

# Violation of Cooperative Principles in Students' Conversations Oleh

Luluk Isani Kulup<sup>1</sup>, Bambang Yulianto<sup>2</sup>, Budinuryanta Yohanes<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Negeri Surabaya

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Negeri Surabaya

**Abstract:- This study aims to describe of the violation of the principle of cooperation in Surabaya students' conversations. The research data are in the form of student utterances in their conversations. The method used is the listening and tapping techniques, advanced SLC (Listen to Engaged), and note-taking techniques. The results show that each maxim in this current study can be divided into two: single maxims and multiple maxims. The single maxims include the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. Meanwhile, the multiple maxims include the maxim of quantity, the maxim of manner, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. The kinds of violations that mostly occurred in the data are the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner both in the form of single and multiple maxims. The use of the cooperative principle in a conversation can be in the form of mocking, sarcasm, lying, or expressing a hope to confirm information. Meanwhile, the effect caused in the speech is blurring of information and clarifying existing information (maxim of quantity); covering up information (maxim of quality); being funny, annoyed (the maxim of relevance); and covering up shyness, excessive speech, unclear, and the impression of joking (the maxim of manner).**

**Keywords:-** *Language, Cooperative Principles, Student Conversation.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

In everyday life, humans must be engaged in communication either directly or indirectly or through media. Depari (2010) and Dardjowidjojo (2005) state that communication is the process of delivering ideas, hopes, and messages conveyed through certain symbols, containing meaning.

In addition, in communicating, one will definitely use a language to ease social interaction (Morrisan, 2014). Language is a system formed by a number of components that are patterned regularly and can be ruled out (Chaer & Leonie, 2014). Therefore, to speak properly and correctly, language users must understand the patterns of the language.

The success of communicating depends on how the addresser and the addressee apply the principle of cooperation. The use of the cooperative principle requires the speaker to convey relevant information instead of the false one. Besides,

in order that the addressee understands the information conveyed, the information should not be excessive and must be in accordance with the required conversational capacity (Jumanto, 2017). In addition, this principle also emphasizes that communication between the speaker and the speech partner must be interconnected and not deviate from the topic of conversation.

The principle of cooperation was put forward by Grice (in Putrayasa, 2014:102) that to implement the principle of cooperation, each speaker must comply with four conversational maxims, namely maxims of quantity, maxims of quality, maxims of relevance, and maxims of implementation.

According to Gunarwan (2007), the maxim of quantity requires each participant of the speech to provide sufficient information as needed by the interlocutor. The maxim of quantity rules are as follows: a. Provide information as needed for the purpose or intent of the regulation, b. Don't give too much information. It means that speech participants must be communicative and not excessive in providing the information needed by the speech partner (Setiawan, Basuki, & Rahayu, 2017)

Gunarwan (2007) also explains that the maxim of quality requires that every participant in the conversation tells the truth. Conversation participants' contributions should be based on sufficient evidence. The maxim of quality rule is: a. Don't say anything that isn't true, b. Don't say something that can't be adequately proven. It means that conversation participants should convey something that must be based on adequate evidence (Fauziah, Emzir, & Lustyantje, 2018). Leech (1993) explains that the maxim of relevance requires that each participant of the conversation make a contribution that is relevant to the problem of the conversation.

Fauziah et al., (2018) and Leech (1993) explain that the maxim of manner requires that each participant of the conversation speak directly, not vaguely, not exaggerating, and in a coherent manner. The maxim of manner follows the rules: a. Avoid vague expressions, b. Avoid confusing phrases, c. Avoid long phrases, and d. Express something coherently.

Furthermore, a violation of the principle of cooperation can occur in certain situations, e.g., making jokes in a tense situation. For example, the speaker tells the interlocutor that there is a fire in the next village, but the interlocutor replies

casually, "Well, it's good, let it be a show". The response can be classified as a violation of the maxim of relevance (relationship), where the speech partner responds to something that deviates from the topic being discussed (Hassani, 2019).

A conversation is carried out by two or more people to obtain information and exchange ideas with each other (Depdiknas, 2008:253). Conversations can be anywhere, anytime, and can be in any situation either relaxed, tense, or serious. This current study took the data from the university student conversations in Surabaya, Indonesia.

