from https://www.elsevier.com/social-sciences/psychology/society-for-research-in-adolescence

Thao, N. V., Herman., Ha, T. T., Thuy, N. T. T., and Tho, N. T. Q. 2020. Analysis of Argumentation in Nam Cao's Story 'Chi Pheo' Based on a Pragmatics Perspective. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net, Volume 12, Issue 12, 2020. Retrieved from https://www.ijicc.net/images/vol12/iss12/121288_Thao_2020_E_R.pdf

Thomas, M. 2002. Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Thomas, Jenny.A. 2014. Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics Learning About Language. London: Routledge.

Tobing, A.P.L., Panggabean, H., Sinar, T.S.S. (2016). Effect-for-cause inferencing in the evaluation of loudness among Toba Batak People.Sociolinguistic Studies,10(3), 455-474. doi: 10.1558/sols.v10i3.28869

Wang, Na. 2013.AnAnalysis of the Pragmatic Function of 'Swearing' in interpersonal Talk.Griffith WorkingPaper and Intercultural Communication 6.Retrieved from https://www.griffith.edu.au/-data/assets/pdf-file/0007/589453/Na-Wang.pdf

Williamson, D. F., Thompson, T. J., Anda, R. F., Dietz, W. H., &Felitti, V. 2002. Body Weight and Obesity in Adults and Self-Reported Abuse in Childhood. International Journal of Obesity, 26, 1075-1082. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/ijo/

Wijana, IDewaPutu. 1996.Dasar-DasarPragmatik. Yogyakarta: PustakaPelajar.

Wijana, I Dewa Putu and Rohmadi. 2009. Analisis Wacana Pragmatik; Kajian Teori dan Analysis.Surakarta: Yama Pustaka.

Yule, George. 1996. Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lawal, Adebayo (2012)."Aspects of a Stylistic Theory and the Implications for Practical Criticism." In Adebayo Lawal (ed.), Stylistics in Theory and Practice. Ilorin: Applied Linguistics Study Group (ALSG), University of Ilorin, p. 38.