

Violations of The Cooperative Principle and Their Implications in The Context of The Animated Film Spongebob Squarepants: A Pragmatic Study

M. Asroruddin Thayyib¹ | Budi Hermawan¹ | Rinaldi Supriadi¹

¹Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Corespondence should be addresed to: M. Asroruddin Thayyib; asroruddin.22@upi.edu

Abstract. Both the speaker and the interlocutor are aware that there are rules governing their actions, language use, and interpretation of the actions and utterances of the interlocutor. Each participant in the speech act is responsible for their actions and deviations from linguistic rules in the linguistic interaction. The purpose of this study is to describe violations of the principles of conversational cooperation and implicature found in the Spongebob Squarepants animated film episode *Cinta Tetangga*. The research method used in this study is a qualitative descriptive research method. This study was conducted by observing and then analyzing excerpts from the main character's conversations that contain violations of cooperation and implicatures found in the film. The results of this study four maxims were violated: the maxim of quantity with 5 instances of violation, the maxim of quality with 2 instances of violation, the maxim of relevance with 6 instances of violation, and the maxim of manner with 2 instances of violation. In addition to cooperation violations, implications were found regarding the violation of the four maxims. The implicature of the maxim of quantity includes providing information, expressing objection, informing, requesting assistance, and advising. The implicature of quality includes knowing the data and feeling afraid. The implicature of relevance includes diverting the conversation, following the data, refusing to assist, and informing about the data. Finally, the implicature of the maxim of manner includes covering up ignorance and covering up something.

Keyword: Implicatures; maxims; pragmatics; spongebob squarepants

Introduction

Language is defined as a system of arbitrary sound symbols agreed upon within a community for the purpose of interacting, identifying, and collaborating (Misbahuddin, 2020; Noermanzah, 2019). The primary function of language is communicative, meaning it serves as a tool for conveying information, news, facts, opinions, and other forms of communication. Additionally, humans can express their ideas through spoken or written language, as well as through linguistic symbols. Therefore, the language used should support the intended purpose so that what is thought, desired, or felt can be understood by the listener or reader.

The use of language often deviates from structural rules, but the communication process does not encounter obstacles and instead results in more effective and efficient communication. Even the study of a language at the structural level alone often does not produce a maximal study. This is what drives the study of a language not only from a structural perspective but also in relation to aspects outside the structure of language. Language studies that can accommodate aspects beyond language in their analysis are pragmatics and discourse analysis wacana (Al-Hindawi & Saffah, 2017; Muzaffar, 2024). In these two fields, the study of a language involves aspects beyond language that contribute to the meaning of communication. Pragmatics is the study of the meaning conveyed by the speaker to the listener as the interpreter of a utterance, or what is

also known as the study of the speaker's intention (Yule, 1996).

In pragmatics, understanding the implied meaning of a speech act is known as implicature. Implicature is the meaning conveyed by a speaker to their interlocutor (Arifianti, 2018; Lestari & Arifianti, 2023). In the study of implicature, there is a theory proposed by a philosopher named Herbert Paul Grice. In this theory, Paul Grice divides implicature into two types: conventional implicature and conversational implicature (Odot, 2022). In the process of effective communication between a speaker and their interlocutor, rules are needed so that the communication process can run as it should. Communication is built as an effort to foster harmony through language that is integrated into communication greetings (Ibrahim, 2021).

Simply put, implicature is an indirect or implied meaning that is conveyed by what is explicitly stated. Implicature refers to a statement that implies something different from what is actually said. Using implicature in conversation means expressing something indirectly. Implicature is a prime example of the abundance of information conveyed beyond what is said. For implicatures to be interpreted, certain basic principles of cooperation must be assumed beforehand in their implementation (Yule G., 2006).

The concept that there is some information expected to be present in a conversation is only one aspect of the general idea that people involved in a conversation will form a cooperation with one another. On some occasions, assumptions about cooperation are so ingrained that they can be stated as principles of cooperation. Grice expressed the view that there are four maxims in the principle of cooperation: 1) The Maxim of Quantity, 2) The Maxim of Quality, 3) The Maxim of Relevance, 4) The Maxim of Manner (Nugraheni, 2010; Yule, 2006).