In this study, the respondents came from various ethnic groups (e.g., Java, Kalimantan, Maluku, and Flores) who were living in Surabaya. In interacting, students who come from various regions used everyday language, especially Indonesian in order to understand the content and context in a conversation. In the conversations, it is undeniable that there were violations of the principle of cooperation, either intentional or unintentional.

In line with the background above, the purpose of this current study is to identify what kinds of violations are made by the respondents in their conversations and why they made violations?

### 1. Violation of the Maxim of Quantity

(1) Vena: *Titip apa kiriman apa? Mukena apa baju?*

Nursia : *Jilbab. Mangkanya kemarin, beta kira kak Sherly itu punyanya Fika*  
(PMKN-2)

(1) Vena: What did you order? *Mukena* or clothes?

Nursia : Hijab. Yesterday, I thought that Sherly's is Fika's  
(PMKN-2)

In data (1), the conversation was between Nursia (Southeast Maluku) and Vena (Flores) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. Nursia's utterances clearly violated the maxim of quantity because Nursia's response was excessive to what was conveyed by Vena. Nursia should have only answered "*Jilbab*" instead of explaining another thing not

(1) Vena : *Shopee biasanya cepet kok*

Nursia : *Mangkanya itu. Sek sabar.. oh ini hubungi penjual ini*  
Vena : *Ini ini lihat cukup sembilan ribu*  
(PMKN-3)

(2) Vena : *Shopee is usually fast*  
Nursia : *That's it. Be patient.. oh this, contact the seller*  
Vena : *Here it is, see only nine thousand*  
(PMKN-3)

Data (2) was a conversation between Nursia (Southeast Maluku) and Vena (Flores Manggarai) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation discussed the speed of delivery of goods purchased through the Shopee online application. Vena said, "Shopee is usually fast." Then Nursia

## II. RESEARCH METHOD

This is a qualitative study with the data in the form of spoken words (utterances) from the respondents (Brogdan and Taylor in Moleong, 2010). The data contain violations of the cooperative principle. The data collection technique was carried out by observing and followed by three advanced techniques, namely (1) tapping technique, (2) SLC technique, and (3) note-taking technique.

The listening method was used to obtain data by listening to the use of language by tapping. The tapping technique was used to tap or record the conversations carried out by students in a boarding house and cafe in Surabaya. The SLC is used to listen to Surabaya students' conversations which had previously been recorded using a voice recorder. The note-taking technique was used to record the students' conversations. Besides, the note-taking technique was used to record anything difficult to understand when recorded by the voice recorder. The data analysis was carried out in three stages: (1) Data Clarification, (2) Data Interpretation, and (3) Drawing a conclusion.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results showed that the violation of the cooperative principle in the collected data was a linguistic phenomenon related to pragmatic studies. The following data are analyzed.

related to the matter of question. As a result, what Nursia said obscured the information because the answer deviated from what was asked by Vena, who initially discussed what was ordered, but Nursia added unrelated information to the question.

responded, "That's is. Be patient.. oh this, contact the seller." Nursia's answer is said to violate the maxim of quantity because it exceeds the information required by Vena. Nursia should only have to answer with, "That's it" instead of explaining other things. The effect of the violation was

blurring of information which might make the interlocutor thought differently.

(3) Sherly : *Iya saya dulu dari Labuan-ND, ND-Kupang, Kupang-Surabaya*  
 Nursia : *Astaga.. ke Kupang lagi baru kesini?*  
 Vena : *Iya. ND-Kupang lho jauhnya gak seberapa, beda. Ini bocor kah?*  
 (PMKN-6)

(3) Sherly : Yes, from Labuan to ND, ND to Kupang, Kupang to Surabaya  
 Nursia : Gosh.. to Kupang first then to go here?  
 Vena : Yes. ND to Kupang is not too far. Is this leaking?  
 (PMKN-6)

In data (3), the conversation was between Nursia (Southeast Maluku), Vena (Flores), and Sherly (Flores) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation discusses the flight route from Flores to Surabaya. Sherly's utterance "Yes, from Labuan to ND, ND to Kupang, Kupang to Surabaya" was responded by Nursia by asking a question "

Gosh.. to Kupang first then to go here?". Vena then confirmed "Yes. ND to Kupang is not too far. Is this leaking?" Vena's response clearly violated the maxim of quantity because it was excessive. She should respond with, "Yes" instead of explaining other things.

