

The Analysis of Conversational Implicature Between Students and Teachers at Al-Azhar Islamic Boarding School

¹Akhmad Sofyan, ²Riantino Yudistira, ³Muta'allim*, ⁴Fahmi Reza Alfani, ⁵Abdul Azizul Ghaffar

¹Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Jember, ²STAI Al-Utsmani Bondowoso, ³Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Tarbiyah Togo Ambarsari, ⁴Kementerian Sosial Republik Indonesia, ⁵Pondok Pesantren At-Taufiq Wringin Bondowoso

¹196805161992011001@mail.unej.ac.id, ²riantinoyudhistira@gmail.com, ³*alimhafidz@yahoo.com, ⁴rezaalfanifahmi@gmail.com, ⁵gho.far35@gmail.com

Published: 01/04/2022

How to cite (in APA style):

Sofyan, A., Yudistira, R., Muta'allim., Alfani, F. R., & Ghaffar, A. A. (2022). The Analysis of Conversational Implicature Between Students and Teachers at Al-Azhar Islamic Boarding School. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 8(1), 65-72. doi: <https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.8.1.4344.65-72>.

Abstract - Pesantren is an environment that is very well known as religiousness in which there are several rules that must be obeyed by teachers and students. The purpose of this discipline is to build humanist relationships. This study aims to uncover and describe the meanings and types of conversational implicatures contained in the conversations of teachers and students at the Salafiyah Syafi'iyah Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school. This study uses data analysis. Qualitative methods are methods that aim to obtain descriptive data. The data in this study are conversational implicatures that transcribed into written text. Data were collected using selection, description and verification techniques. Data were analyzed using qualitative descriptivewhich is based on Siswanto's theory. The results of this study indicate that there are four types of conversation implicatures, namely general conversation implicatures, scaled implicatures, special conversation implicatures and conventional implicatures.

Keywords: Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school, Conversational implicatures, Students and teachers conversation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Humans are social beings who cannot live without the help of others. It is said so, because humans always need other humans to survive. In social life, of course there is a relationship mutual symbiotic. One of the human relationships that are never separated in life is social relations. This is characterized by a form of interaction. This interaction will be well established and in accordance with their aims and objectives if in communication they understand each other. To achieve good

interaction and communication, a person is required to use the main human tool/media called language.

(Chaer, 2011) language as a system in the form of sound symbols, is arbitrary, used by a speech community to cooperate, communicate and define themselves. Based on the above statement, it can be concluded that the main fulcrum/key in human interaction is language. Language is the main tool that plays an important role in human life such as conveying messages, communication media and others.

With a person's language it is easy to interact with others, but on the other hand, without language, someone will find it difficult to interact with others. Therefore, language cannot be separated from human life. One of the branches of science that studies language to communicate is pragmatics (Nadar, 2009a). Therefore, it can be concluded that through pragmatics we can learn a lot about matters related to language.

The use of language here concerns the language function, while the context is an external element of language that builds speech or discourse. These two things are interrelated, namely to know the language function of the speech partner must adjust it based on the context.

Pragmatics has many studies related to language, one of which is implicature. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that has only recently emerged and developed in the linguistic arena of the United States since the (1970s). Ross and Lakoff are linguists who argue that the study of syntax cannot be separated from the narrative situation. Implicature is a component of the speaker's meaning which is an aspect of what is meant in the speaker's speech without being part of what is being said. What the speaker means to communicate is much richer than what is expressed directly; Linguistic meanings cannot radically be determined by those that are conveyed and understood.

Someone who interacts tends to apply the implicatures of a conversation because that person looks after, the image, feelings of others, maintains politeness, dignity, respect and so on. Courtesy and respect in interacting through communication often occur in religious institutions, namely Islamic boarding schools. In this article, the researcher discusses the implications of conversations between teachers and students that take place in the Salafiah Syafiiyah Islamic boarding school, Al-Azhar. Pesantren is a place where students' learn the Qur'an. The term *Ngaji* here does not mean merely studying the book and the Qur'an, but the term has a broad meaning such as; studying other people's feelings, paying respect, applying politeness/politeness in communicating and so on.

