

# Interpersonal Pragmatics and Critical Linguistics: A Critical Pragmatic Analysis

Dina Mardiana<sup>1\*</sup>, Fathur Rokhman<sup>2</sup>, Rustono<sup>2</sup>, Hari Bakti M<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [dina\\_mardiana@fkip.upr.ac.id](mailto:dina_mardiana@fkip.upr.ac.id)

**Abstract.** Pragmatics studies about the forms of language to understand the speaker's utterance meanings which bases its analysis on contexts. Interpersonal pragmatics is a rhetoric that has an explanatory value about the meaning and the power of communication. Interpersonal pragmatics includes interpersonal rhetoric as a strategy and conversational rule that must be obeyed in speaking activities to achieve the goals of the discourse cooperatively and politely. The speech where interpersonal rhetoric used contains ideological values which are not sufficiently analyzed only by pragmatic studies, but also it can be analyzed by critical linguistics using critical discourse analysis (CDA). From the empirical and theoretical point of view, both can be partially applied as a complementary and generalizable approach in the critical pragmatics to conduct a study of interpersonal rhetoric and the ideological meaning of speech.

**Keywords:** pragmatics; interpersonal pragmatics; critical discourse analysis; critical linguistics; critical pragmatics analysis.

**How to Cite:** Mardiana, D., Rokhman, F., Rustono, R., M, H. B. (2021). Interpersonal Pragmatics and Critical Linguistics: A Critical Pragmatic Analysis. *ISET: International Conference on Science, Education and Technology*, 7(1), 736-742.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1970s and 1980s Leech took part in the development of pragmatics as a new subdiscipline of linguistics which was heavily influenced by the philosopher of phatic language communication, J.L. Austin, J.R. Searle and H.P. Grice. In Leech's phenomenal work, a major book on the subject of "Principles of Pragmatics" published in 1983, he put forward a general explanation of pragmatics based on regulative principles which follow the cooperative principle model or it was introduced by Asim Gunarwan as *prinsip kerja sama* which was in line with what Grice stated in 1975 as a cooperative principle. The part of the book that has been mostly influencing on pragmatics to complement the theory of conversation principle is the theory of the politeness principle. Leech's politeness principle is viewed as a principle that has constituent principles such as the Grice's cooperative principle (Mardiana 2021: 50).

Leech (1983) argues that pragmatics is a scientific discipline that examines the meaning conveyed in general and does not examine the meaning that arises from one's thoughts or personal judgments. Therefore, to explain the power of pragmatics we must start from something that can be observed by the public, which means the text itself. The power of pragmatic can be understood as the process of speakers understanding the interpretation of the other speaker's speech by decoding its meaning. Then through a heuristic problem solving

process, the speaker tries to understand the pragmatic power or interpretation of the speech.

Pragmatics has been known in Indonesia since 1984 through the education curriculum. The presence of pragmatics attracts the attention of the language user community. Pragmatics examines language forms to understand the speaker's intentions, which bases its analysis on context (Rustono 1999:9). In addition, Leech argues (1983) that we cannot truly understand the nature of language itself if we do not understand pragmatics, namely how language is used in communication. Furthermore, in his latest view, Leech (2007) puts a new constraint on pragmatics as a study of meaning in relation to speech situations.

Furthermore, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a language analysis which in its analytical activities use a critical language paradigm. Critical language or critical linguistics was born from the paradigm of Halliday followers (Fowler et al, 1979) regarding the function of language in society where one of which is the trend of critical pragmatolinguistics (linguistic pragmatics). Discourse cannot have meanings without social meanings and there is certainly a strong relationship between linguistics and social structure (Jacob Mey 1988; and Kress & Hodge 1979 in Darma 2014).

Furthermore, according to Darma (2014: 100), the basic understanding of CDA is that discourse is not understood solely as an object of language study, but language is of course used to analyze texts, and is not viewed in the traditional

linguistic sense. Language in CDA is analyzed on the text and on the context of language as a tool used for the purpose of certain practices including ideological practices. CDA views the use of spoken and written language as a social practice. The social practice in CDA is seen as a cause of dialectical relationship between certain discursive events with situation and institution, and social structures in various communications. One of experts in critical discourse analysis with a critical linguistics framework model is Roger Fowler. The essence of his critical linguistics is to view how language grammar carries certain ideological positions and meanings or values (Fowler 1991).

