

Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics

Artha Nur Restia Panji^{1*}, Fahmy Lukman², Riza Lupi Ardiati³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Padjajaran
Indonesia

Corresponding author: artha22002@mail.unpad.ac.id

Article History: Submitted date; October 30th, 2024; Revised date; December 23rd, 2024; Accepted date; December 24th, 2024; Published date; December 31st, 2024

ABSTRACT

Panji Gumilang and his educational institution, Al-Zaitun, have been the subject of much discussion in the last few months because of their heresy case. In the interview on the Kick Andy Talk Show, many of his utterances were not contextualized with the interviewer's questions. This research aims to analyze the meaning of 'convoluted' Implicature contained in the Violation of Cooperation Principle Maxim Relevance of Panji Gumilang's speech in Kick Andy's interview based on Grice Theory and Relevance Theory. The research data are in the form of pieces of Panji Gumilang's speech that are irrelevant to Andy's questions, so they imply the meaning of implicature. The research data were collected through observation techniques and documentation techniques. At the same time, the data source of this research is obtained through the video interview of the Kick andy television program on the Metro TV YouTube channel entitled 'Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun' uploaded on 6 June 2023. The method of data analysis in this study applies the pragmatic commensurate analysis method with the basic technique of sorting out the determining elements and the advanced technique of comparative equating. The data presentation method is done descriptively with the help of informal words. The result of this research shows that Panji's violation of the maxim of relevance represents the intention or information that he wants to avoid and hide against the question from the interviewer Andy F Noya. The hidden information of Panji's speech is analyzed through the premises of implicature in the process of interpreting the relevance of the conversation based on the knowledge and cognition experience between the two members of the conversation.

Keywords: Cooperation Principle, Implicature, Kick Andy Talk Show, Relevance Theory

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

INTRODUCTION

Conversation, in its context, is a series of utterances exchanged between a speaker and a listener in sequence (Wardianto et al., 2023). The speaker must deliver a message that the listener can comprehend and interpret according to the context, so the listener's response aligns with the speaker's expectations (Fudhaili, 2024). However, in practice, the structure of conversations is sometimes non-contextual. This is evident from the many ambiguous utterances in responses, requiring effort from the listener to process them to be more understandable and communicative (Wardianto et al., 2023). This may be due to incomplete utterance structures and unstructured or fragmented cognition (Kamariah, 2017).

In conversation, the intended meaning the speaker wants to convey is not directly apparent to the listener due to a lack of necessary elements in the utterance. This can result in the emergence of implicit or implied meanings (Grice, 1975). These implied meanings are known as implicatures, while the elements or components that must be fulfilled to produce an easily understood and communicative utterance are referred to as the Cooperative Principle (Cutting & Joan, 2002). Implicature is the result of utterances that do not explicitly appear in the structure or semantic meaning proposition. Implicature arises from logical assumptions about how an utterance is received or interpreted. Sperber and Wilson (2009) state that these assumptions are built through the interpretation of premises that lead to a strong conclusion accepted by both the speaker and the listener, making the conversation relevant even if the utterance is not immediately easy to understand. In the context of relevant conversation, interpreting an utterance requires context and shared knowledge (Levinson, 2008).

According to Grice (1975), the principles or guidelines governing cooperative communication, known as the Cooperative Principle, are divided into four maxims: the Maxim of Quality, the Maxim of Quantity, the Maxim of Manner, and the Maxim of Relevance. The Maxim of Quality governs how someone should speak according to the facts and not lie (Saifudin, 2020). The Maxim of Quantity requires a speaker to provide information according to what the listener needs, without excess (Yulianti et al., 2022). The Maxim of Manner guides speakers to speak clearly and without ambiguity (Wijana, 1996). The Maxim of Relevance directs speakers to speak contextually so that it is relevant to the content of the conversation (Abadi et al., 2024). These four maxims are guidelines that Grice believes every speaker should follow to make their utterances effective (Pramukti & Utomo, 2020). If these maxims are violated, the meaning or interpretation of the utterance becomes more complex and less explicit, resulting in the emergence of implied meaning or implicature (Pauziah et al., 2022). The listener will naturally try to interpret the utterance through a series of logical assumptions, leading to the

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

conclusion of the hidden meaning so that the utterance becomes relevant again to the context of the conversation (Sari & Wijayanti, 2020).

