

**THE VIOLATION OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE
A CASE OF HUMOROUS VERBAL CARTOON IN KOMPAS**

Mory Yana Gultom

Elia Masa Gintings

English Department, Faculty of Language and Arts

State University of Medan (UNIMED)

Abstract

This research is aimed at describing the types of maxim violated in humorous verbal cartoon in Kompas, to find out the type of the maxims that is dominantly violated in it and to find out the causes. The method of research is descriptive qualitative research. The data is analyzed by interpreting the conversations and analyzing them based on the types of the maxim violated. From the data, it was found that the violation of the maxim of quality is 12 (20.33%), the violation of the maxim of quantity is 25 (42.37%), the violation of manner is 15 (25.42%), and the violation of the maxim of relevance is 7 (11.86%). The frequency and the percentage shows that maxim of quantity is the dominant type of maxim which is violated.

Key words: cooperative principle, maxim, cartoon, humor

Introduction

Background of Study

Language as a mean of communication is the way of behaving to interact one another to represent their ideas and thought of men's minds be conveyed from one another. It will be difficult to express our intention to our listener without language. For example, when a child wanted to have a lunch s/he would have to use signs such as pointing out to her/his mouth and stomach. S/he would not be able to tell at once what s/he meant is s/he was hungry, then there will be misunderstanding.

Language is used such in conversation. Conversation itself is a communication which is done by two or more people where there is (are) the speaker(s) and the listener(s). To build a meaningful conversation, it is important that both speaker and listener have the same interpretation about intended meaning in utterance. In other word, listener can not grasp what the speaker meant. This case is called cooperative principle. It is a rule that should be obeyed to achieve a cooperative communication among them. The cooperative principle describes how people interact with one another (Yule, 1996 : 36).

The most important thing in using language as a means communication is the message carried, which is called meaning. Language without meaning is useless.

Meaning makes little sense except in the context of communication: the notion of communication therefor provides as good a place as any to start an exploration of meaning. Communication can be conceived very broadly, including within its scope such matter as the transfer of information between biological generations via the genethic code, the interaction between a driver and his car, and indeed any sort of stimulus-response situation (Cruse, 2000 : 15).

Someties, speaker doesn't say what s/he means. S/he utters something for different intention, aimed to unhurt the other feeling, or even to offend him/her. For example,

Mike and Anny are in a living room.

Mike : Do you like to have dinner in the living room or in the kitchen?

Anny : It's cold in here.

What Anny actually intention is, “Let’s eat in the kitchen” but she utters another expression with a hope that Mike will understand the meaning or message carried.

When both speaker and listener or hearer do not have a cooperative principle, they will not ever arrive in the same meaning of the topic spoken. Otherwise, the cooperative principle helps us to understand and interpret easily what the speaker utter, if only it is obeyed.

It is common for people to break the rule in cooperative principle while they are conversing. The action is called violation. When speaker does not obey the principle, it means that s/he is doing “violation of cooperative principle”.

Consider the example bellow:

Rudy : Will you accompany me to my uncle’s party?

Mary : I have to pick my brother up, then we will go for shopping with my mother.

In the conversation, Rudy actually needs an answer whether or not Mary will go with him. Mary’s answer indicates that she has many things to do at the time and she just catch the surface meaning of Rudy’s utterance. Therefore, she doesn’t fullfill the needed eventhough she she is expected to provide it more.

The abillity in providing an expected amount of information by a speaker in a conversation is a concept of cooperative principle in which the participants make their contributions as informative as is required (Yule, 1996 : 36). Therefore, the speakers those who give less information than expected in conversation, they violate the cooperative principle and it causes their failure to reach their mutual goal.

The sub-principles of cooperative principle is named maxim. It is elaborated into four kinds, they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner.

People have their own style to deliver their mind. One of them is with humor. Just to make it fun, they often violate the cooperative principle in conversation. The violation to the rules of pragmatic aspect will create joke or humor (Wijana,

2003 : 32). Those rules for the cartoonist or humorist are often violated either intentionally or unintentionally. Thus, the comic effect in humorous story can be analyzed through pragmatic approach by paying attention to the disobedience of the speaker to the rules to the cooperative principle (Wijana, 2003 : 18).