In relation to the above description, the author is interested in this film as it has its own appeal as a research subject. Films are inherently a form of mass communication due to their ability to reach a wide audience and convey messages simultaneously to many people (McQuail, 2010). One of the SpongeBob SquarePants series produced by Nickelodeon Arabia, titled "Cinta Tetangga," was selected as the subject of this study. The story revolves around SpongeBob's interactions with his neighbors, Squidward (the octopus) and Patrick (the starfish). The humor in this series stems from Spongebob's innocent, optimistic, always cheerful behavior and his good intentions toward everyone. Sometimes this behavior leads to disasters, is exploited, or causes misunderstandings when combined with the characteristics of other creatures living in Bikini Bottom.

There are several studies that examine violations of the principle of cooperation and its implications, one of which is a study conducted by Legisyha et al. (2022) that examined the conversations of characters in the film Ranah 3 Warna by Ahmad Fuadi. In this study, they found that there are three implicatures: general conversation implicature, specific conversation implicature, and scaled conversation implicature. In addition to films, implicature analysis is also used to analyze texts such as novels and scripts. As done by Odot (2022), who analyzed the novel Jodoh Akan Bertemu by Lana Azim. In this study, conventional implicature and conversational implicature were found in different sentence forms. In line with this research, Ananda & Astuti (2024) also analyzed movies. In their study, they found forms of quality maxims, relevance maxims, deviations from quality maxims, and deviations from relevance maxims. In the film script, Nugraheni (2010) conducted research on the Harry Potter film script, and the results showed that all types of maxims were found in the script.

Although there have been several studies examining implicature in films or scripts, researchers have not yet found any analysis of violations of the principle of cooperation and its implicature in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants particularly in the episode "Cinta Tetangga." Therefore, this research is still relevant to be conducted. In this study, the researcher will examine the four types of violations of the principle of cooperation, namely the Maxim of Quantity, the Maxim of Quality, the Maxim of Relevance, and the Maxim of Performance. Additionally, the implicatures in the conversations between the characters in the film are also discussed in this study.

Method

The research method used in this study is a qualitative descriptive research method. According to Ratna (2015), qualitative methods are methods that utilize interpretation in the form of description. They pay attention to natural data and data related to the context of its existence. This method is the driving force behind qualitative methods in their existence, which are capable of involving several relevant major social phenomena. The descriptive and qualitative methods were used in this study by describing the speech data in the SpongeBob SquarePants animation film episode “*Cinta Tetangga*.” To obtain the desired data, the researcher used data collection techniques through observation, meaning that the data involved direct observation of the participants and the context involved in the research phenomenon. Observation provides researchers with the opportunity to observe social interactions, behaviors, and contexts relevant to the phenomenon being studied (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). In this study, observation was conducted by carefully watching the Spongebob Squarepants animated film episode “*Cinta Tetangga*” and noting various aspects relevant to the research, such as dialogue, visuals, and plot. After the data was collected, the researcher proceeded to the analysis stage using Grice's 1975 theory of cooperation principle violations and implicatures (in Rahardi, 2018).

Result and Discussion

When speaking, both the speaker and the listener are aware that all of their actions are governed by applicable rules. In addition to the actions of the speaker and listener, rules are used to regulate language use and interpretation in the actions and utterances of the listener. According to Allan, every action and deviation from linguistic rules in such communicative interactions is the responsibility of each participant in the speech act (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2018).