(4) Nursia : *Mau masak?*  
 Fitri : *Masak tempe. Kalau nggak mau masak ya nggak apa-apa lho*  
 Nursia : *Lah maksudku...*  
 (PMKN-12)

(4) Nursia: (You) will cook?  
 Fitri : Cooking tempe. If you don't want to, it's okay  
 Nursia: I mean...  
 (PMKN-12)

Data (4) is a conversation between Nursia (Maluku) and Fitri (Java) on the way to the market in a relaxed situation. This conversation was about the meal to cook. Nursia asked a question "(You) will cook?" Then Fitri answered by saying "Cooking tempe". If you don't want to, that's okay." Nursia then responded, "I mean". Fitri's speech, in this case, clearly

violates the maxim of quantity because her response is excessive. She should only answer with, "Cooking tempe" instead of talking about something else. It was because Fitri felt that Nursia quipped her by saying "(You) want to cook?" which made Fitri responded at length. The effect of such a violation was that the hearer became annoyed.

(5) Reni: *Kok ngene ya rasane?*  
 Salma : *Heem, ikine sing gak enak. Iki podo mbek pekku*  
 (PMKN-9)

(5) Reni : How come it tastes like this?  
 Salma : Hmmm, It is this that tastes bad. The same as mine.  
 (PMKN-9)

Data (5) is the conversation between Reni (Javanese) and Salma (Madurese) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. The conversation talks about the chicken noodle bought that had a strange taste. Reni asked, "How come it tastes like this?" Salma answered "Heem, It is this that tastes bad. The same as mine." Salma's utterance clearly violates the maxim of quantity because it is excessive to what Reni asked. Salma

should only respond, "It is this that tastes bad" instead of explaining another thing that did not correlate with the question. The effect of the violation was blurring of information because they initially discussed the strange taste of the food but then talked about the similarity of the food owned by Salma, making the hearer think differently (Setiawan, Basuki, & Rahayu, 2017).

## 2. Violation of the Maxim of Quality

6. Ira : *Lapo ning sekret Sufi?*  
 Ainun : *Anak rajin*  
 Ira : *Hahahaa*  
 Ainun : *Pacaran lah, kencan*  
 (PMKL-1)

6. Ira : Why were you at the secretarial office, Sufi?  
 Ainun : Diligent student  
 Ira : Hahahaa  
 Ainun : Dating, dating  
 (PMKL-1)

Data (6) was a dialogue between Ira (Madurese) and Ainun (Javanese) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation discussed what Sufis do in the secretarial

office. Ira said, "Why were you in the secretarial office, Sufi?", Ainun then responded by insinuating Sufi, "Dating, dating". Ainun's speech was a violation of the maxim of quality

because she said something whose truth could not be proven concretely and it was intended to satire. The effect of the

speech is to cover up information because what Ainun said is a satire and joke and did not match the fact.

7. Irene : *Aku nggak sabar dapat undangan dari ...*  
 Najiatul : *Nggak tau sama siapa hahaha*  
 Irene : *Kelas kita nggak ada kabar, siapa yang tunangan gitu*  
 Najiatul : *Aku yang tunangan hahaha*  
 Irene : *Kamu yang jelas*  
 (PMKL-2)

7. Irene : I can't wait receiving a (wedding) invitation from ...  
 Najiatul : Don't know with whom hahaha  
 Irene : Don't have any news who are in engagement in our class?  
 Najiatul : I'm in engagement hahaha  
 Irene : You, for sure  
 (PMKL-2)

Data (7) was a conversation between Irene (Papua) and Najiatul (Sidoarjo) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation is about who among them is being engaged. In the dialogue, Irene asked, "Don't have any news about who is in engagement in our class?" Najiatul responded, "I am in engagement, hahaha". Najiatul's speech was a violation of maxim of quality because she answered the question by

laughing. Irene then emphasized Najiatul's statement by saying, "You, for sure." In this case, Najiatul's speech is considered to violate the maxim of quality because her speech cannot be proven correct. The effect of this speech was to cover up information because what Najiatul said was only a joke and did not match the fact.