Verbal cartoon as a humorous drawing is found in many newspapers and magazines. Writer chooses verbal cartoon as the object of the study since many violations to the rule of pragmatics found in their words usage, in producing their humorous idea. Linguistically, a research can be conducted to the verbal cartoon as it concerns dominantly to the conversational text that the words in the text create comic effect. Meanwhile, the drawing influences nothing its humorous idea (Wijana, 2003 : 1). In this case, Kompas newspaper is chosen because it is liked most to read by many people, especially in Indonesia.

Based on the explanation above, writer has an inquisitive feeling to analyze the violation of cooperative principle and find out the dominant maxim which is used there.

The Problems of The Study

The problems of the study were formulated as the following:

1. What types of maxims are violated in humorous verbal cartoon of Kompas daily?
2. What is the dominant type of maxims are violated in humorous verbal cartoon of Kompas daily?
3. What are the causes of the dominant type of maxims violated in humorous verbal cartoon of Kompas?

The Scope of The Study

Yule (1996 : 37) stated that either speaker or listener who gives less information related to the topic than the expected and who are not cooperating in a conversation will produce such kinds of funny event.

Based on Grice's theory, cooperative principle is elaborated to its four sub-principles, called maxim. They are: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of

quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. In order to have specific research, the writer limited the study deals with the four maxims in humorous verbal cartoon of Kompas daily.

The Objectives of The Study

The objective of the study are:

1. to describe the types of maxim violated in humorous verbal cartoon in Kompas,
2. to find out the type of the maxims that is dominantly violated in it
3. to find out the causes the dominant maxim violated.

The Significances of Study

This study is aimed at providing some contribution for both writer and reader in developing their knowledge related to pragmatics, especially cooperative principle. So,

1. This study is expected to be useful for the readers in finding the humorous aspect of verbal cartoon especially through cooperative principle.
2. This study is expected to help the students or learners to conduct a further research related to cooperative principle.
3. This study is expected to help the other researchers in researching about cooperative principle.

Review of Literature

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what

the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they're talking to, where, when and under what circumstances. Therefore, pragmatics is the study of semantic meaning and also contextual meaning (Yule, 1996 : 3).

Pragmatics is a way of investigating how sense can be made of certain texts even when, from a semantic viewpoint, the text seems to be either incomplete or to have a different meaning to what is really intended. Consider a sign seen in a children's wear shop window: "Baby Sale - lots of bargains". We know without asking that there are no babies for sale - that what is for sale are items used for babies. Pragmatics allows us to investigate how this "meaning beyond the words" can be understood without ambiguity. The extra meaning is there, not because of the semantic aspects of the words themselves, but because we share certain contextual knowledge with the writer or speaker of the text. Pragmatics is an important area of study for your course. A simplified way of thinking about pragmatics is to recognize, for example, that language needs to be kept interesting - a speaker or writer does not want to bore a listener or reader, for example, by being over-long or tedious. So, humans strive to find linguistic means to make a text, perhaps, shorter, more interesting, more relevant, more purposeful or more personal.

"She says what she doesn't mean". That is an idiom statement that is suitable to this topic. Speakers sometimes express their intention by choosing the other words or sentences. In other words, they do not speak it directly to the hearer and it's merely to be a joke or humor. When the listener is able to dig the deep meaning as the speakers intend, it means that they have arrived in cooperative principle. The meaning of utterances will be got by understanding the context when the conversation is happening. For example: In a closed room, mother said to her child, "It's dark here", then the child turned on the lamp. From the case, the child is able to dig the meaning beyond his mother's utterances. He understood that his mother indirectly wanted to say "turn on the lamp".

The focus of pragmatic analysis is on the meaning of speakers' utterances rather than on the meaning of words or sentences. It concentrates on those aspect of meaning that cannot be predicted by linguistics knowledge about the physical and social world (Peccei, 2000 : 5). The child in the example above understood the context that his mother is needing a light in the dark room then he turned it on.