The maxim is often violated to conceal information that the speaker does not wish to explicitly convey to the listener or even the general public, either as an independent utterance or as a response to a question posed by the interlocutor (Ahsanurrijal, 2017). The second purpose usually occurs in dialogues or interviews. In such situations, when a person wishes to avoid stating something explicitly, they may respond with an utterance that lacks relevance to the interlocutor's intended conversational topic (Gunas, 2021), thereby implying an implicit meaning or what is known as implicature (Senft, 2014). The interlocutor, hearing an utterance that is irrelevant to the context (Audina, 2022), will attempt to understand it through the natural human cognitive process based on shared experiences and encyclopedic knowledge between the speaker and the interlocutor (Megawati, 2018). This understanding process unconsciously involves analyzing premises, which are then concluded as the most reasonable proposition for the conversation's context, allowing the implicit meaning to be correctly interpreted, thereby avoiding misinterpretation in an utterance (Sperber & Wilson, 2009).

In mid-2023, there was an emerging issue of heretical teachings being practiced by an Islamic educational institution based in a pesantren in Indramayu, West Java. Numerous local television stations and social media platforms widely reported the case, with many parties attempting to invite the leader of the institution for interviews as a form of clarification regarding all the accusations. One of the media outlets that invited and broadcasted an interview with this individual on television and YouTube was Metro TV. In one of its programs, which adapted the interview concept between a host and a guest, A.R Panji Gumilang, also known as Panji Gumilang, was invited for an exclusive interview and was asked several questions related to his case. In the interview, he frequently emphasized that all the allegations were untrue.

Research on Panji Gumilang's utterances is highly interesting to study because, in the interview, he often responded to questions from the host, Andy Flores Noya, in a manner that was neither explicit nor contextual. As a result, Panji's responses required more effort from the listener to understand the intent and interpretation. In this case, the interlocutor's cognition naturally processes the utterances and keeps them relevant to the conversation's context through a series of logical assumptions leading to a conclusion, known as implicature (Sperber & Wilson, 2009).

Therefore, this study aims to expose what Panji Gumilang means implicitly through inconsistency and his implied digressing when answering Andy's questions via his violation of relevance maxim. This study would unpack each Panji Gumilang's utterance with several steps of possible assumption (implicature) to end in the most logical conclusion.

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

Research on implicature in interviews on television and social media has been conducted extensively; however, the majority of it focuses on the host's utterances, with little focus on the guest, as in this study. This distinction represents a new point of interest in this research. For example, research on the host's utterances in interviews includes a study conducted by Dian and Dedi titled "Types of Implicature in Rocky Gerung's Language Style on the Aliansi Pengusaha Nasional Program on YouTube in 2020" (Sari and Wijayanti 2020). This study aims to describe the conventional implicature in Rocky Gerung's language style on the Aliansi Pengusaha Nasional program on YouTube in 2019, and also to analyze the conversational implicature in Rocky Gerung's language style on the same program.

The difference between Sari & Wijayanti's (2020) study and this research lies on the research object, data sources, and data analysis methods. This study uses Panji Gumilang's utterances from an interview video on Metro TV's YouTube channel in the Kick Andy program, while Sari & Wijayanti (2020) analyzed Rocky Gerung's speech video on YouTube, making the research object Rocky Gerung's utterances.

Another study focusing on conversational utterances as the research object is by Anisa & Al-Farisi (2023) titled "Relevance Theory in Sheikh Assim's Humorous Preaching as an Alternative to Contemporary Da'wah: A Critique of the Cooperative Principle." This research critiques Grice's cooperative principle theory. The findings show that relevance theory critiques these violations (from the video) by suggesting that they were intended to create humor and emphasize Islamic values.