In the pesantren environment, of course there are kiyai-santri, superiors-subordinates, teacher-students, and others. Therefore, it cannot be denied that in the pesantren environment

there are always conversational implications. This aims to maintain image, pay respect, maintain feelings, apply politeness/politeness in language and so on. Pesantren is a form of Islamic education that has been institutionalized permanently in rural areas. The forms of Islamic education in rural areas can at least be mentioned in a number of terms, namely formal colleges, helping unions such as yasinan groups, training assemblies such as pesantrenkilat and seven-minute lectures (Kuntowijoyo, 1988). According to Zamakhsyari Dhofier, the Salaf Pesantren is a boarding school that maintains the teaching of classical Islamic books (Salaf) as the core of education.

Meanwhile, the madrasah system was established only to facilitate the sorogan system, which was used in the old form of recitation institutions, without introducing general knowledge teaching. Based on the above statements, it can be concluded that the pesantren is a place that is very strong towards religiousness. This means that students and teachers in the pesantren environment really apply politeness, respect others, maintain feelings, images and so on. Therefore, it cannot be denied that one of the students from the pesantren often applies politeness, politeness in behavior, especially in communicating. The form of conversation between teachers and students in the Salafiyah Safi'iyah Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school if it contains implied meaning, it can be stated that the meaning of the conversation is outside the structure of the language. To reveal this meaning, of course we need a pragmatic role, especially the implications of conversation.

Grice through (P.W.J, 1987) asserts that the concept of implicature is used to explain the difference that is often there is 'what is said' with 'what is implied'. Besides, Levinson (Nadar, 2009) mentions implicature as thoughts in pragmatics one of the most important ideas (one of the single most important ideas in pragmatics). Based on the above statement, it can be concluded that pragmatics is very suitable for uncovering the conversational implicatures or the implied meanings contained in the conversations of teachers and students at Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school.

There are several types of researches that have something in common with this research. First, Niatro (2016) indicates that there are three types of conversational implicatures contained in the film *pink guinea pig* by RadityaDica.

These implicatures are the specific conversational implicature (GPA), the general conversational implicature (IPU) and the scaled conversational implicature (IPB). The three types of conversational implicatures are divided into several types according to the characteristics of the marker and the form of the conversation. Furthermore, the conversational implicature function in film *pink marmot* Raditya's generally shown to show the reality of teenage life (SMA) to the audience. The function of the conversation between characters in Raditya's film *pink marmot* has several functions, including building the image of each character (exhibition) and creating humor to support the scene, channeling messages as well as in the form of good advice and warnings related to daily life (especially teenagers) and channel the speech to attract sympathy and/or soak the anger of the speech partner.

Second, [Rahayu \(2011\)](#) found that there are many conversational implications in applying the principles of courtesy, among others, violations of the maxims of quantity, quality, relationship, maxims of combination of quantity and quality as well as maxims of combined relationships and methods. The functions and objectives of the use of these conversational implicatures consist of competitive functions and directive objectives; fun function and expressive purpose; and fun functions and obsessive purposes.

Third, [Hadiati \(2007\)](#) indicate that there are four different types of conversational implicatures, including representative, directive, commissive and expressive conversational implicatures.

Based on the above studies, it can be concluded that these studies have similarities and differences. The above studies have similarities in their subject only, namely both studying the implications of conversation. While the difference is that the studies above have differences in their objects.

The above researchers examined objects about the conversational implicatures of characters in the film *pink guinea pigby Raditya Dika*; Conversation implicatures in learning Indonesian in *class v SD Negeri Pondok 1, Nguter sub-district, Sukoharjo district* and speech acts and conversation implications for female and male characters in the film *the sound of music*. While the authors is to uncover and describe the meanings and types of conversational implicatures contained in the

conversations of teachers and students at the Salafiyah Syafi'iyah Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Pragmatic

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the language used to communicate in certain situations ([Nadar 2009](#)). Furthermore, [Yule \(2006\)](#) states that pragmatics is the study of how to convey more than what is said. Pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistics in which it examines several languages including conversational implicatures. One of the branches of science that studies language to communicate is pragmatics ([Nadar, 2009](#)). Therefore, it can be concluded that through pragmatics we can learn a lot about matters related to language. Pragmatics has many studies related to language, one of which is implicature. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that has only recently emerged and developed in the linguistic arena of the United States since the 1970s. Ross and Lakoff are linguists who state that the study of syntactic matters cannot at all be separated from the narrative situation.

