

THE FLOUTING OF CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS IN SHORT MESSAGES

Idda Astia

Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya
Email: idda.astia@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to describe how the participants (senders and receivers) flout conversational maxims in short messages. In this study, the source is taken from short messages that are sent via a provider because nowadays most people do communication with others using mobile phone. This study uses Grice's theory of cooperative principle is used especially the flouting of maxims (maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner). All kinds of those flouting that exist in short messages are analyzed, which are delivered by the participants (senders and receivers). This research uses qualitative descriptive. The utterances produced by the participants, the senders and the receivers, when they were conversing with each others in term of short messages or texting (SMS) were analyzed and described. The data of the research were written data, collected from the utterances, which contain flouting performed by the senders and the receivers in the short messages or texting (SMS). The result of the research shows that in maxim of quantity, they flout by adding more information and giving a little information. In maxim of quality, all of the participants flout it by saying what they believed false. In maxim of relevance, the participants flouted it by saying irrelevant responses. In maxim of manner, moreover, the participants flouted it by saying convoluted words which are extremely long-winded. The conversational maxim are mostly flouted by the participants (sender and receiver) in the short messages is maxim of quantity. It is flouted by adding more information.

Keywords: Conversation of Maxim, Flouting of Maxim, Short Message Service (SMS)

INTRODUCTION

When we make a communication with other people, of course, we must use language. Because language is tool that used by a group of people in their society. According to Francis (1958: 13) in which he states that language is an

arbitrary system of articulated sounds made use of by a group of humans as a means of carrying on the affairs of their society. So that language has an important function for communication. According to Business Times (2011), language is an important aspect in our day to day life because it enables us to communicate. We can use language to communicate with others. Without language, it is impossible to carry out communication in the real world.

So, in this context, communication will be successful if there is no misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer. The speakers must be aware when they use language or when they speak with the hearer and the hearer has to try to understand the speaker's intention or the speaker's means. Then, the hearer should know the speaker's communicative intention when the speaker produces an utterance. The speaker and the hearer have to be cooperative and have contributions in order to have a smooth conversation. Between speaker and hearer have commitment when they communicate each other. Raskin (1985: 101) also explains that the speaker is committed to the truth and relevance of his text whereas the hearer is aware of this commitment and perceives the uttered text as true and relevant by virtue of his recognition of the speaker's commitment to its truth and relevance. Cutting (2002: 34) adds that verbal exchanges, whether interviews, conversations or service encounters, tend to run more smoothly and successfully when the participants follow certain social conventions. In such a way people have to obey the rule in communication in order that communication can run smoothly.

According to Grice (1975: 45 in Toolan, 1992: 286), conversations normally exhibit some degree of coherence and continuity, which suggests that speakers are obeying some general principle of co-operation. Then Grice formulates a general principle of language use which is called the Cooperative Principle. Grice (1975 in Brown and Yule, 1983: 31) explains about cooperative principle and says, make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which is occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you engaged. Grice (1975) creates The Cooperative Principle that is reflected in the four maxims of conversation. The four maxims are Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relevance and Maxim of Manner.

The first maxim of the cooperative principle is the maxim of quantity. According to Thomas (1995: 63), maxim of quantity is make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange) and do not make your contribution more informative than is required. The second maxim of the cooperative principle is the maxim of quality. According to Thomas (1995: 63), maxim of quality is do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. According to Thomas (1995: 63), maxim of relevance is be relevant. The last is the maxim of manner. In Thomas's explanation (1995: 64), He states that maxim of manner is avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), be orderly.

Maxims is a rule that people must fulfill in a good conversation, but in communication the speaker utterances usually do not always follow the rules. There might be flouting of cooperative principles. According to Curse (2000: 360) the other ways in which implicature arise are through deliberate flouting of maxims in circumstances in which it is obvious to the hearer that the maxims are being flouted, it is obvious to the hearer that the speaker intends to hearer to be aware that the maxims are being flouted and there are no signs that the speaker is opting out of the cooperative principle. According to Guy (1989: 30) that the flouting the maxim of quantity is a speaker should give neither too little information or too much. According to Guy (1989: 30), flouting the maxim of quantity can be flouted if the speakers do not tell the truth or the information is lack of evidence and something in the meaning is not literally true. In flouting the maxim of relevance, the speaker says irrelevant to hearer and flouting the maxim of manner is the speaker cannot say clearly and briefly and the speaker also says convoluted words.