The differences between Anisa & Al-Farisi's (2023) study and this research is the data sources and the focus on applying Sperber & Wilson's relevance theory versus Grice's cooperative principle and implicature theory. This research does not seek to critique Grice's theory but rather to integrate the two theories for a more comprehensive analysis.

Furthermore, another relevant study was conducted by Savitri in 2021, titled "Explicature and Implicature in Puja Astawa's YouTube Content: A Sociopragmatic Study". This study focuses on analyzing implicature meanings using Sperber & Wilson's relevance theory in the context of a Balinese YouTuber, Puja Astawa. The findings indicate that in the five videos used as data sources, implicit meanings were found, which listeners must understand as assertive, directive, and expressive functions.

The differences between Savitri's (2021) study and this research is the number of theoretical foundations used and the analysis focus. Savitri (2021) solely focuses on applying Sperber & Wilson's theory to analyze the data, while this research combines two conversational theories—Grice's (1975) theory focusing on violations of the relevance maxim and implicature, and Sperber & Wilson's (2009) theory focusing on the actual implicit meaning and its relevance process within the conversation context.

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333–354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

In this research, previous studies will serve as a foundation and comparison for analyzing irrelevant utterances that imply additional meanings, as well as a reference in processing their relevance within the conversation context.

METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative research method with a descriptive analysis presentation model. Qualitative research is a method that involves mapping data into classifications and analyzing it through specific protocols step by step in depth (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The research data was collected through observation and documentation techniques, where the researcher records and examines the data source, then documents and classifies it (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The data source for this research was obtained from the interview video of the Kick Andy television program on Metro TV's YouTube channel, titled "Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun," uploaded on June 6, 2023. The TV's program was chosen due to its popularity and its comprehensive discussion in the national domain. The data analysis method in this study applies the pragmatic equivalent method with the basic technique of sorting determining elements and the advanced technique of comparative equalizing. The pragmatic equivalent method refers to linguistic elements in relation to extralinguistic elements (Sudaryanto, 2015). The stages of analysis in this research include first gathering data of Panji Gumilang's utterances which are violations to the Maxim of Relevance through observation and documentation techniques, followed by detailed analysis. The data are then described according to the theory of Violating the Cooperative Principle of the Maxim of Relevance, after which the implicature is analyzed and the relevance of the utterance to the conversational context is examined from the perspective of Relevance Communication Theory. In this stage, Panji Gumilang's implication of lying and digressing will be exposed through the theory of Relevance.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis results indicate that nine instances of Panji Gumilang's speech violated the Cooperative Principle of the Maxim of Relevance. These nine instances involve Panji's speech, which appears to be lengthy or does not directly address the context of the questions posed by the host, Andy F. Noya. This suggests an implicit meaning or implicature and diminishes the relevance of the conversation, consistent with the findings of Sari & Wijayanti (2020) in their analysis of maxim violations and the implicatures implied by those violations. Additionally, these results align with the studies of Anisa & Al-Farisi (2023) and Savitri (2021), which demonstrate conversational

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

relevance in maxim violations and the implicit meaning of 'humor' as the speaker's true intent based on the conversational context.

The analysis of implicature meanings and their relevance in the conversational context will be further elaborated below.

Panji Gumilang's Implications

(1)

Andy: "Anda pernah naik haji?" (*"Have you been on the Hajj pilgrimage?"*)

Panji: "Saya itu petugas dari Arab Saudi dulu yang namanya Rabithah!" (*"I was an officer from Saudi Arabia called Robitoh!"*)

(*Kick Andy: Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun: Minute18.00*)

Conversation Context: In the previous conversation, Andy questioned Panji's statement about the Hajj pilgrimage, suggesting that it could be completed simply by circumambulating the Al-Zaitun Islamic Boarding School area.