Pragmatics is a linguistic study between speakers and speech partners which is motivated by context, ([Levinson, 1983](#); [Rahardi, 2005](#); [Muta'allim, 2019](#); [Muta'allim, Sofyan & Haryono, 2020](#); & [Muta'allim, Alfani, Mahidin, Agustin & Wicaksi, 2021](#)). There are two important things that need to be observed from the pragmatic understanding above, namely the use of language and the context of speech.

2. Implicature

Implicature is the thing that is implied or the sentence implied its meaning. That is, the speaker's meaning is an aspect of what is meant in the speaker's utterance without being part of what is being said. What the speaker means to communicate is much richer than what he is expressing directly; Linguistic meanings cannot radically be determined by those that are conveyed and understood. This is in line with the opinion of [Grice \(1975\)](#) which states that a speech can imply propositions that are not part of the speech. The proposition that is implied is called the *implicature* conversational.

Implicature refers to the proposition implied by utterance in a context that is not part of the utterance and does not utter the meaning that is actually meant ([Gazdar, 1979](#)). The term implicature is derived from the verb 'to imply'

which means to imply something. Etymologically, 'to imply' means to wrap or hide something using something else. Therefore, the conversational implicature is something that is hidden in a conversation, that is, something that is implicitly contained in the actual use of language. Brown and Yule (1983) state that implicature is used to take into account what is meant by speakers as different from what is stated literally.

Mey (in Nadar, 2009) explains that the implicature of "implicature" comes from the verb to imply while the verb is implication. The verb comes from the Latin *implicare* which means to fold "to fold", so to know or understand what is folded or stored, one must open it using a pragmatic approach, especially implicature. Therefore, in order to know/understand the meaning and purpose of these implicative conversations, the speech partners are required to interpret the utterances uttered by the speakers according to their context. Grice (in Abdul Rani, et al, 2006: 177) Implicature is the indirect meaning or the implied meaning that is generated by what is said (explanatory). Based on the statement put forward by Grice, it can be concluded that the word implicature is the antonym of the word explicit. So, conversational implicature is an indirect statement (*implied*). Implicatures have several types.

3. Types of Implicatures

According to Thomas (2014) states that implicatures are divided into 2 parts, namely: conventional implicatures and conversational implicatures. Besides that, Yule (2006) shares the types of implicatures which are divided into four parts, including: general conversation implicature, scaled implicature, special implicature, and conventional implicature. Furthermore, Grice (in Abdul Rani, et al, 2006) states that implicature consists of two kinds, namely the conventional implicature.

a) General Conversation Implicature

General implicature is a type of conversation that does not require interpretation to find out the meaning in the conversation because the context used is a general conversation which makes the interlocutor understand directly (Grice, 1975).

b) Implicature Scaled

Certain information is always conveyed by choosing a word that represents a value from

a scale of values. This is particularly evident in terms of expressing quantity. As the term is *all, most, many, some, a little, always, often, and sometimes*. When speaking, a speaker chooses the words from that scale that are the most informative and correct (quality and quantity).

c) Implications of Special Conversations

In the preceding examples, all implicatures have been taken into account without special knowledge of *the context* particular. However, often our conversations take place in very specific contexts where we assume information that we know locally. A special implicature is a type of conversation that requires interpretation to find out the meaning in the conversation because the context used is a special conversation which makes the other person do not understand directly (Grice, 1975).

Rahardi (2003) states that in actual speech, the speaker and the speech partner can communicate fluently because they both have some kind of similar background knowledge about something being said. Grice (1975) states that a speech can imply propositions that are not part of the speech.

d) Conventional Implicatures

Conventional implicatures are the opposite of all conversational implicatures discussed so far, conventional implicatures are not based on the principle of cooperation or maxims. Conventional implicatures do not have to occur in conversation, and do not rely on specific contexts to interpret them. Grice (in Abdul Rani, et al, 2006) conventional implicatures are those that are determined by "the conventional meaning of the words used". Yule (2006) states that conventional implicatures are the opposite of conversational implicatures, namely conventional implicatures do not have to occur in conversation and do not depend on the context to interpret them. As with lexical presuppositions, the conventional implicatures associated with the words are used. The conjunction "but" in English is one of these words.