Table 1. Types of Maxims in The Spongebob Squarepants Animated Film Episode “*Cinta Tetangga*”

Type of Maxim	Speaker	Number of Utterances
The Maxim of Quantity	Spongebob, Squidword, Patrick	5 Utterances
The Maxim of Quality	Spongebob, Squidword, Patrick	2 Utterances
The Maxim of Relevance	Spongebob, Patrick, Squidword, Plankton	6 Utterances
The Maxim of Manner	Spongebob, Squidword, Patrick	2 Utterances

The data found from the discussion of maxim quality is 5 data. 4 of these data are conversations between Spongebob and Squidword discussing important matters and expressing their respective opinions. Spongebob and Squidword have conversations when they are in the yard or inside the house. Another piece of data found in the maxim quantity discussion is 1 piece of data containing a conversation between SpongeBob and Patrick. They are chatting in front of the Crusty Crab Restaurant, planning to play together.

The data found from the maxim quality discussion consists of 2 pieces of data. Both pieces of data show conversations between SpongeBob, Squidward, and Patrick while they are playing. The first data is set in a library, where Spongebob is joking around with Patrick. The second data is when Spongebob, Patrick, and Squidward are in the backyard. Squidward scolds Spongebob and Patrick for playing and disturbing his peace.

The data found from the discussion of maxim relevance is 6 data points. 3 data points are conversations between Spongebob, Patrick, Squidword, and Plankton while they are playing or joking around. They play together in the backyard or inside the house. The other 3 data points are conversations between SpongeBob, Patrick, and Squidward having serious discussions in a tense atmosphere. These include asking for help and exchanging opinions.

The data found from the discussion on the maxim manner consists of 2 data points, which are serious conversations between SpongeBob and Squidward. Set in front of SpongeBob's house, Squidward is seen angry at SpongeBob. Another piece of data is a conversation between SpongeBob and Patrick set inside SpongeBob's house. Patrick looks a little sad in front of SpongeBob.

Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity expects participants in a conversation to contribute only as much as is necessary

or appropriate for their conversation partner. The maxim of quantity consists of two submaxims, namely (a) providing informative contributions as requested, and (b) not providing contributions that exceed the information requested. If a speaker does not fulfill these submaxims, they are considered to have violated the maxim, indicating the implicature that the speaker wishes to achieve. Based on observations, in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia, there are utterances that violate this maxim. The following are examples of utterances by characters in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia that violate the maxim of quantity:

Data 1: Episode 1 Minutes 1:45-1:55

Spongebob : “ kau lihat itu ? apa yang membuatku bersin ?” (See that? What made me sneeze?)

Squidword : “Mungkin karena debu Barnicle yang kau bersihkan” (Maybe it's the Barnicle dust you cleaned up).

This context was spoken by Squidward to SpongeBob in SpongeBob's yard. SpongeBob asked Squidward why he sneezed. Squidward replied that SpongeBob had been exposed to dust. The speaker spoke seriously, using direct speech. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee is that of neighbors. In the context above, Squidward answers SpongeBob's question about why he sneezed. Then Squidword replied, “Maybe it's the Barnicle dust that Spongebob cleaned.” In the principle of cooperation, if the utterance does not contain information needed by the interlocutor, it can be said to violate the maxim of quantity in the principle of cooperation (Rahardi, 2018). In the utterance above, Squidword violated the maxim of quantity by providing excessive information to Spongebob. In the utterance above, Squidward provides information that SpongeBob does not need; Squidward could have simply said, “Maybe it's the Barnicle dust..” without adding anything else.

Implicature

The utterance above implies that Squidward wants to tell SpongeBob that the reason he sneezed is because of barnacle dust that was stuck to the wall while SpongeBob was cleaning his house. The meaning of this is that dust is indeed one of the causes of sneezing. The violation of the maxim of quantity by Squidword in the above utterance indicates the presence of an implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, Squidword violates the maxim of quantity because he answers more than what Spongebob asked.

Data 2: Minutes 3:21–3:31, episode 2

SpongeBob: “Squidword, kau mampir mengunjungiku ?” (Squidward, are you visiting me?)

Squidward: “Aku tidak berkunjung, aku ingin rumahku kembali kepadaku!” (I'm not visiting, I want my house back!)