(8) Chandri : *Aku loh kalau magang senang aja..*  
 Najiatul : *Kenapa?*  
 Chandri : *Senang aja. Pokoknya aku kalau magang itu senang aja. Tidak ada rasa beban*  
 Najiatul : *Rasa beban hehehe*  
 (PMKL-5)

(8) Chandri : "I'm happy when doing an internship.  
 Najiatul : Why?  
 Chandri : It's good. Anyway, I'm happy with the internship. There's no sense of burden.  
 Najiatul : Sense of burden hehehe  
 (PMKL-5)

Data (8) was a dialogue between Chandri (Sumatra) and Najiatul (Sidoarjo) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. The conversation discussed the mood when doing an internship at school. Chandri's utterance, "I'm happy when doing an internship." Najiatul then asked, "Why?" The following Chandri's statement was a violation of the maxim of quality because she could not give a strong reason why she liked doing the internship, she only replied, "It's good.

Anyway, I'm happy with the internship. There's no sense of burden." Chandri's response is tantamount to lying. The effect of this speech is to cover up information because what Chandri says is only an expression of her feeling and did not necessarily correspond to the reality during her internship. Her response can be included as the violation of the maxim of quality, not based on evidence (Fauziah, Emzir, & Lustyantje, 2018).

### 3. Violation of Maxim of Relevance

(9) Vena: *Ko punya itu to. Sudah sampai Surabaya atau belum?*  
 Nursia : *Di sini keterangannya. Sek, apa ini?*  
 Vena : *Nomor resinya kan dikirim kemarin to?*  
 (PMR-1)

(9) Vena: Do you have that, too?  
 Has it reached Surabaya or not?  
 Nursia : Here's the description. Wait, what is this?  
 Vena : The receipt number was sent yesterday, right?  
 (PMR-1)

Data (9) was a dialogue between Nursia (Southeast Maluku) and Vena (Flores) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation discussed the delivery of the J&T Express package that never arrived, even though it had reached

the specified time limit. In the dialogue, Vena asked, "Do you have that, too? Has it reached Surabaya or not?" Nursia then replied, "Here's the description. Wait, what is this?" Nursia's response, in this case, can be said to violate the maxim of

relationship (relevance) because what Nursia said did not match the question asked by Vena. The reason for the violation was because she provided new information. Nursia's response was not in line with the topic of conversation, Nursia should

have provided a response that matched the question posed so that Vena could understand it. The effect of Nursia's utterance is blurring of information because the answer deviated from what was asked by Vena.

- |                                     |                                      |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (10) Sherly : Fika siapa?           | (10) Sherly : Fika who?              |
| Nursia : Masih tu beta punya Papaya | Nursia : It's still my papaya        |
| Sherly : Yang kayak papaya itu?     | Sherly : The one that's like papaya? |
| (PMR-4)                             | (PMR-4)                              |

Data (10) was a dialogue between Nursia (Southeast Maluku) and Sherly (Flores) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation was about a child named Fika. In the dialogue, Sherly asked, "Fika who?" Then Nursia replied, "It's still my papaya". Nursia's speech violates the maxim of relevance because what Nursia said was not in accordance with the questions asked by Sherly. The reason for the

violation was because she provided new information. Nursia's responses actually were not in line with the topic of conversation. Nursia should have provided the answer that matched the question posed so that Vena could understand it. The effect of the speech expressed by Nursia was blurring of information because the answer deviated from what was asked by Sherly.

- |                                 |                                   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (11) Masduki : Main rank?       | (11) Masduki : Play rank?         |
| Dito : Iya dong                 | Dito : Yes, for sure              |
| Geo : Undang                    | Geo : Invite                      |
| Masduki : Kamu nggak ikut main? | Masduki : You don't join to play? |
| Bayu : Tak cas Mas              | Bayu : It's charged, bro          |
| (PMR-14)                        | (PMR-14)                          |

Data (11) was between Bayu (Sidoarjo), Masduki (Madura), Dito (Padang), and Geo (Mentawai) in a coffee shop in a relaxed situation. This conversation discussed the mobile legend game. In the dialogue, Masduki asked, "You don't join to play?" Bayu then answered, "No, it's charged, bro". Bayu's speech violates the maxim of relevance because what Bayu said was not in accordance with Masduki's question. The reason for the violation was because he provided new

information. Bayu actually answered a question that was not in accordance with the topic of conversation. Bayu's response should have been in accordance with the question posed so that Masduki could understand. The effect of the speech expressed by Bayu was blurring of information because the answer deviated from what Masduki asked, making Masduki would think differently again.