4. Implicature Function

In general, implicatures have several functions, one of which is to reveal implicit meaning or interpret the implied sentence. "Provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what is actually said" (Nadar, 2009). In connection with the

above statement, interpreting a speech is not enough just by implicature, we also need to adjust it to the context.

(Dewi et al., 2020) states that implicatures have several uses, including: they can provide an explanation of the meaning or linguistic facts that are not covered by linguistic theories; implicature can provide a clear explanation of the physical difference from what is meant by the speaker of the language; The implicature can provide a simple semantic description of the clause relations associated with the same conjunctive and the implicature can provide a variety of outwardly unrelated, even contradictory facts (such as metaphors). Rani Arifin (2006) explains that language society often uses conversational implicatures for certain purposes, for example to refine the propositions that are uttered and in order to save the face (*saving face*).

5. Context

Context or topic is the target scope of a person in telling speech. Mey (Nadar, 2009b) *the surroundings, in the widest sense that enable the participants in the communication process to interact, and that make the linguistic expressions of the their interaction intelligible* (environmental situation in a broad sense that allows participants to speak to be able to interact and make their speech understood). Based on the above statement, context is a measure that is considered in pragmatics.

Cutting (Samarlam 2014) there are three types of context, namely, *first*, situational context is a context that concerns about what the speaker pays attention to about his surroundings or the conditions in which the speech occurs. *Second*, the context of knowledge is divided into two, namely the context of general cultural knowledge and interpersonal knowledge.

The general context of culture is general knowledge about human life. The context of interpersonal knowledge is personal experience in verbal interactions before acting in speech. *Third*, contextual context is the content surrounding the text consisting of grammatical and lexical cohesion.

III. METHODS

This type of research is a qualitative descriptive study. The descriptive approach can be defined as research that seeks to provide a systematic and accurate picture of the actual facts and characteristics of certain populations

(Zuriah, 2005). Based on the above statement, it can be concluded that the researcher observed and then analyzed the conversations between teachers and students at the Salafiyah Syafi'iyah Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school.

Qualitative research that aims to understand the phenomenon of what purpose is experienced by research subjects such as behavior, perception, motivation, action and more holistically and by way of description in the form of words and language, in a specific context in which the natural and by utilizing several natural methods (Moleong, 2006). This research is descriptive because it describes the types of implicatures and their functions in the conversations between teachers and students at the Salafiyah Syafi'iyah Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school.

1. Data and Data Sources

The data in this study were conversations between teachers and students at the Salafiyah Syafi'iyah Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school which contained conversational implicatures. Sources of data in this study were teachers and students at the Salafiyah Syafi'iyah Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school.

2. Data Collection Techniques

The data in this study were in the form of conversations between teachers and students which were transcribed into written text. This research uses reduction data. According to Siswanto (2010), the data reduction steps are as follows; *first*, prepare a data collection sheet; *second*, selecting data; *third*, describe the data; *fourth*, draw conclusions and *fifth*, verification. Data is collected in several ways; *First*, prepare a data collection sheet. *Second*, selecting data. That is, selecting data that is considered to contain *conversational implicatures*. This is based on the observations and experiences of the author. *Third*, explain the selected conversation data and then give reasons. This has the aim of obtaining the accuracy of the data, to help or to make sure the writer determines the data related to the *implicatures of the conversation*. *Fourth*, draw conclusions. This means checking the data that has been selected in order to obtain better accuracy. The accuracy of this research depends on the author himself. *Fifth*, prove the validity of the data. That is, the authors prove the data according to the results of experience and observations.