Nowadays most people can do communication with others using short message that is sent via provider. It is often called SMS (Short Message Service) by all of people in Indonesia. All of people like texting messages by SMS better than calling by phone. Thickett (2012) also supports and he gives opinion that the research is conducted by Ofcom in 2011 showed 58% of respondents communicate with SMS every day, while making a phone call is only 47%. Spook (2002) also says that a common way of modern communication is text messaging

(texting) i.e, sending an SMS message, 160 characters or less, to and from a mobile phone. Then, Spook (2002) adds that texting in today's world has become one of the most popular ways of communication.

So far, Grice always gives the flouting of conversational maxims through spoken but in the flouting of conversational maxim also happen in short messages or SMS. It happens as in spoken. There is no research which discusses about the flouting of maxim through short message which is sent by provider or it is often called with SMS and the general theory of the flouting of maxim by Grice. Such studies will reveal the flouting in short messages. Finally, the result of this research can be used as a reference for further research on the flouting of conversational maxims. Based on this reason, the research is conducted. There are two purposes that want to be discussed. First, to identify and describe the way of maxims are flouted in the short messages. Second, to identify and describe kinds of conversational maxim are mostly flouted in the short messages.

METHOD

In this study, a qualitative approach is applied to analyze the flouting of conversational maxims which is in SMS (Short Message Service) or texting. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982: 29 in Lestari, 2004: 47), one of the characteristics of qualitative research is descriptive. Furthermore they say that the data collected are in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers. They often contain quotation and try to describe what particular situation or view of the world like in narrative form. The written words are very important in the qualitative approach.

The source of data in this research is utterance in written text that there is flouting which is collected in the form of short message or texting. There are 19 data of texting in which one datum consists of some conversations from sender and receiver. The data were taken during December 2012 by using handphone. The data were chosen to prove that there are flouting of conversational maxims.

Several procedures must be taken to collect the data. The data were taken from conversations in written text to be analyzed were in form of short messages

or texting (SMS). Then, that SMS or texting are transcribed, and consequently, analyzed the flouting of utterances in the transcriptions.

These are the steps to analyze the data. The first stage is the conversation in form of short messages or texting (SMS) which is consists of sender and receiver were collected. The second stage is the utterances were translated into English. The third stage is coding which contains flouting of conversational maxims. The fourth stage is classifying the data into four flouting based on cooperative principle. They are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevant, and maxim of manner. The fifth stage is stage is the data are analyzed based on the theory of cooperative principle especially for flouting of maxims.

DISCUSSION

1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity which says that speakers should be as informative as is required, that they should give neither too little information nor too much. In the other hand, conversations in short messages do not match with the maxim of quantity's definition. The conversations which are done by the sender and the receivers are flouting maxim of quantity. They do not make his contribution as informative as is required and they also make their contribution more informative than is required. The conversation below is the conversation in short messages that flout maxim of quantity.

Data: Conversation 9 (Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 10.51 a.m.)

- (1.4) Idda : *Dit, u neliti tntng bhsax orng homo?*
Dit, do you research about the language of homosexual?
- (1.5) Adit : *Iy aq neliti itu.. Aku udh 2bln nglakuin research.. Data udh ada.. heheheserem.*
Yes, I research it. I have done two months for researching. The data have been already. Hehehe, it is scary.
- (1.6) Idda : *Awas u ntar jdi korbanx lho..*
Beware, you can be a victim.
- (1.7) Adit : *Ah, udh biasa, ak jd korbannya nazih sampe 3x malah, tapi ak msh tegar kok,, hahahaha.*
Ah, it is common, I became the victim of Nazih until three times, but I am still stiff. Hahahaha

In the above conversation 9, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Adit is as receiver who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of

quantity by saying “*Iy aq neliti itu.. Aku udh 2bln nglakuin research.. Data udh ada.. hehehe serem..*”. He gave more information to the sender. Idda only asked whether he researched about the language of homosexual or not. She only needs the answer “Yes” or “No”, but he gave more information by adding about his data and also the condition when he looks for the data. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we do not make our contribution more informative than is required. Actually we have to obey the cooperative principle by saying the words that is needed but Adit is as receiver flouts the maxim of quantity which he made her contribution more informative than is required. He flouted because he wanted to show off that he has already been with his data and he wants to tell the condition when he looked for the data. So, he gave more information to Idda.