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| (12) Nursia : Mbak ayo jalan-jalan | (12) Nursia : Let's go for a walk, sist. |
| Fitri : Kemana ayo?                | Fitri : Where?                           |
| Nursia : Kemana ya...              | Nursia : Any idea...?                    |
| Fitri : Ke hatimu hahaha           | Fitri : To your heart ...hahaha          |
| (PMR-8)                            | (PMR-8)                                  |

Data (12) was a conversation between Nursia (Maluku) and Fitri (Javanese) in a boarding house in a serious situation. This conversation was about an invitation to take a walk. In this conversation, Nursia expressed her invitation, "Let's go for a walk, sist." Fitri then answered, "Where?" Nursia replied, "Any idea?" Because of being confused, Fitri answered, "To your heart, hahaha". Fitri's speech violated the maxim of

relevance because what Fitri said did not match the statement of Nursia who was confused. The reason for the violation was throwing a joke to calm the situation a little. Fitri's response, "To your heart hahaha" caused misunderstanding, Fitri should have given a reasonable answer so that the other person could understand. The effect of the speech expressed by Fitri is making the situation relaxed by giving a joke.

- |                           |                               |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (13) Reni : Oskadon?      | (13) Reni : Oskadon?          |
| Salma : Sopo sing pusing? | Salma : Who has got headache? |
| Tika : Iki loh            | Tika : It is her              |
| Reni : Gakpopo oskadon    | Reni : It's okay, oskadon     |
| Indah : Pancen Oye        | Indah : Pancen Oye            |
| (PMR-5)                   | (PMR-5)                       |

Data (13) was a conversation between Tika (Javanese), Reni (Javanese), Salma, and Indah (Madurese) in a boarding house in a tense situation. This conversation was about their

friend who had got a headache. Salma asked, "Who has got a headache?" Tika then answered, "It is her." Reni suggested taking oskadon medicine. Indah responded to Reni's

suggestion by saying, "Pancen Oye". Indah's speech violated the maxim of relevance because what Indah said did not match the question asked by Salma. The reason for the violation was

throwing a joke to calm the situation a little (Raharja & Rosyidha, 2019).

#### 4. Violation of Maxim of Manner

(14) Tika : Bagus nggak?  
Salma : Nggak bagus  
Tika : Nggak bagus piye to?  
Salma : Hehehe.. iyo maksduku bagus  
(PMC-1)

(14) Tika : Is it good?  
Salma : Not good  
Tika : How is it not good?  
Salma : Hehehe.. I mean it's good  
(PMC-1)

Data (14) was a conversation between Tika (Javanese) and Salma (Madurese) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation discussed whether the decoration that had been made was good or not. Tika asked, "Is it good?" Salma then answered, "Not good." Tika responded by

confirming the answer, "How is it not good?" Salma finally answered, "Hehe. I mean good". Salma's utterance, "Not good" clearly violated the maxim of manner because the utterance had two meanings: It was not good and it was good. The effect of Salma's speech was confusing the hearer.

(15) Tika : Sing cilik piro? Iki dijuale 10 ribu?  
Reni : Berarti podo ae  
Tika : Gak lah kandel iki  
(PMC-2)

(15) Tika : How much is the small one? Is it 10 thousand?  
Reni : It means the same  
Tika : No. It is thicker  
(PMC-2)

Data (15) was a conversation between Tika (Javanese) and Reni (Javanese) in a boarding house in a relaxed situation. This conversation discussed how much the balloons cost then discussed the thickness of the balloons. Tika asked, "How much is the small one? Is it 10 thousand?" Reni then answered, "It means the same." Tika responded by confirming the

answer, "No, it is thicker." The speech conveyed clearly violated the maxim of manner because after discussing the price suddenly they discussed the thickness of the balloon. The effect of Tika's speech made the other person more confident because it was confirmed (Hassani, 2019).