In this regard, research on pragmatic analysis and critical discourse analysis is still one of the main issues in linguistic research topics. Krissandi (2014), for instance, conducted a critical discourse analysis research using Gramsci's theory of hegemony which aims at finding out the state ideology in the New Order era during 1960 to 1980 as stated in the short-story writings of Kompas newspaper. He also analyzed the position of Kompas short stories in the hegemony of state in the New Order era. Mayuuf (2015) has also conducted his research on Rhetorical Pragmatics. Then, Firmansyah (2018) conducted a critical discourse analysis of the novel "Negeri Para Bedebah" by Tere Liye to reveal the ideology of a person or group which plays a role and constructs a discourse in the novel using Foucault's CDA model. Then, Ononye and Nwachukwu (2019), the other research in pragmatics, reveal the violation of politeness principles is motivated by the case of hateful language, which has become a recurring decimal in Nigeria's socio-political discourse.

However, some of those studies above-mentioned still separate their findings between pragmatic analysis and critical discourse analysis. In fact, according to Subagyo (2010), it is very important to combine two approaches namely pragmatic approach and critical discourse analysis approach to become "critical pragmatics". Why the critical pragmatic approach is taken into account? This is due to the fact that there are a number of empirical phenomena that are not sufficiently analyzed by the pragmatic approach. By combining pragmatic and critical approaches, a more comprehensive explanation is attained. This is similar with study conducted by Al-Hindawi and Saffah (2017) that pragmatics and discourse analysis are closely related and not as two overlapping disciplines, but as a sister

discipline.

In this regard, Subagyo (2010) suggests that critical pragmatic analysis in pragmatic studies in the domain of illocution power is still not reaching the rhetoric power domain albeit critical discourse analysis is entirely studied by its entity based on the generalizable CDA framework model. Furthermore, according to Leech (1983), the illocution power and the rhetoric power are complementary rhetoric principles that altogether constructing the pragmatic power. The illocution power is used to interpret illocution purposes as the speaker's main motivation in the speech act. Rhetoric power is used to interpret the meaning of an utterance viewed from the speaker's adherence to rhetoric principles in order to keep communication going smoothly and not useless. Therefore, in this paper, the authors would like to present a literature study of complementary critical pragmatic analysis that combines interpersonal pragmatic analysis including the interpersonal rhetoric power and the interpersonal rhetoric strategies to reveal critically the interpersonal pragmatic power and ideological meaning of political figures' utterances in the discourse of educational development.

## INTERPERSONAL PRAGMATICS

Leech (1998: 22) argues the interpersonal pragmatics as a pragmatic approach used in the study of effective language use in communication. Leech puts forward two terms: interpersonal pragmatics and textual pragmatics which refer to the types of rhetoric proposed by Halliday, namely the interpersonal rhetoric and the textual rhetoric. Interpersonal pragmatics has an interpersonal function, namely language function as a disclosure of the speaker's attitude and as an influence on the attitude of the speaker's behavior. Textual pragmatics has a textual function where language functions as a tool to construct or compose a text, in this case the text as an example of spoken and written language (Leech 1983: 86). Furthermore, this paper focuses on interpersonal pragmatics which includes interpersonal rhetoric.

According to Leech (1983) interpersonal pragmatics includes interpersonal rhetoric as a conversational strategy and rule that must be obeyed in speaking activities so that they are cooperative and polite to achieve the discourse goals. Accordingly, Rustono (1999:55) asserts that in oral discourse it needs a mechanism to regulate conversations between participants in order to be cooperative and polite, namely the

principle of conversation (where in Leech's term named as pragmatic principles). The mechanism includes two things, namely the principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness. The principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness are part of interpersonal rhetoric which then includes the metalinguistic aspect of politeness, the principle of irony, the principle of hyperbole and litotes as the interpersonal rhetorical strategy in it.

Accordingly, Gunarwan argues that the principle of politeness is an affirmation that communication activities do not only convey information clearly and cooperatively, but also require comfort in a social relationship between speakers and listeners during the communication activities (Rustono 1999: 66). However, with regard to the concept of politeness formulated by most experts, there are two concepts of politeness that need to be understood. The first concept is formulated in the form of rules which then construct the principle of politeness. Furthermore, there is also the second concept of politeness which is formulated in the form of strategy and then construct the theory of politeness. So, the concept of politeness according to Rustono (1999: 66) can be manifested in two forms, namely the principle of politeness and the theory of politeness.