Panji Gumilang's response above is irrelevant to Andy's question about whether Panji had ever performed the Hajj pilgrimage. Therefore, the utterance violates Grice's Maxim of Relevance. This is reflected in the implicature of his utterance. The statement, "I was an officer from Saudi Arabia, named *Rabithah!*" if understood in its propositional or explicit form, provides the information that he was once an officer. However, the term "officer" could have multiple possible meanings.

In Relevance Theory, understanding the actual meaning of an utterance that may seem puzzling requires a process of meaning relevance by the interlocutor. This process involves making logical inferences based on the context of the conversation, shared encyclopedic knowledge, and past experiences (Sukma & Prayoga, 2024).

In the case of Panji Gumilang's utterance, which is not contextual to Andy's question, the expression "an officer from Saudi Arabia named Robitoh" could logically be interpreted as follows:

- (1a) Panji was an officer from Saudi Arabia, known as Robitoh.
- (2a) Panji was an officer who once worked in Saudi Arabia in an institution/group called Robitoh.
- (3a) Panji was an officer involved in the Hajj pilgrimage activities, working in Saudi Arabia for an institution called Robitoh.

Interpretation (1a) could occur if it were not linked to the conversational context and Andy's question. However, interpretations (2a) and (3a) are the most logical and likely interpretations when connected to the

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

conversational context. This is because interpretation (1a) does not align with Panji's identity as an Indonesian rather than a Saudi Arabian.

To determine the true meaning of Panji's utterance, the conversational context plays a crucial role (Al-Farisi, 2013). The conversation between Panji and Andy revolves around Panji's statement that the Hajj ritual can be completed by circumambulating the Al-Zaitun complex, with Andy's question intended to clarify Panji's understanding of the Hajj concept itself, as Andy finds Panji's statement illogical.

The meaning in (2a) seems less fitting for the conversation's context, where the main discussion is about the Hajj pilgrimage. The interpretation of "officer" in (2a) is also too general and not specific to the context. Therefore, the interpretation in (3a) is the most logical conclusion of Panji's utterance. The meaning of "officer" here refers to a "Hajj officer," which is more specific to Andy's question. Thus, the overall inferred meaning of Panji's utterance is that he is explaining that he once worked as a Hajj officer for an institution called *Robithab*. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that there is indeed a large non-governmental Islamic organization based in Mecca named *Rabithab Alam Islami*.

In the conversational scheme above, where Panji should have clearly answered whether he had ever performed the Hajj, he instead responded with a statement and information that he had been an officer, implying the actual purpose behind his answer. Panji's response is an informative explanation to emphasize to Andy that he once worked as a Hajj officer in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, the actual implicature is a "yes" that he had indeed performed the Hajj since, logically, a Hajj officer would have automatically participated in the Hajj alongside the pilgrims.

(2)

Andy: "Pak Panji, saya ingin bertanya, uang untuk pembuatan perahu ini dari mana?" ("Mr. Panji, I'd like to ask, where did the funds for building this ship come from?")

Panji: "Lah perahu saja kok ditanyakan uangnya! pakek kayu! Pakek paku!" ("Why are you asking about the money for a ship? It's just made with wood! And nails!")

(Kick Andy: Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun, Minute 1:12:03)

Conversation Context: Al-Zaitun is known as an educational institution that continues to build new infrastructure, including a shipyard located on the northern coast of the boarding school. Andy's question was intended to inquire about the source of Panji's funding for building the shipyard and its ships.

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

Panji's response violates the Cooperative Principle, specifically Grice's Maxim of Relevance, as it is unrelated to Andy's question about the source of funds for constructing the shipyard and the ships. His answer raises questions about why he responded in this way and what he truly intended to convey. There is a possibility that Panji may be withholding certain information that he does not want to reveal explicitly during the interview.