This context was spoken by Squidward to SpongeBob while they were in Squidward's yard. Spongebob, who was surprised at the time, asked Squidword about his arrival and whether he was visiting Spongebob. Squidword replied that he wasn't visiting but wanted his house back. The speaker uttered the statement seriously, using direct speech. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee is that of neighbors.

In the above utterance, Squidward answered SpongeBob's question about his presence at SpongeBob's house. Squidward then replied, “I'm not visiting, I want my house back!” In the principle of cooperation, if the speaker provides information that is not needed by the listener, then he violates the principle of cooperation. In the above conversation, Squidward has violated the maxim of quantity by providing excessive information to SpongeBob. In the above conversation, Squidward provides information that is not needed by SpongeBob; Squidward could have simply said, “I'm not visiting” without saying anything else.

Implicature

The above utterance implies that Squidward visits SpongeBob at his house, which SpongeBob is occupying. The meaning of this is that Squidward is unhappy that SpongeBob is occupying his house and wants him to leave. The violation of the maxim of quantity committed by Squidward in the above utterance

indicates the presence of an implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, Squidward violates the maxim of quantity because he answers more than what SpongeBob asked. He even explains that Squidward wants his house back.

Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality consists of two submaxims, namely (a) do not say anything that is believed to be false, and (b) do not say anything that does not have sufficient evidence (Yule, 2006). If the speaker does not fulfill these submaxims, then he/she is considered to have violated them and it indicates that there is an implicature that the speaker wants to achieve. Based on observations, in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia, there are utterances that violate the maxim of quality. The following are examples of utterances in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia that violate the maxim of quality.

Data 1: Minutes 20:41–20:48, episode 9

Patrick: “Tapi apa gunanya barang-barang ini ?” (But what are these things for?)

Spongebob: “Ini pasti untuk mengambil buku dari rak paling atas!” (This must be for taking books from the top shelf!)

The context of this utterance is spoken by Patrick to Spongebob while they are at the library together. Patrick and Spongebob, who received a package for Sandy, began to open it and found various items inside. Patrick, who was curious about the purpose of these items, asked Spongebob. The speaker uttered the words seriously, using direct speech. The relationship between the speaker and the listener is that of neighbors. In the above utterance, SpongeBob responds to Patrick when Patrick asks about the purpose of Sandy's items in the package. SpongeBob responds while holding a golf club and says, “This must be for taking books from the top shelf!”

In the principle of cooperation, if a speaker provides information that does not match the required reality, then they violate the principle of cooperation. In the utterance above, SpongeBob has violated the maxim of quality by providing Patrick with information that is not true. In the utterance above, SpongeBob informs Patrick of an unconventional use for a golf club. The utterance above means that SpongeBob is using a golf club to take a book from a high shelf.

Implicature

The meaning of this is that SpongeBob's violation of the maxim of quality in the utterance above indicates an implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, SpongeBob violates the maxim of quality because he responds to Patrick with information that is not true.

Data 2: Minutes 12:57–13:02, episode 5

Squidward: “Apa yang sedang kalian lakukan dengan semua peralatan ini?” (What are you guys doing with all this equipment?)

SpongeBob and Patrick: “Peralataan?” (Equipment?)

Squidward: “Kalian berdua tidak tau peralatan ini ? ini adalah bola sepak ! ini adalah racket tenis ! dan ini sepasang orang konyol !!!” (You both don't know what this equipment is? This is a soccer ball! This is a tennis racket! And these are a pair of idiots!!!)

This context was spoken by Squidword to Spongebob and Patrick while they were in Squidword's flower garden. Spongebob and Patrick were playing together in Squidword's flower garden at the time. When Squidword saw Patrick and Spongebob damaging his garden with some equipment, he asked them what they were doing. Patrick and Spongebob responded with confusion. The speaker delivered the utterance seriously, using direct speech. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee is that of neighbors.