3. Data Analysis Techniques

Siswanto (2010) emphasizes that the data analysis is carried out by describing the descriptive form of each data functionally and relational. In addition, Siswanto (2010) says that data is classified and explained based on concrete data. This means that in this study, the researcher must analyze the data based on the observation results. These steps are as follows: *first*, pay attention and observe the data that has been collected based on the results of observations. *Second*, find the characteristics of conversation patterns that are considered to

contain conversational implicatures and then interpret them. *Third*, describe and give reasons. *Fourth*, provide a table of conversational implicatures based on observations.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this research show that there are types of implicatures that used by students' and teachers' at Al-Azhar islamic boarding school. They are General conversational implicature, scale conversational implicature, special conversational implicature and Implications of conventional conversations.

Table. 1.1 Types of Implicatures

Types of Implicature	Conversation	Context
General conversational implicature	Student: Sir, Agos is talking to Firda Guru: Where ...? Student: at the gate above, sir	In the classroom (during the lesson)
Scale conversational implicature	Teacher: Tomorrow's exam Student: I have studied some of the lesson grids that were delivered yesterday sir	In the classroom (learning evaluation)
Special conversational implicature	Teacher: Faqih, are you going to be quiz tomorrow? Student: I haven't studied yet, sir.	At school (student selection)
Implications of conventional conversations	Teacher: Why are you coming to school late. Student: I left early sir, but my bike is leaking.	In the classroom (during lessons)

Data01:

Student: Sir, Agos is talking to Firda

Teacher: Where ...?

Student: At the gate above, sir. (general conversation implicature).

Based on the above conversations, it can be concluded that these conversations are general conversation implicatures. It is said that, because when a teacher was teaching a class, suddenly one of the students gave information that Agos was talking to Firda. Agos is a boy student and Firda is a girl student. Judging from the context of the situation or because they are occupied by the boarding school, Firda and Agos have violated or violated the rules of the pesantren. It is said that because in the pesantren, male and female students are prohibited from meeting or even talking, unless they are both their families and have received

permission from the boarding school.

At that time, students were said to be uttering or using conversational implicatures because when they reported they only said that Agos and Firda were talking without saying that Agos and Firda had violated or violated the pesantren's rules. The real meaning of the sentence "*Sir, Agos is talking to Firda*" is that Agos and Firda have the right to receive punishment or are words of demands to the teacher that they must be sentenced in accordance with the established cottage policy. However, he as a student still has to apply or have to say politely to his teacher in any case. The sentence "*Sir, Agos is talking to Firda*" is the implicature of a general conversation, it is said that because someone does not need or without a very broad and deep interpretation in understanding the sentence. Because in the context someone will immediately understand

the meaning of these words.

Data 02:

Teacher: exam tomorrow

Student: I have studied some of the lesson grids that were delivered yesterday sir. (conversational implicature at scale).

Based on the above conversations, it can be concluded that this type of conversation is a conversational implicature at scale. It is said so because the conversational implicature in it inserts several conjunctive terms such as *several*. So, the above conversation between teacher and student is marked with the word "*several*". When the teacher throws a sentence *tomorrow exam* on the to the student, then the student answers that *I have studied several lesson grids*, meaning that a student understands that the teacher not only informs the student, but the teacher also gives advice or orders the student to study.

Then when the student answers by choosing a word *few* in the example above, the speaker creates an implicature (not all). This means that a student responds to the teacher's advice with a positive (appreciative) response. Even though the student did not learn the lesson he was giving at all, the student dared to lie in order to cover up or reduce the anger of the teacher. This is what is called a *scaled implicature*. One of the features seen in scaled implicatures is when speakers correct themselves about some details, such as the following example.

Data 03:

Teacher: Faqih, will you become a quiz tomorrow?

Student: I haven't studied yet, sir. (special conversational implicature).

Based on the above conversation, it can be concluded that the conversation is the implicature of a special conversation. Said so because the conversation requires interpretation of the interlocutor to understand the meaning of the answer from the interlocutor. When a teacher says "*Faqih, are you going to be quiz tomorrow?*" The sentence only requires a yes or no answer. But the student's answer was off the mark by saying "*I haven't studied yet, sir*". Now, to make the student's answer relevant, the teacher is required to have a small supply of knowledge, which assumes that the student

needs time to learn. So, Faqih takes a lot of time to provide such quiz. On the other hand, it is possible that Faqih objected to following the quiz because there were several obstacles such as: *insecurity, humility, fear, laziness, difficulty in understanding lessons, lack of insight* and so on.