Data: Conversation 7 (Taken on December 16th, 2012 (at 04.40 p.m.)

- Idda : *Pean sudah dapat gaji ta?*
Have you got your salary?
Nazih : *Kasih tau gak ya..*
Hemm,, Should I tell you?
Idda : *Terserah pean wes!!*
Up to you!!

In the above conversation 7, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih is as receiver who responded to the sender’s message flouting the maxim of quantity by saying “*Kasih tau gak ya..*” He gave a little information to the sender. The sender asked about his salary but he did not tell her about it. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we make our contribution as informative as is required. Grice says we must give our information which is needed by neither adding nor reducing the information. Cutting also supports that we should give neither too little information nor too much (2002: 34). He flouted because he wanted to hide his salary and did not want Idda knows about it if he has not got it yet from his boss. So that he gave her too little information.

2 Maxim of Quality

The second maxim is maxim of quality, which says that speakers are expected to be sincere in saying something that they believe corresponds to the reality. Guy (1989: 30) says this maxim can be flouted if the speakers do not tell

the truth or the information is lack of evidence and something in the meaning is not literally true.

Data: Conversation 9 Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 10.51 a.m.)

- Idda : *Dit, u neliti tntng bhsax orng homo?*
Dit, do you research about the language of homosexual? Dit, do you research about the language of homosexual?
- Adit : *Iy aq neliti itu.. Aku udh 2bln nglakuin research.. Data udh ada.. hehehe serem..*
Yes, I research it. I have done two months for researching. The data have been already. Hehehe, it is scary. Yes, I research it. I have done two months for researching. The data have been already. Hehehe, it is scary.
- Idda : *Awas u ntar jdi korbanx lho..*
Beware, you can be a victim.
- Adit : *Ah, udh biasa, ak jd korbannya nazih sampe 3x malah, tapi ak msh tegar kok,, hahahaha..*
Ah, it is common, I became the victim of Nazih until three times, but I am still stiff. Hahahaha

In the above conversation 9, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. The way Adit responded by sending "*Ah, udh biasa, ak jd korbannya nazih sampe 3x malah, tapi ak msh tegar kok,, hahahaha..*" is flouting the maxim of quality. It is called flouting the maxim of quality because receiver's words which he talked are false and he also lacked adequate evidence. The researcher says that Adit's words are false because the researcher knows the relation between Adit and Nazih. Both of them are only friend. She knows that Nazih is not gay. Adit also could not give evidence enough to prove that he has become the victim of Nazih. So that the researcher can say if he did not tell the truth and have evidence enough with his words. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is that we do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. He flouted because he wanted to have intimate relationship which she made a humour with Idda by saying false words. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

Data: Conversation 17 (Taken on December 25th, 2012 (at 11.19 a.m.)

- Frieska: *Cint tgs tk kumpulkn bsok k Diana.. cz qu lg gk enak bdan..*
Cint, I will submit the task tomorrow to Diana.. because I am not good..
- Idda : *iya mbak..*
Yes, sis..
- Frieska: *ywes klo gtu.. awak qu legrek n ngedrop..*
Ok.. My body is so tired and I am drop..
- Idda : *Pean kbnyakan golek duwit.*
You work too much.
- Frieska :*Dapak mek duwit tok.. Golek duwek ricik koq nang prempatan suramadu,, hahahahahaha*
Not only money.. **but also I look for coins in crossroad suramadu,, hahahahahaha**
- Idda : *Lho kuq iso..?*
Can it..?
- Frieska: *Kan dirimu yow ngancani qu.. qu seng nyanyi dirimu nggawakno omplonge.. wkwkwkwkwk*
You also accompany me.. I am singing and you are bringing a tin.. wkwkwkwkwk

In the above conversation 17, there are flouting of cooperative principle. Frieska is as sender who responded the receiver's message flouting the maxim of quality by saying "*Golek duwek ricik koq nang prempatan suramadu,, hahahahahaha*" and "*Kan dirimu yow ngancani qu.. qu seng nyanyi dirimu nggawakno omplonge.. wkwkwkwkwk*".