In the utterance above, Spongebob and Patrick responded to Squidword when he asked why they were

playing on his garden, which could indirectly damage the flowers there. Squidward is very upset, and SpongeBob and Patrick respond with confusion, “Tools?!” In the principle of cooperation, if a speaker provides information that does not match the required reality, they violate the principle of cooperation. In the utterance above, SpongeBob and Patrick have violated the maxim of quality by providing information that does not match the truth to Squidward. In the above utterance, Squidward conveys an unconventional statement about items unknown to Patrick and Spongebob.

Implicature

The utterance implies that Squidward is angry with Spongebob and Patrick. The meaning behind this is that Squidward is annoyed and wants to teach them a lesson. The violation of the maxim of quality by Spongebob and Patrick in the above utterance indicates the implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, Squidward violates the maxim of quality because he responds in a manner inconsistent with the truth to Spongebob and Patrick.

Maxim of Relevance

The maxim of relevance contains only one submaxim, which is to make relevant contributions. If the speaker does not fulfill this maxim, then he or she is considered to have violated it, indicating that the speaker wants to achieve an implicature. Based on observations, in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia, there are utterances that violate the maxim of relevance. The following are some utterances in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia that violate the maxim of relevance.

Data 1: Minutes 0.52-0.58 episode 1

Squidword: Bisakah kau hentikan itu! (Can you stop that!)

Spongebob: “oh... hai Squidword” (Oh... hi Squidword)

In the above context, Squidward asks SpongeBob to stop the noise he is making. Before he can continue, Squidward's mouth is blocked by a hose that SpongeBob is using. SpongeBob simply responds, “Oh, hi Squidward.” According to the principle of cooperation, if a speaker provides information that is not needed by the listener, they violate the principle of cooperation. In the above utterance, Spongebob has violated the maxim of Relevance because Spongebob provides information that is irrelevant to Squidword's statement. Instead of stopping the noise he is making, Spongebob greets Squidword, whose mouth is stuffed with a hose because of his actions.

Implicature

The above utterance implies that SpongeBob greeted Squidward, who was seen leaving his house and saying something. The meaning of this is that SpongeBob was confused by Squidward's presence outside his house and his shouting. SpongeBob's violation of the maxim of relevance in the above utterance indicates the implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, Spongebob violates the maxim of relevance because he responds in a way that is not in line with what Squidword wants.

Data 2: Minutes 6:21–6:27, episode 4

Squidword: “Hey, can you two be quiet?”

Spongebob: “Hi Squidword, how are you?”

The context of this utterance is Spongebob speaking to Squidword when he interrupts Spongebob and Squidword at home. Squidword is annoyed by the noise coming from Spongebob's house caused by Spongebob and Patrick, so he asks them to be quiet. The speaker utters the sentence seriously, using direct speech. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee is that of neighbors.

In the above utterance, Spongebob responds to Squidword's question, who is annoyed by the noise caused by Patrick and Spongebob. Spongebob then responds, “Hey Squidword, how are you?”

In the principle of cooperation, if the speaker provides information that is not needed by the listener, then he violates the principle of cooperation. In the above utterance, SpongeBob has violated the maxim of relevance by providing irrelevant information to Squidward. In the above utterance, SpongeBob provides an irrelevant statement in response to Squidward's expression. Instead of answering yes or no, SpongeBob asks about Squidward's well-being that night, even though it is already late and Squidward has not yet gone to sleep.

Implicature

The utterance above implies that Spongebob answered Squidword's question by asking about his well-being. The meaning of this implication is that Spongebob does not feel guilty about his actions with Patrick and disturbing Squidword. Spongebob's violation of the maxim of relevance in the utterance above indicates the implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, Spongebob violates the maxim of relevance because he answers in a way that does not align with what Squidward desires, instead asking about Squidward's well-being that night, even though it was already late. Spongebob responds in a soft tone and a relaxed manner.