Cooperative Principle

In social science generally and linguistics specifically, the **cooperative principle** describes how people interact with one another. As phrased by Paul Grice, who introduced it, it states, "*Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.*" Though phrased as a prescriptive command, the principle is intended as a description of how people normally behave in conversation

Listeners and speakers must speak cooperatively and mutually accept one another to be understood in a particular way. The cooperative principle describes how effective communication in conversation is achieved in common social situations. The purpose of conversation is both speaker(s) and listener(s) can achieve the same meaning of the utterances then they can avoid such ambiguity. Listener(s) use the cooperative principle to grasp what the speaker(s) intent and s/he should be able to provide information as complete as s/he needs.

Without cooperative principle, people communication will be far more difficult because the cooperative principle itself is studied in pragmatics will reduce the bewilderment of listener. It will make both speaker and listener's conversational discourse meaningful since they obey the certain principle in the conversation. People who obey the cooperative principle in their language use will make sure that what they say in a conversation furthers the purpose of that conversation. Obviously, the requirements of different types of conversations will be different.

Maxim

Maxim is the sub-principles of cooperative principle. It is elaborated into four maxims, they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. They will be explained as following

a. Maxim of Quantity

Oxford dictionary defines quantity as the amount or number of something. The definition support to what Grice said as cited in Yule (1996 : 37) that the maxim of quantity is concerned with the amount of information from the utterance conveys.

- 1) Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
- 2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxim of quantity leads the speaker to make the contribution as informative as is required that there will be cooperative principle in the conversation. It should be neither too much nor too little, just say just as much as is necessary.

For example:

- a) Mother : What do you need for your examination tomorrow?
Sisca : Pen and dictionary.
Mother : Anything else?
Sisca : No. It's enough.

From the example above, it is clear that Sisca is able to give the information as informative as required about her preparation in examination.

b. Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality is a conversation in which speaker should truthful and give a true and provable information or that is supported by evidence. The following is the definition of maxim of quality explained briefly by Yule (1996 : 37)

- 1) Do not say what you believe to false
- 2) Do not say for which you lack adequate evidence.

For example:

1. Pungguk : What is the weather like in Sahara desert area?
Kayang : It is hot.

Even though Pungguk has never been to Sahara desert but his information is believed to be true because everybody knows that Sahara desert has a high temperature.

2. Teacher : What is the capital city of Indonesia?
Student : Bandung

The example above shows us that student cannot give an informative answer because everybody knows that the capital city of Indonesia is Jakarta not Bandung. He said something lack of evidence.

c. Maxim of Relevance

In every conversation, speaker needs to give contribution relevant with the topic and stick to the point of conversation and says thing related clearly to the purpose of the exchange an appropriate in a certain context. That is the definition of maxim of relevance. The point is. Be relevant.

For example:

A: Would you like to tell me the job description of you secretary?

B : Well, it is my birthday today.

The conversation above can make the other laugh since it has no relation at all between A and B. Here is another example:

- Siti : What is your favorite food?
Coko : Fried chicken.

The example above is relevant between speaker and listener since Coko's answer is the kind of food. The point of the relation maxim is the contribution must be informative which is indicated by the relevance of information. For example, when the question is about place, so the answer must be about place, when the question is about singers, the answer cannot be about film, and so on.

d. Maxim of Manner

The maxim of manner is concerned with how the speaker deliver his/her intention to the hearer or listener. Yule (1996 : 37) conclude the explanation of maxim of manner as following:

1) Avoid obscurity

You should not use words you know, but is unfamiliar with listeners. They would not understand.

2) Avoid ambiguity

Try to make your words have just one meaning, depends on the context.

3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)

You should not state something in a long, drawn-out way if you could say it in a much simpler manner.

4) Be orderly (following the natural order or events)

Maxim of manner is about the way of speaker in delivering his/her contributions.

For example:

a) A wife asks her husband something to eat for their children

Mother : Let's get our children something.

Father : Well, but not ice cream.

By saying *but not ice cream*, it shows that it is not wanted to eat and the father wants to make it clear and tries to be straightforward.

Humor

Humor is defined as some attributes of an event that make a person laugh or smile, namely attributes that lead us to perceive the event as ludicrous or humorous (McGhee, 1979 :6).