That was Lakoff and Leech (1972 and 1983 in Rustono 1999) formulating the concept of politeness into politeness rules to form politeness principles. The concept of politeness formulated into the theory of politeness is the form of a politeness strategy studied by Fraser, Brown, and Levinson (1978) in Rustono (1999). In addition, according to Gunarwan (1992) in Rustono (1999) that Lakoff's (1972) politeness principle contains three rules that must be obeyed in order that speech is polite; those are the rules of formality, hesitancy, and equality or solidarity.

The politeness principle proposed by Fraser (1978) bases his concept of politeness on strategies, whether those strategies applied by speakers to attain a polite speech. However, according to Gunarwan (1992) in Rustono (1999: 68), Fraser does not specify the form and strategy of the politeness. Fraser only distinguishes politeness from respect, in which respect is part of an activity that functions as a symbolic means to express appreciation on a regular basis, while politeness is a property associated with speech that according to the listener the speaker does not exceed his rights or does not break to fulfill his obligation.

Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1978) put forward the principle of politeness around face notions which are positive face and negative face. Positive face is a face that refers to the self-image of a person who wants that what they do, what they have, or what values that they believe can be recognized by people as a good thing, comfortable, admirable, and so on (Gunarwan 1992; in Rustono 1999: 68). Meanwhile, the negative face is the face that refers to the self-image of a person who wants him or her to be appreciated by allowing the speech partner(s) freely to do what they are doing (Rustono 1999: 69).

Again, according to Gunarwan (1992) in Rustono (1999: 69) a speech act can threaten the interlocutor face. Therefore, to reduce the threat to the interlocutor face in communication, it does not always have to comply with Grice's cooperativeness principle, instead of speakers should use the politeness principle, namely the politeness principle with regard to politeness strategies as in Brown and Levinson (1978). However, in contrast to this, Leech (1983) recommends that the principle of politeness which is based on rules in the form of maxims containing proverbs or suggestions and advice must be obeyed that the speech meets the politeness principle.

In this regard, a political figure should not only have to secure his own image through the use of these politeness strategies, but also must comply with the rules of language politeness in every speech he utters in the discourse context of educational development. This is done not for a good self-image only, but for educating public so that the public figure can use the rules of language politeness in his various communications. It is assumed that the politeness of language spoken by political figures in various social communications in the society can facilitate the situation and condition so that there is comfort situation and condition in the social relationship.

The importance of polite behavior shown to the third party is very miscellaneous because it is determined by various factors and cross-cultural variations which are certainly related to social and moral norms. Therefore, Leech (1983) asserts that the principle of politeness is a maxim of interpersonal rhetoric with regard of the principle of cooperation. In this case, the principle of politeness and the principle of cooperation are very important to be used altogether because they can complement to each other clearly and completely (generalizable) in a conversational

principle.

The study of interpersonal rhetoric is the interpretation of meaning or the study of rhetoric power in a speech act. The rhetoric power is applied in order that communication activities can be maintained and conversations run smoothly and not useless. This is due to compliance toward the principles of cooperation and the principles of politeness. In contrast to the illocution power albeit it is in line, the illocution power is spoken to express the speaker's intention to the interlocutor without any social purpose. Rhetoric power and illocution power altogether build pragmatic power in a speech act. Thus, interpersonal rhetoric is the rhetoric power that interprets the meaning of an utterance viewed from the speaker's obedience to the principles of interpersonal rhetoric.

Leech's analysis of pragmatic power which is only limited in the domain of interpersonal pragmatics is certainly acceptable, because this domain contains the most problematic issues that need to be reviewed and to be questioned. However, Leech also provides recommendations for wider interpretation where pragmatic power can also be investigated more broadly into the domain of discourse study. This is the authors' goal that is to expand the domain of interpersonal pragmatic study, to review partially pragmatic analysis and critical discourse analysis in a speech. In this regard, the analysis is carried out partially in the domain of interpersonal pragmatics and the domain of critical discourse analysis to yield a pragmatic power more completely and more clearly which is in Leech's terms called 'generalizable'.

## CRITICAL LINGUISTICS

The essence of critical language analysis is to view how language grammar carries certain ideological positions and meanings or even certain values (Fowler 1991). Critical language or critical linguistics was innate from the paradigm of Halliday followers (Fowler et al 1979) regarding the function of language in society, one of which is in the critical direction of linguistic pragmatics. That discourse cannot have meaning without social meaning has certainly a strong relationship between linguistics and social structure (Jacob Mey 1988; Kress & Hodge, 1979 in Darma, 2014). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a language analysis which uses a critical language paradigm in its analytical activities.