Maxim of Manner

The Maxim of Manner consists of four submaxims, namely (a) avoid vague expressions, (b) avoid mystery, (c) be concise (avoid unnecessary length), and (d) be orderly or regular. This maxim of manner requires participants to speak directly, clearly, and without ambiguity. People who speak without paying attention to the above points can be said to be violating the principle of cooperation (Rahardi, 2018). If a speaker does not fulfill this maxim, then they are considered to be in violation and it indicates that there is an implicature that the speaker wants to achieve. Based on observations, in the animated film SpongeBob SquarePants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia, there are utterances that violate the maxim of manner. The following is an example of an utterance in the animated film SpongeBob SquarePants produced by Nickelodeon Arabia that violates the maxim of manner.

Data 1: minutes 01:22–01:29, episode 1

SpongeBob: "Apa yang ingin kau katakan ?" (What do you want to say?)

Squidward: "Tolong matikan Airnya!" (Please turn off the water!)

SpongeBob: "Aku sudah melakukannya, baiklah aku akan melakukannya lagi" (I already did that. Okay, I'll do it again)

Squidward: "Tidak tidak tidak !" (No, no, no!)

The context of this utterance is spoken by Squidward to SpongeBob in SpongeBob's yard. SpongeBob is watering the plants with a hose, making noise and attracting Squidward's attention. However, Squidward, who is annoyed, gets hit by SpongeBob's hose. The speaker utters the words seriously, using direct speech. The relationship between the speaker and the listener is that of neighbors.

In the above utterance, SpongeBob asks Squidword what he said when he was hit by the hose. Squidword then says, "Please turn off the water!" and Squidword says this after SpongeBob has already turned off the hose. Squidward's utterance is confusing to SpongeBob. This is because Squidward wants SpongeBob to turn off the hose after it has already been turned off. In the principle of cooperation, if a speaker speaks indirectly, vaguely, and ambiguously, then the speaker is said to be uncooperative in the conversation because they have violated the maxim of manner. In the above statement, Squidward said something confusing to SpongeBob.

Implicature

The above statement implies that Squidward wants SpongeBob to turn off the water hose that is on and hitting his mouth. The meaning of this is that Squidward is angry with SpongeBob and deliberately said that because he was annoyed. The violation of the maxim of manner by Squidword in the utterance above indicates the presence of an implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, Squidword violates the maxim of manner because he responds to Spongebob in an angry tone and does not directly express his desire, even

though Spongebob asked in a soft tone.

Data2: Minutes 9.18-9.24, episode 4

SpongeBob: "Kita Harus tetap tenang" (We have to stay calm)

Patrick: "Beritahu Orang tuaku bahwa aku sayang mereka" (Tell my parents that I love them).

The context of this utterance is that Patrick is speaking to Spongebob while at Spongebob's house. Patrick is with Spongebob playing with bubbles by drinking them. At that time, Spongebob was visiting Squidward's house, who couldn't sleep. However, because Patrick was making noise, Spongebob approached Patrick again. The speaker uttered the statement seriously, using direct speech. The relationship between the speaker and the listener is that of neighbors. In the above statement, SpongeBob told Patrick to stay quiet and not be noisy. Then Patrick replied, "Tell my parents that I love them." Patrick's statement did not provide SpongeBob with clear information about what he was doing. Patrick only gives a resigned response and does not explain why he said that. In the principle of cooperation, if a speaker speaks indirectly, vaguely, and ambiguously, then the speaker is said to be uncooperative in the conversation because they violate the maxim of manner. In the above utterance, Patrick conveys an ambiguous utterance that gives rise to another perspective.

Implicature

The above statement means that Patrick feels strange after drinking the bubble liquid and makes his stomach bloated. The meaning of this is that Patrick feels that he will not live much longer and leaves a will to his parents. Patrick's violation of the maxim of manner in the above statement indicates the implicature achieved by the speaker. Through his utterance, Patrick violates the maxim of manner because he responds to SpongeBob's concerned statement with a resigned and calm tone.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion of violations of the principle of cooperation in conversations found in the animated film Spongebob Squarepants episode "Cinta Tetangga" produced by Nickelodeon Arabia and the analysis of violations of the principle of cooperation and the implications of conversations caused by these violations, it can be concluded that maxims and their implications were found in the animated film. Specifically, four maxims were violated: the maxim of quantity with 5 instances of violation, the maxim of quality with 2 instances of violation, the maxim of relevance with 6 instances of violation, and the maxim of manner with 2 instances of violation. In addition to cooperation violations, implications were found regarding the violation of the four maxims. The implicature of the maxim of quantity includes providing information, expressing objection, informing, requesting assistance, and advising. The implicature of quality includes knowing the data and feeling afraid. The implicature of relevance includes diverting the conversation, following the data, refusing to assist, and informing about the data. Finally, the implicature of the maxim of manner includes covering up ignorance and covering up something.