The definition of humor includes ideas or events judge to be incongruous, absurd, ridiculous, and so forth. It is essential to clarify the meaning of these adjectives terms as they are commonly used to describe the qualities of events associated with the humor.

There is an essential difference between humorous and non-humorous story. In non-humorous story, the use of language is appropriate to rules of the principles of pragmatics aspects and obeys those rules tightly.

In humorous story, the rules of principle in pragmatics aspects are violated to create joke or humor as stated like the quotation bellow:

Joke, though encountered fairly frequently in everyday conversation, represent tightening or heightening of language of a kind that is unnecessary to, and sometimes actively disruptive to, the normal pragmatic and informational functions of language. Many perhaps most, jokes will be found to rise from a phenomenon which is in pragmatics terms a potential source of confusion (Nelson in Wijana, 2003 : 32).

- a) Absurd : The event or statement which is illogical or inconsistent with what is either known or strongly believed to be true.
- b) Incongruous : The notion of incongruity refers to the relationship between components of an object, event, social expectation and so forth. When the arrangement of the constituent elements of an event is incompatible with the normal of expected pattern, the event is perceived as incongruous. Only when the pattern is seen to be meaningful or compatible then, the incongruity disappears.
- c) Ridiculous : this term refers to events that are laughable, and not to be taken seriously. The intent of ridiculing a person is usually to belittle or disparage. Thus, laughter at the ridiculous often tends to be derisive, contemptuous and hostile.
- d) Ludicrous : The concept that refers to any event that produces laughter because of incongruity, absurdity, exaggeration, or ridiculousness.
- e) Funny : This word refers to unusual or incongruous events that are puzzling but not humorous. In referring to something puzzling, it is puzzling in itself, because it is derived from the word 'fun' which doesn't have a comparable meaning. When we are having fun, we are playful, joking, merry, and generally lacking of any serious intent.

- f) Amusing : The common usage of this term is nothing to do with humor. But it is used interchangeably with 'funny' since funny means amusing. Amusement is one's form of experience in a pleasant entertainment and it doesn't involve humor at all. For example, TV theatre, a light novel, or games can be amusing in the absence of humor.
- g) Mirthful : The term is inappropriate in its usage but often used as if it were synonymous with humor, because when we are merry and in generally lighthearted mood then, we are mirthful. Besides, laughter is a sign of mirth, in which it results from one sense fun who capture humorous sense in something even though it is not funny.

Cartoon

Most dictionary definitions and people interpretations emphasize two distinct meaning about cartoon. One is a humorous or satirical drawing published in newspaper or magazine and the second is in a film which is made by photographing a series of cartoon drawings, to give the illusion of movement when projected in rapid sequences.

Oxford dictionary stated that cartoon is an amusing drawing in newspaper or magazine, especially one about politics or current event. The definition becomes the focus of the study here.

Cartoon as the humorous drawing in newspaper and magazine is usually presented to the readers who need amusement after reading a serious matter in the other articles of those printed media. The idea that cartoon can encompass is very broad. It can critique the condition of a country, for example political, economical, or social event and artistic point. It seems to be simple but has a deep meaning that can special impression for the readers, not only entertain but also satire. Nevertheless, when doing the idea in the form of conversational text and the drawing of the cartoon, the streaks or humor keep existing beyond them that the reader enjoying reading cartoon for its entertaining purposes.

Verbal cartoon is the combination of words and pictures in which the humorous idea or joke is put beyond the form of conversational text and the

drawings (Wijana, 2003 : 8). The conversational text shows the speech uttered and the drawing shows the speaker, hearer, the word spoken of and spatiotemporal setting related to where and when the speech is uttered.

Non-verbal cartoon is the humorous idea which is put in the form of the drawing without any words to support (Wijana 2003 : 9). Linguistically, it is impossible to create the conversational text of the humorous idea of non-verbal cartoon, since it is no more original to be made as the object of the research, because it is based on the reader's assumption and interpretation. That's why non-verbal cartoon is out of this study.