Linguists such as Roger Fowler, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Tony Trew (Fowler et

al 1979) formulate their theory of critical linguistics which was developed from linguistic theory and view language as a social practice to spread its ideology. These linguists believe that language choice is made according to a set of constraints, such as ideological, political, social, and cultural practices. This approach looks at how certain grammars and certain vocabulary choices carry certain implications and ideologies. In building his model, Fowler et al., mainly based on Halliday's explanation of the structure and function of language. What he does is to place grammar and usage practices to find out ideological practices (Rustono and Mardikantoro 2020: 3).

Furthermore, according to Rustono and Mardikantoro (2020:4-5) vocabulary is related to language which is a classification system. Language describes how the reality of the world is viewed, by giving a person the possibility to control and regulate the experience of social reality. The significance of this classification is how different experiences and politics can be marked from the language used and a same event which can be explained by different languages. Different choice of words is a certain ideological practice. Meanwhile, grammar is a set of categories and processes including: (1) Transitive, related to the process, by seeing which part is considered the cause of an action and the other part as a result of an action, (2) Intransitive, the actor is associated with a process but without explaining or describing the effect or object being subjected to, and (3) Relational, explaining the relationship between the he/she entities and its parts.

According to Fowler (1991) in Darma (2014: 150) the thing that must be considered in analyzing news or writing in a text is that the language used is not a neutral thing, but it has certain ideological aspect or value. The problem is how the reality is described. Reality means how events and actors are involved and represented. Language as a representation of this reality can change and be completely different from the real situation.

In his study dealing with the theory of critical discourse analysis of Fowler's model, Darma (2014: 150) explains matters that are in line with Rustono and Mardikantoro, that the analysis of Roger Fowler's (1991) model of ideological values in a textual discourse focuses on words or sentences, that is how ideology is represented in an event by the construction of words or sentences. At the word level, how the event and

the actors involved in the event are also discussed. Words in this case are not only as markers or identities, but they are associated with certain ideologies, what meaning you want to communicate to the audience, so that it provides values or ideological aspects that can be understood by the public as the readers. Which party or group having benefits or disadvantages in a marginal position by the use of words also can be well-understood.

Furthermore, at the level of sentence structure, how words are arranged into certain sentence forms to be understood is not merely a linguistic technical issue, but also the language practice. In this case, what is emphasized is how the patterns such as rule, combination, and construction have certain effects. These effects tend to make one party's position more favorable or having a positive image than the other, or to make certain events are understood in certain categories which are more benefited than other understanding categories (Fowler). 1991 in Dharma 2014: 150).

### **CRITICAL PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS**

In relation to critical discourse analysis (CDA), a study of the relationship between discourse and its context, the analysis is studied in the pragmatic discourse. The CDA functions discourse (language) as a "gateway" to view ideological motives and the inequality relation in the power that occurs in society. Subagyo (2010) combines two approaches, namely pragmatic and critical approaches, to become "critical pragmatics". Why are pragmatic and critical approach? According to Subagyo, a number of empirical phenomena found are not sufficiently investigated only with a pragmatic approach. This can be done by combining pragmatic and critical approaches to obtain more comprehensive explanation in the phenomena.

The scope of "critical pragmatics" proposed by Subagyo (2010) is a discourse (using spoken and written language) which contains ideological motives and power relations that can have a wide impact. So, the critical nuances in "critical pragmatics" can be formulated as the ability or power to reveal the social meaning of language discourse and reflect the human as the users. To achieve the ability or the power, "critical pragmatics" needs to have "ideological prejudgment" in every its analysis, where in this case by using critical discourse analysis perspective without losing its identity as a pragmatics study.

The principle of conversation which includes

the principle of cooperativeness and politeness in language is one of the most important things in pragmatics, because this is interpersonal rhetoric in various communications. The importance of the conversation principle aims to guide language users so that they can use language effectively and efficiently in carrying out the conversation. Likewise with political figures in charge of education issues in Commission X of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (DPR-RI) as the language users who are the center of public attention should be able to speak cooperatively and politely.