References

Ananda, S. W., & Astuti, S. P. (2024). Implikatur Percakapan dan Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Novel "Kisah untuk Geri" Karya Erisca Febriani. *Nusa: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 19(1), 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.14710/nusa.19.1.95-108>

Arifanti, I. (2018). Implikatur Konvensional Dan Non Konvensional Tuturan Pengunjung Kawasan Lawang Sewu Semarang Jawa Tengah. *Pena Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Dan Teknologi*, 32(1), 44. <https://doi.org/10.31941/jurnalpena.v32i1.936>

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). for Education An Introduction to Theory and Methods. In *Qualitative Research for Education*.

I Dewa Putu wijana dan Muhammad Rohmadi. (2018). *No Title*. Yuma Pustaka.

Ibrahim, N. (2021). Penerapan Prinsip Maksim Kerja Sama sebagai Upaya Pengembangan Kemampuan Berbicara. *Pena Literasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 4(2), 99–107. <https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/penaliterasi>

Lara, G. M. P. (2022). Pragmatics and discourse analysis. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, July, 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.26.1.05lar>

Legisyha, A., Shanty, I. L., Suhardi, Elfitra, L., Wahyusari, A., & Zaitun. (2022). Analisis Implikatur Percakapan Tokoh Dalam Film Ranah 3 Warna Karya Ahmad Fuadi a. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*, 13(2), 168–180. https://ejournal2.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/jurnal_bahasa/article/view/695

Lestari, D., & Arifianti, I. (2023). Implikatur Konvensional Dan Implikatur Non Konvensional Pada Novel Kita Pergi Hari Ini Karya Ziggy Zeczyazeoviennazabrizkie. *Jubindo: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 8(02), 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.32938/jbi.v8i02.4457>

McQuail's Mass Communication Theory. (1994). <http://docshare04.docshare.tips/files/28943/289430369.pdf>

Mega Suci, D. P., Sundawati, L., Bahasa Indonesia, P., & Siliwangi, U. (2019). Kajian Linguistik Forensik Ujaran Bau Ikan Asin Oleh Galih Ginanjar Terhadap Fairuz A Rafiq. *Jurnal Metabusa*, 1(2).

Misbahuddin, M. (2020). Fungsi, Hakekat, dan Wujud Bahasa. *INTAJUNA*, 3(2), 104–112.

Muzaffar, A. R. (2024). The Fields of Pragmatic Discourse Analysis. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 7(4), 244–250. <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.07.04.540>

Noermanzah. (2019). *Bahasa sebagai Alat Komunikasi, Citra Pikiran, dan Kepribadian*. 306–319.

Nugraheni, Y. (2010). Analisis Implikatur pada Naskah Film Harry Potter and The Goblet of Fire. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Internasional*, 3(2), 390–397. <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id>

ODOT, O. K. (2022). *Analisis Implikatur Dalam Novel Jodoh Akan Bertemu Karya Lana Azim Dan Dwitasari (kajian Pragmatik)*. 2, 1–28. <https://eprints.unmas.ac.id/id/eprint/1494/>

Rahardi, R. K. (2018). *Pragmatik* (H. W. Hardani, Ed.). Erlangga.

Ratna, N. K. (2015). *Teori, Metode dan Teknik Penelitian Sastra*. Pustaka Belajar.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. In *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315884318-16>

Yule, G. (2006). Metode Penelitian Sosial dan Politik. In *Metode Penelitian Sosial dan Politik*. Bumi.