Kompas

Kompas is the most widely read newspaper in Indonesia. Published by Kompas-Gramedia Group Publishing since June 28, 1965, it has a reputation in Indonesia for high-quality writing and investigative journalism. It is written in Indonesian.

The paper was suggested by Ahmad Yani, then the Army Minister and the Commander of the Army, when he suggested to Frans Seda publishing a newspaper that was balanced, credible and independent. Seda sounded out the idea to his friend, P.K.Ojong and Jakob Oetama. Ojong subsequently agreed to undertake the project and Oetama became its first editor-in-chief.

The publication was initially named *Bentara Rakyat (People's Herald)*. At President Soekarno's suggestion, it was renamed to *Kompas ("compass")*, for the direction-finding instrument.

Kompas began publication on June 28, 1965 from an office in central Jakarta, with an initial circulation of 4,800 copies. Since 1969, it has been the largest national newspaper in Indonesia. In 2004, its daily circulation reached some 530,000 copies, and its Sunday edition 610,000 copies. Readership totaled some 2.25 million.

Like many major daily newspapers, *Kompas* is divided into three major parts: a front section containing national and international news, a business section and a sports section.

Besides, there are many minor parts of it. One of them is “TTS & Kartun” that published on Sunday. In this part, there are four verbal cartoons and one non-verbal. They are Panji Koming (created by Dwi Koendoro), Mice (created by Benny Rachmadi and Muhammad "Mice" Misrad), Timun (created by Rachmat Riyadi) and Sukribo (created by Ismail). Panji Koming, Timun and Sukribo used to take the hottest news about politic such as Nazaruddin case, while Mice is about something developing in human being such as boy band and girl band in Indonesia. They are aimed to critic both governments and people in Indonesia. All of the critics are delivered pragmatically designed in funny utterances and pictures.

Methodology Research and Discussion

In this research, the descriptive qualitative research method was used to find out the violation of Cooperative Principle in humorous verbal cartoon of Kompas daily. Qualitative research is descriptive in that the researcher is interested in process, meaning and understanding gained through words or pictures (Creswell, 1994 : 145). The data in this study are in the form of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences which maxim are violated. This study described the types of violation maxim to find the dominant type. Therefore, the descriptive qualitative design was used.

The data of this study were verbal cartoons, which were taken from newspaper, it Kompas. They were taken in four months, from August to November 2011 which appeared in every Sunday. The writer analyzed the data based on Grice’s theory named Cooperative Principle. There should be 17 editions and 4 verbal cartoons in each, but two edition of them were holiday and Kompas was not published. They were on 6th and 27th of November 2011. So, there were just 60 verbal cartoons all included as the data.

The data which were collected were analyzed based on Grice’s theory and classified by four types of the violated maxim after interpreting first. They are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner.

The data of this study had been collected by using documentary technique. The main source of the data was humorous verbal cartoon in *Kompas*. The techniques were done as following:

- 1)Collecting humorous verbal cartoon from Kompas newspaper
- 2)Reading all the humorous verbal cartoon
- 3)Identifying the utterances which contain the violation of Cooperative Principle.

Through the interpretation and classification based on the maxim violation, there were 68 cartoons that displayed the attributes needed (by giving numbers). There were 12 cartoons violated the maxim of quality, 25 cartoons violated the maxim of quantity, 15 cartoons violated the maxim of manner and 7 cartoons violated the maxim of relevance. There was also 1 cartoon which didn't violate any maxim. It means that it followed the rule of cooperative principle.

The data analysis was carried out to discover the types of violated maxim and the dominant one in humorous verbal cartoon in Kompas. The steps were as following:

- 1) Interpreting the utterances to find out the cartoons humorous idea.
- 2) Classifying the violated maxim into four types of maxims based on the utterances whether they are quality, quantity, relation, or even manner.
- 3) Counting the violated for each maxim by using the percentage formula

$$X = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Note: X = the percentage of the violations for each maxim

F = frequency

N = total number of violations

- 4) Finding the dominant violated maxim.
- 5) Giving explanation about the findings

Furthermore, some of the result of the analysis which is got from the data is shown in the following table:

Table 1.