First, she flouted by saying "*Golek duwek ricik koq nang prempatan suramadu,, hahahahahaha*". She said that she looked for coins in crossroad of suramadu. It can be seen that she said false and she did not tell the truth. Because Idda is as receiver and also researcher in this thesis who knows that her job does not look for coins in crossroad of suramadu like a beggar. Second, she flouted by saying "*Kan dirimu yow ngancani qu.. qu seng nyanyi dirimu nggawakno omplonge.. wkwkwkwkwk*". She said that Idda accompany her to look for coins. She also said that she was singing and Idda was bringing a tin. It can be seen that she said false and she does not tell the truth because she knows that between herself and Idda are not a singing beggar. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is we do not say what you believe to be false. Actually, we have to obey the cooperative principle but Frieska flouted in first sub maxim of quality which she said what she believed to be false. She flouted because she wanted to make a joke with Idda by saying false words for creating intimate relationship. According

to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

3 Maxim of Relevance

In order to the conversation is always relevant, the speakers must build or construct roughly the same context with the context that is established by his interlocutor. If not, they will be trapped in a misunderstanding. This is same as Sperber & Wilson (1989: 15-16) point of view in Wijana's book (2004: 85). They say that a speaker who intends an utterance to be interpreted in a particular way must also expect the hearer to be able to supply a context which allows that interpretation to be recovered. A mismatch between the context envisaged by the speaker and the one actually used by the hearer may result in a misunderstanding. In cutting's point of view (2002: 39), if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make the connection between their utterance and the preceding one(s).

Data: Conversation 1 (Taken on December 1st, 2012 (at 06.32 p.m.)

Idda : *Jdi jlan2 ap g?*

We will go around or not?

Nazih : *Ad sepak bola antara Malaysia n indo cnta*

There is football match between Malaysia and Indo my dear..

In the above conversation 1, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih flouts maxim of relevance which is showed by saying "*Ad sepak bola antara Malaysia n indo cnta*". The way he responses the sender's message is flouting of maxim relevance because it is not relevance with Idda's question. Idda asked about he would ask to go around or not, but he answered if there is a football match between Malaysia and Indonesia. When Idda asked about it, Nazih should have answered with the world which related to her question. According to Grice (1975), maxim relevance is that be relevant. If we say something irrelevant, it can be concluded that we flout maxim of relevance. He flouted because he wanted to her imagine what he did not said or he wanted to her conclude what he said. He did not want to say truthfully if he did not want to ask her to go around.

According to Cutting (2002: 39), if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say.

Data: Conversation 6 (Taken on December 13th, 2012 (at 09.49 p.m.)

- Idda : *Cnta, bku qw ud ta?*
Honey, has my book done?
Nazih : *Aq msih nunggu,,*
I'm still waiting,,
Idda : *Mksudx?*
What do you mean?

In the above conversation 6, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih flouts maxim of relevance which is showed by saying “*Aq msih nunggu,,*”. The way he responded her message is not relevance with her question. Idda asked about her book, but he answered if he was still waiting. Idda was confused with his answer. Idda did not understand what he said. So, it created misunderstanding in conversation between Idda and Nazih. According to Sperber & Wilson (1989: 15-16 in Wijana, 2004: 85), A speaker who intends an utterance to be interpreted in a particular way must also expect the hearer to be able to supply a context which allows that interpretation to be recovered. A mismatch between the context envisaged by the speaker and the one actually used by the hearer may result in a misunderstanding.