The cooperative and polite speech of political figures in Commission X DPR-RI is an interpersonal rhetorical education, or in terms of the disruption era nowadays as proposed by Zulaeha (2018) in Mardiana (2021) as a humanist literacy education for Indonesian people in the multicultural society without seeing personal social background of the speaker as a political figure that has become property of wider multicultural community. In addition, cooperative and polite speech or statements from political figures can encourage the conducive political situation in the society regarding issues in the discourse of educational development which often make people restless.

In line with this, Subagyo (2010) suggests that CDA functions as a "window" to see the ideological motives and inequality of power relations that occur in society. To analyze discourse as a study of the relationship between discourse and its context, it means discourse analysis is studied pragmatically. This critical pragmatic study certainly refers to the context and situation of speech in a discourse situated.

The identity of pragmatic study according to Subagyo (2010) can cover topics of pragmatic study including (1) deixis, (2) presuppositions, (3) speech acts, (4) conversational implicatures, (5) the principle of cooperation, (6) the principle of politeness, and (7) other communication principles proposed by Leech (1983). The critical nuance in the identity of pragmatic study can be investigated by including "ideological prejudgment". The phenomena of deixis, presuppositions, speech acts, conversational implicatures, as well as communication principles are studied pragmatically, then the interpretation comes to the assumption that these phenomena are not free from the speaker's motive power so that it gives an ideological effect for the speech partner to interpret. As an example of study, a critical pragmatic analysis can be investigated

through the cooperative and polite speech of the political figures in the discourse of educational development which are assumed containing ideological meanings and power relations on their utterances.

Consider an example of excerpt from the speech of the Chairman of Commission X DPR-RI Syaiful Huda who asked the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemdikbud) to withdraw temporarily the Indonesian History Dictionary of volumes I and II from circulation because they were considered containing many defects. The following quote from Syaiful Huda's speech was published by the online mass media Kompas.com on April 20, 2021 (Ramadhan and Meiliana, 2021).

*"Kami meminta Kemendikbud untuk menarik sementara Kamus Sejarah Indonesia baik Jilid I dan Jilid II dari peredaran. Kami berharap ada perbaikan konten atau revisi sebelum kembali diterbitkan dan digunakan sebagai salah satu bahan ajar mata pelajaran sejarah."*

"We ask the Ministry of Education and Culture to temporarily withdraw the Indonesian History Dictionary, both Volume I and Volume II, from circulation. We hope that there will be improvements to the content or revisions before it is re-published and used as one of the teaching materials for the history subject."

The excerpt of Syaiful Huda's speech has an imposing illocution power by asking the Ministry to temporarily withdraw the circulation of the History Dictionary. However, this speech also has a positive interpersonal rhetorical power because it is delivered cooperatively and politely. The cooperativeness of the speech is due to the fact that it is in accordance with the context and situation when there was a negative reaction over the publication of the History Dictionary which omitted a number of names of Indonesian independence heroes and development figures. Although the speech has an implicit illocution power, the cooperativeness of Syaiful Huda's speech does not violate the principle of language politeness because it is spoken politely and also it uses language politeness strategy. In the passage "We hope that there will be improvements to the content or revisions before it is re-published and used as one of the teaching materials for the history subject" Syaiful Huda has used the choice of the word "We" to represent Commission X DPR-RI as the people's representative in charge of education issues. Again, the word "hope"

shows the maxim of humility that obeys to the principle of language politeness. Furthermore, the fragment of the speech states that the DPR-RI Commission X did not prevent the publication of the History Dictionary as one of the teaching materials for history subjects, unless there need many revisions to the contents of the dictionary. This shows compliance with the maxims of manner and quality on the principle of cooperativeness and the maxim of approval that obey to the principle of language politeness.

The cooperativeness and politeness of Syaiful Huda's speech as people representative in the educational development discourse contains positive ideological value. Syaiful Huda was not only able to secure his image as a political figure, but also to secure the good image of the House of Representative institution of the Commission X by representing the voices of the people's conscience in the discourse he uttered cooperatively and politely. In addition, the ideology conveyed in the speech positively related with the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia because it does not totally blame the Ministry, but it can be interpreted as a mistake or unintended words. This is acceptable, because Syaiful Huda is a member of the representatives who stands for one of the parties supporting the current government. As long as the discourse he utters does not take side of particular group, does not marginalize or misrepresent groups who discard the circulation of the dictionary, Syaiful Huda's ideology can be accepted because it represents his image as people's representative and a member of a party supporting the government. In terms of social cognition, Syaiful Huda's speech is interpreted as an ideology that is balanced between the voices of people he represented and supporters of the government. And, by pragmatics this has complied with the strategy and the norm of conversation principle.