The Interpretation and the Classification of Maxim Violation

NO	INTERPRETATION	MAXIM VIOLATION			
		Quality	Quantity	Manner	Relation
1	A and B are being on the street. A talked about dark car. B got misunderstanding since he didn't know that A used "dark car" just to symbolize the certain persons.			√	
2	Everyone uses certain words to represent the works of someone they are talking about. In this case, they said "rat" for corrupt governors who are so difficult to be captive especially when they had someone who had more power.			√	
3	Sukribo's friends do not want Pak Lur anymore as their leader. Meanwhile, Sukribo gives his opinion as if he likes Pak Lur. He doesn't try to tell directly that he just actually wants Pak Lur to apologize.			√	
4	The conversation will make confuse for a time since A doesn't try to straightforward. He said that it was his father's film as to show the case of Nazaruddin.			√	
5	A looks at some pulic places. It is closed in fasting day. Then he makes the same thing, he writes it in front of his house in order to say people not to talk or gossipping and people do not understand.			√	
6	A is crying for her dead poor friend. They see some rich people are running after each other. Suddenly		√		

	there is a towel on B's head and he asked his mother his mother where was it from. A gives too much information since she said that the people was wasting his when they cleaned their hands.				
7	C is asked to be the contestant in a speech competition. B suggests C to be confidence by saying "pede." C got misunderstanding since in his mind, "pede" is a word for corruptor. B and C doesn't cooperate what it means.			√	
8	The conversation is completely irrelevant. A asked about the originality of food in the market, but B suggest just to ask about brain cleaning.				√
9	It's time to eat something after fasting in the day. They are still in journey, that's why A said that they must get food on street. Meanwhile, B assumes that it's real street. He doesn't get what A means.			√	
10	A is telling that the way to get a good fruit is by planting the good seed. From a distance there are some rich person bringing a big tree and planting it again, they called it politic tree which is owned by the only rich men. A said, it's better to plant the new pure seed, but he can't provide enough information when B asked how long it would be bigger.		√		

The dominant type:

NO	MAXIM VIOLATION	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Quality	12	20.33
2	Quantity	25	42.37
3	Manner	15	25.42

4	Relevance	7	11.86
	Total	59	100

From the table, it was found that the violation of the maxim of quality is 12 (20.33%), the violation of the maxim of quantity is 25 (42.37%), the violation of manner is 15 (25.42%), and the violation of the maxim of relevance is 7 (11.86%). The frequency and the percentage shows that maxim of quantity is the dominant type of maxim which is violated.

Conclusions

Based on the findings that is explained, it can be concluded as bellow:

1. There are four types maxim violated in humorous verbal cartoon in Kompas. They are They are maxim of quality (20.33%), the maxim of quantity (42.37%), the maxim of manner (25.42%), and the maxim of relevance (11.86%).
2. The most dominant type of maxim which is violated in humorous verbal cartoon in Kompas is the maxim of quantity.
3. The finding shows that from Cooperative Principle point of view, most of the humorous verbal cartoon in Kompas is induced by the speaker's habit in telling something without giving enough information or even providing it too much by adding something unimportant to say which is aimed at creating humor, entertaining and giving much lesson for reader.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Cook, G.1989. *Discourse*. New York: Oxford University
- Creswell, J. W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd
- Cruse, D.Alan. 2000. *Meaning In Language*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Student*. New York: Routledge
- Dicks, Bella., Bruce Mason., Amanda Coffey and Paul Atkinson. 2005. *Qualitative Research And Hypermedia*. London: Sage Publication
- Flick, Uwe., Ernst von Kardorff and Ines Steinke. 2004. *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication
- Lesley Jeffries. 2006. *Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English*. China: Palgrave Macmillan
- Lyons, John. *Linguistic Semantics : An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Marvasti, Amir B. 2004. *Qualitative Research in Sociology*. London: Sage Publication
- McGhee, Paul E. 1979. *Humor : It's Origin and Development*. San Fransisco: W.H Freeman and Company
- Peccei, Jean Stilwell. 2000. *Pragmatics*. China:
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu. 2003. *Kartun*. Jogjakarta: Ombak
- Yule, George. 1996. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press