(16) Bayu : Ni gimana bang Bawanya ni? Dikasih kaca atau tirai gitu?  
Echo : Jangan sok tahu kau itu  
Lia : Hahahaa  
Masduki : Kamu mau rokok?  
Geo : Nanti aja  
Masduki : Kamu mau rokok Bay?  
Bayu : Oh, enggak Mas  
(PMC-14)

(16) Bayu : How to bring this? Given glasses or curtain?  
Echo : Don't act like you know that  
Lia : Hahahaa  
Masduki : Wanna cigarette?  
Geo : Later  
Masduki : Cigar Bay?  
Bayu : No, thanks  
(PMC-14)

Data (16) was a dialogue between Bayu (Javanese) Lia (Padang), and Echo (Mentawai) in a coffee shop in a relaxed situation. This conversation discussed how to bring a handmade decoration. Bayu asked, "How to bring this? Given glasses or curtain?" Echo answered, "Don't act like you know

that." Lia responded to Echo's answer by laughing "Hahaha". Echo's statement clearly violated the maxim of manner because the answer conveyed ambiguous and unclear speech. The reason for the violation was giving a humorous sense, making the other interlocutor laughing.

(17) Nursia : Astaghfirullah mbak. Orangsabar itu disayang Tuhan  
Fitri : Nah ngene lho, Jatukman sampean kayak gini lho  
(PMC-6)

(17) Nursia : Astaghfirullah sis... God loves patient people  
Fitri : Well, you should say like this, you know  
(PMC-6)

Data (17) was a conversation between Nursia (Maluku) and Fitri (Javanese) on the way to the market in a serious situation. This conversation discussed God's recompense for patient people. In that speech, Nursia stated "Astaghfirullah

sis. God loves patient people." Fitri then replied by affirming, "Well, you should say like this, you know". Fitri's reply was a violation of the maxim of manner because it affirms an

explanation. The effect of Fitri's speech makes Nursia as her interlocutor confused about the meaning of the speech.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the Surabaya student conversations occurred in accordance with the four violations of Grice's cooperative principles: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. Each maxim in this current study can be divided into two: single maxims and multiple maxims. The single maxims include the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. Meanwhile, the multiple maxims include the maxim of quantity, the maxim of manner, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. The kinds of violations that mostly occurred in the data are the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner both in the form of single and multiple maxims. The use of the cooperative principle in a conversation can be in the form of mocking, sarcasm, lying, or expressing a hope to confirm information. Meanwhile, the effect caused in the speech is blurring of information and clarifying existing information (maxim of quantity); covering up information (maxim of quality); being funny, annoyed (the maxim of relevance); and covering up shyness, excessive speech, unclear, and the impression of joking (the maxim of manner).

#### THANK-YOU NOTE

The researchers thank the University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya for giving permission to examine students' conversations within the University. Hopefully, the research results can be useful for the Institute.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Aw, S. (2010). *Komunikasi Interpersonal*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- [2]. Chaer, A., & Leonie, A. (2014). *Sosiolinguistik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- [3]. Dardjowidjojo, S. (2005). *Psikolinguistik Pengantar Pemahaman Bahasa Manusia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- [4]. Depdiknas. (2008). *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka.
- [5]. Fauziah, M. T., Emzir, & Lustyantje, N. (2018, September). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Tuturan Diskusi Kelas Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan sastra Indonesia*, 3, 51-57.
- [6]. Gunarwan, A. (2007). *Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya.
- [7]. Hassani, N. (2019). The Flouting Maxim on Twitter Influencers' Tweets. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, Vol. 01, No. 02, pp 139-155.
- [8]. Jumanto. (2017). *Pragmatik (Dunia Linguistik tak Selebar Daun Kelor)*. Yogyakarta: Morfaliunga.
- [9]. Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik (Terjemahan)*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- [10]. Mahsun, M. S. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa (Terapan Strategi, Metode dan Tekniknya)*. Jakarta: PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- [11]. Moleong, L. J. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi)*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- [12]. Morrison. (2014). *Teori Komunikasi*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- [13]. Muhammad. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- [14]. Putrayasa, I. B. (2014). *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- [15]. Raharja, A. S., & Rosyidha, A. (2019). Maxim of Cooperative Principle Violation by Dodit Mulyanto in Stand-up Comedy Indonesia Season 4. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 43-61.
- [16]. Setiawan, A., Basuki, R., & Rahayu, N. (2017, Agustus). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Percakapan Dalam Acara Mata Najwa di Metro TV. *Jurnal Korpus*, 1-9.