Actually, when Idda asks about it, Nazih should have answered with the world which is related to her question, such as not yet because he still need her book or I will return your book. According to Grice (1975), maxim relevance is that be relevant. If we say something irrelevant, it can be concluded that we flout maxim of relevance. He flouted because he wanted to her imagine or conclude what he said but he has made Idda confused with his answer, so that it creates misunderstanding. According to Sperber & Wilson (1989: 15-16 in Wijana, 2004: 85), A speaker who intends an utterance to be interpreted in a particular way must also expect the hearer to be able to supply a context which allows that interpretation to be recovered. A mismatch between the context envisaged by the speaker and the one actually used by the hearer may result in a misunderstanding. Cutting (2002: 39) also adds that if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say.

4 Maxim of Manner

This maxim flouts either for humor, as in the case of puns, and double endangers, where rival meanings are deliberately tolerated, or in order to establish solidarity between the speakers or exclude an over hearer from the conversation.

Data: Conversation 2 (Taken on December 3rd, 2012 (at 06.06 p.m.)

Nazih : *Au mau berangkat latihan di STIKOM*

I want to go to exercise in STIKOM

Idda : *Aq leh ikut?*

May I come with you?

Nazih : *Pean ntar dsna cenggur,, au wez jrang lat dteng2 cm lead.. Truz au g pngen kjadian yg ud trjadi, trjadi lg cnta.. Au dsna jga rncana g lat tpicuma lead tok..*

Maybe you will not have activity there. I also seldom exercise and I only

come for watching. Then, I do not want the last incident will happen again my dear. I plan I do not exercise but just watch it in there.

In the above conversation 2, there is flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih flouted maxim of manner by saying "*Pean ntar dsna cenggur,, au wez jrang lat dteng2 cm lead.. Truz au g pngen kjadian yg ud trjadi, trjadi lg cnta.. Au dsna jga rncana g lat tpi cuma lead tok..*". Nazih could not say clearly. He is convoluted when he answers Idda's request. His words are extremely long-winded. According to Grice (1975), maxim of manner is avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly. Actually, Nazih should have obeyed the cooperative principle when he answered Idda's will. He could simply replay "Yes" or "Ok" if he wanted to Idda came with him but if he refused, he could simply replay "No". He flouted because he did not have the ability to say clearly. He also said indirectly because he did not want if Idda would come with him. So that he wanted to her imagine or conclude what he said. According to Cutting (2002: 39), if the speakers flout the maxim of manner, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say.

Data: Conversation 11 (Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 07.42 p.m.)

- Idda : *U ud bli kado wat ultahx Nope?*
Have you bought a present for Nope?
- Ria : *Kmaren aq ud k'delta wat cari kado. Smwx bgus2 terus ada yg co2k bgt wat kadox dy. Trus aq mw bli, trnyta wktu ngmbil uang, dompet qw ktnggalan. Jdi aq lum bli.*
Yesterday I have gone to Delta for seeking a present. All of the presents are good and then there is a present which is suitable for her. Then, I wanted to buy, evidently when I took my money, my purse left behind. So, I have not bought it yet.

In the above conversation 11, there is flouting of cooperative principle. Ria flouted maxim of manner by saying “*Kmaren aq ud k'delta wat cari kado. Smwx bgus2 terus ada yg co2k bgt wat kadox dy. Trus aq mw bli, trnyta wktu ngmbil uang, dompet qw ktnggalan. Jdi aq lum bli.*”. Ria could not say clearly and briefly. She is convoluted when she answered Idda’s question. She also said unnecessary prolixity. Her words are extremely long-winded. According to Grice (1975), maxim of manner is avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly. Actually, Ria should have obeyed the cooperative principle when she answers Idda’s question. She can simply replay “Yes” or “Have done” if she has bought a present for Nope but if she has not bought it yet, she could simply replay “Not yet”. Idda only needed simple answer from her, because Idda did not ask her with “Why”. If Idda asks her, Why do not you buy a present for Nope?, Ria could answer with long words because Idda’s question asks about reason. She flouted because she did not have the ability to say clearly and briefly. She also hid her feeling because of she is shy that she canceled to buy a present because her purse left behind. So, she added some information which is not needed by Idda. According to Jazeri (2003), if the speakers flout the maxim of manner, they will say information which is convoluted and is not brief, so that the hearers do not get the information that they want.