So, Faqih gave trying to give reasons like that with the aim that he was not included in the quiz. Besides that, Faqih also aims to prevent the teacher from scolding him. It is said that, if Faqih directly rejects the teacher's request by saying "no", then the teacher automatically feels disrespected because these words are inappropriate words. So, as a student, he must be really smart in applying courtesy when talking to his teacher and vice versa, a teacher must really know to control and protect the feelings of his students because these words will discourage his students.

Data 04:

Teacher: Rofin *has not* come to this event

Student: maybe soon sir.

The conventional implicature is that the situation at that time is expected to be different, or maybe vice versa in the future. In the example above the speaker generates an implicature that he expects the statement "Rofin came to the event". So, this sentence is said to be conventional implicatures because conventional implicatures are the opposite of all conversational implicatures discussed so far, conventional implicatures are not based on the principle of cooperation or maxims. Conventional implicatures do not have to occur in conversation, and do not rely on specific contexts to interpret them. As in the example above, even though the teacher said "Rofin *has not* come to this event" and did not get a response or answer from the student, the sentence was still said to be conventional implicature because basically conventional implicatures do not depend on a particular context. This means that even though the teacher says this without any response from the student, the sentence is still formed as a conventional implicature.

V. CONCLUSION

In general, the pesantren environment is termed religiously. This means that the pesantren environment is an environment that is very thick with religiousness. For this reason,

teachers and students are required to obey all the established rules. One of the general rules that must be obeyed by teachers and students in Islamic boarding schools is language. With smooth and good language, humanist interactions are automatically achieved. The purpose of maintaining language in communicating includes maintaining image, feeling, enforcing courtesy and others, so that some of the language or sentences communicated have many meanings. For that, we must really understand the language according to the context. This requires a pragmatic approach to interpret the meaning of the language according to the context.

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which studies several languages, one of which is conversational implicatures. One of the branches of science that studies language to communicate is pragmatics (Nadar, 2009: 2). Therefore, it can be concluded that through pragmatics we can learn a lot about matters related to language.

Besides that, we can understand the meaning of the implicit implications of a conversation or conversation. Implicature is the thing that is implied or the sentence implied its meaning. That is, the speaker's meaning is an aspect of what is meant in the speaker's utterance without being part of what is being said. What the speaker means to communicate is much richer than what he is expressing directly; Linguistic meanings cannot radically be determined by those that are conveyed and understood.

It is necessary to carry out further research on the implicature of conversation because this research still has room for the development of findings that will enrich scientific treasures. In addition, it is hoped that the results of the research can be used as a reference for future researchers so that they can carry out more accurate and in-depth research, not only regarding the description of the implications of the conversation but also regarding the factors that influence speakers so that these utterances appear and their impact on speech partners in context. conversations.

This research is still has room for the development of findings that will enrich scientific treasures especially on speech level conversation between teachers and students. It is very important to do futher research on the context of the use of speech levels and their implementation in learning activies. Besides, it is very interesting to do futher research by using

a sociopragmatic approach.

REFERENCES

- Chaer, A. (2011). *Tata Bahasa Indonesia Praktis*. Renika Cipta.
- Dewi, I. A. P. A., Kardana, I. N., & Muliana, I. N. (2020). Functions of Speech Acts in "Critical Eleven." *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 6(1), 1–6.
- Kuntowijoyo. (1988). *Menuju Kemandirian Pesantren dan Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa*.
- Moleong, L. J. (2006). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif* (Edisi Revi). Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nadar, F. (2009a). *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Graha Ilmu.
- Nadar, F. (2009b). *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Graha Ilmu.
- Niatri, A. . (2016). *Implikatur Percakapan Antartokoh dalam Film Marmut Merah Jambu Karya Raditya Dika*. Yogyakarta: PBSI, JPBS, FKIP, Sanata Dharma.
- P.W.J, N. (1987). *Ilmu Pragmatik*. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Rani, A., Arifin, B., & M. (2006). Analisis Wacana. In *Sebuah Kajian Bahasa dan Pemakaian*. Bayumedia.
- Siswanto. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Sastra, Analisis Struktur Puisi*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Zuriah, N. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Sosial dan Politik*. Bumi.