From this description, it can be emphasized that research on the combination of pragmatic analysis and critical discourse analysis in a speech act can be carried out in a generalizable manner. For example, in pragmatic analysis within the framework of interpersonal pragmatics, the analysis falls into interpersonal rhetoric data which includes the cooperativeness and the politeness speech of political figures in the discourse of educational development. For the ideological meaning of political figures' speech can be identified and critically analyzed using critical linguistics based on the findings of

ideological values and power relations occurred in the cooperativeness and the politeness of these political figures' speeches.

## CONCLUSION

Pragmatics examines the language forms to understand the speaker's intention which bases its analysis on context. Interpersonal pragmatics is rhetoric that has explanatory values about the meaning and power of communication. Interpersonal pragmatics includes interpersonal rhetoric as a strategy and conversational rules that must be obeyed in speaking activities so that speakers are cooperative and polite to achieve the discourse goals. In speech using interpersonal rhetoric, it contains ideological values which are not sufficient to be analyzed by pragmatic study only, but it can be analyzed by critical linguistics using critical discourse analysis (CDA). Research on the combination of pragmatic analysis and critical discourse analysis in a speech act of political figures can be done in a generalizable manner. The study can be looked into pragmatically within the framework of interpersonal pragmatics which includes cooperativeness and politeness in the political figures' speech, as well as metalinguistic aspects, irony and jokes, hyperbole and litotes as its interpersonal pragmatic strategy. Furthermore, the analysis is held to find out the ideological meaning of the political figures' speech being identifying and analyzing critically using critical linguistics.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Hindawi, F.H. dan Saffah, M.D. (2017). Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Education and Practice*. 8(19), 93-107-15. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319044172\\_Pragmatics\\_and\\_Discourse\\_Analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319044172_Pragmatics_and_Discourse_Analysis)
- Darma, Y.A. (2014). *Analisis Wacana Kritis: dalam Multiperspektif*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Firmansyah, M.B. (2016). *Analisis Wacana Kritis: Dimensi Sosial dalam "Novel Negeri Para Bedebah Karya Tere Liye"*. Artikel dalam <https://maqala.readthedocs.io/en/latest/firmansyah.html#abstrak>. doi:10.31227/osf.io/9tmav
- Krissandi, A.D.S. (2014). Cerpen-cerpen Kompas 1970—1980 dalam Hegemoni Negara Orde Baru (Analisis Wacana Kritis). *Jurnal Poetika*. II(1), 26-35. DOI:10.22146/poetika.v2i1.10405
- Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G.N. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West divide?. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 3(1). DOI. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.009>
- Mayuuf, H.H. (2015). Rhetorical Pragmatics. *Journal of Advanced Social Research*. 5(5), 19-38. <http://www.sign-ific-ance.co.uk/index.php/JASR/article/view/1102>
- Mardiana, D. (2021). "Teori Pragmatik dan Prinsip Kesantunan Geoffrey Neil Leech" dalam Rokhman, F, dkk (ed.). *Dialektika Filsafat Bahasa: Dari Strukturalisme ke Pascastrukturalisme*. Semarang: LPPM Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Mardiana, D. (2021). "Implementasi Pendidikan Literasi Humanis dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Dayak Ngaju di Sekolah Dasar" dalam Rokhman, F, dkk (ed). *Literasi Era Disrupsi*. Semarang: LPPM Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Ononye, C.F, dan Nwachukwu, N.J. (2019). Metalinguistic Evaluators and Pragmatic Strategies in Selected Hate-Inducing Speeches in Nigeria. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, 9(2), 308-315. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i1.13602>
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.
- Rustono dan Mardikantoro H.B. (2020). "Kajian Wacana Kritis Model Roger Fowler". Materi 5. Semarang: Pascasarjana UNNES.
- Ramadhan A., dan Meiliana D. (2021). *Nilai Banyak Kejanggalan, Ketua Komisi X Minta Kemendikbud Tarik dan Revisi Kamus Sejarah*. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2021/04/20/08273681/nilai-banyak-kejanggalan-ketua-komisi-x-minta-kemendikbud-tarik-dan-revisi?page=all>. Kompas.com on April 20, 2021.
- Subagyo, P.A. (2010). Pragmatik Kritis: Paduan Pragmatik dengan Analisis Wacana Kritis. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 28(10), 177-187.