This is the number of flouting the conversational maxims in short messages which the researcher has made in form of table.

No.	Short Messages	Flouting of Conversational Maxims			
		Flouting Maxim of Quantity	Flouting Maxim of Quality	Flouting Maxim of Relevance	Flouting Maxim of Manner
1.	Conversation 1			v	
2.	Conversation 2				v
3.	Conversation 3		v		
4.	Conversation 4				v
5.	Conversation 5			v	
6.	Conversation 6			v	
7.	Conversation 7	v			
8.	Conversation 8		v		
9.	Conversation 9	v	v		
10.	Conversation 10	v			
11.	Conversation 11				v
12.	Conversation 12	v	v		
13.	Conversation 13	v			
14.	Conversation 14			v	
15.	Conversation 15	v			
16.	Conversation 16	v	v		
17.	Conversation 17		v		
18.	Conversation 18	v			
19.	Conversation 19		v		
Sum		8	7	4	3

From the table above, it can be seen that conversational maxims are mostly flouted is maxim of quantity. It is mostly flouted because according to table of flouting above, it has found that there are 8 short messages from 19 short messages. The second place that is flouted by the participants is maxim of quality. It can be seen from the table of flouting which it shows there are 7 short messages from 19 short messages. The third place that is flouted by the participants is

maxim of relevance. It can be seen from the table of flouting which it shows there are 4 short messages from 19 short messages. The least in flouting of conversational maxims are maxim of manner. It is slightly flouted because according to table of flouting above, it has found that there are 3 short messages from 19 short messages.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data which are taken from short messages by texting, it can be concluded that in maxim of quantity, the participants flout it by adding more information, but there is one conversation which gives a little information. Next, in maxim of quality, all of the participants flout it by saying that they believe false. After that, in maxim of relevance, the participants flout it by saying irrelevant. The last, in maxim of manner, the participants flout it by saying convoluted words and extremely long-winded. It also can be concluded that conversational maxims are mostly flouted by participants (senders and receivers) in the short messages are maxim of quantity. In the other hand, the conversational maxims are slightly flouted by participants (senders and receivers) in the short messages are maxim of manner. It can be seen in the number of flouting.

Furthermore, after doing the analysis, that all of the statements of the problems are answered is concluded. He suggests the reader to conduct the research in other types of people who have high social status, one of which is within be capacity of a politician for the comparison studies in the future.

REFERENCES

- Brown, G. and Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, Guy. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruse, Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge
- Francis, Nelson W. 1958. *The Structure of American English*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Jazeri, M. 2003. *Realisasi Prinsip Kerjasama dalam Interaksi Antarmahasiswa*. Thesis (Unpublished). Malang: PPS IKIP Malang.
- Lestari, Chatarini S.N. 2004. *An Analysis of Speech Acts in Ernest Hemingway's "The Killers"*. Thesis (Unpublished). Surabaya: Universitas Negeri Surabaya.
- Raskin, Victor. 1985. *Semantics Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Saylor, Stephen. 1999-2013. "List of Verbal Communication Types". © 1999-2013 Demand Media, Inc. Retrieved from: http://www.ehow.com/list_6038355_list-verbal-communication-types.html.
- Spook. 2002. "Writing Text Messages". Copyright ©1999-2013 Demand Media, Inc. Retrieved from: http://www.h2g2.com/approved_entry/A765722.
- Thickett, James. 2013. "Communication". **BBC © 2013 BBC**. Retrieved from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/indonesia/majalah/2012/07/120718_sms_inggris.shtml.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Toolan, Michael. 1992. *Language, Text and Context, Essay in Stylistics*. New York: Routledge.
- TMC. 2010-2013. "Why People Use SMS Text Messages". Copyright ©2010-2013 The Messaging Centre Ltd. Retrieved from: <http://www.tmcsm.com/why-people-use-sms-text-messages.html>.
- Wijana, I Dewa P. 2004. *Kartun*. Jogjakarta: Ombak.