Panji's statement can generate several possible implicatures:

- (1a) Expressive and Emphatic: "How could you not understand the concept of shipbuilding? Of course, it uses wood and nails!"
- (2a) Clarification: "Building ships doesn't require large funds; it's a simple process, using easily obtainable materials like wood and nails."
- (3a) Evasion: "I'm not going to tell you where the funding came from; the important thing is that it's made with wood and nails."

Given the broader context of Andy and Panji's conversation, which centered on the source of funds or income for Al-Zaitun's rapid and extensive development, and considering that Panji was, at the time of the interview, facing accusations of money laundering involving billions of rupiah, Andy's question and Panji's response about the funding would likely attract significant public scrutiny, especially as the interview was broadcast on national television and social media platforms like YouTube. Therefore, the most plausible implicature is (3a). Although (2a) could also be a possible implicature, it seems less fitting, especially given the subsequent conversation in which Panji again avoided explicitly answering Andy's questions regarding Al-Zaitun's funding and his role in raising the money for the school's construction.

Thus, (3a) is the more logical implicature, as Panji's responses consistently appear evasive in all of Andy's questions. This aligns with the background of the allegations of money laundering against him, which could explain why (3a) emerges as the most relevant implicature in the conversation between Panji and Andy.

Panji's evasive responses serve as a strategy to conceal explicit information that could be revealed to the public. Moreover, his pattern of irrelevant answers was likely intended to avoid Andy's probing questions, which could exacerbate the legal charges against him, including the money laundering case.

(3)

Andy: "Jadi anda menuduh ada yang ingin mengambil alih Al-Zaitun dengan cara-cara yang tidak benar?" (*So you're accusing someone of wanting to take over Al-Zaitun through improper means?*)

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

Panji: “Bukan menuduh nanti dulu saya tidak pernah menuduh”...(interupsi) (*I'm not accusing, I've never accused'...(interruption)*)

Andy: “Kalimat anda itu bersayap sekali!” (*Your statements are very evasive!*)

Panji: “Saya tidak pernah menuduh, sudah banyak bagaimana menyelesaikannya” (*I never accused, there have been many ways to resolve it'*)

Andy: “Sudah banyak upaya maksudnya?” (*There have been many attempts?'*)

Panji: “Iya ungkapan-ungkapan itu sudah banyak Al-Zaitun ga masalah, pimpinannya! bukan menuduh wong saya tinggal hanya di sini kok itu kan itu kan yang bebas dimana-mana itu!” (*Yes, there have been many expressions that Al-Zaitun has no problem, the leader! I'm not accusing, I only live here, that's what's free everywhere!'*)

(*Kick Andy: Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun, minute 30.30*)

Conversation Situation: Andy asked Panji about the source of funds for the ongoing construction of Al-Zaitun. This is a sensitive question for Panji as he is currently under investigation for money laundering charges.

Panji Gumilang's utterances above are lengthy and imply an implicit meaning, as he avoids and conceals a direct or explicit answer. His attempt to evade is reflected in Andy's first response: “Your statements are very evasive!” This response is the result of interpreting Panji's utterance, “I'm not accusing, hold on, I have never accused,” which does not align with what Andy expected based on the relevance of the conversation and its preceding context.

The statement, “I'm not accusing, hold on, I never accused,” indicates that Panji is attempting to avoid making an explicit statement by denying Andy's initial question. However, in the previous conversation context, Panji did suggest that external parties were attempting to tarnish the reputation of his educational institution, as discussed in the earlier dialogue analysis in this study. Therefore, Panji's denial of accusing such parties seems unacceptable to Andy. This suggests that Panji is consciously or unconsciously attempting to convey something without fully considering the prior context of his speech. If Panji's denial was deliberate, it can be assumed that he wanted to avoid making a specific statement, perhaps to evade Andy's question about identifying the particular parties attempting to undermine Al-Zaitun.

Andy's cognitive dissonance with the prior conversational context is marked by his response: “Your statements are very evasive!” This indicates that Panji's earlier statement was not explicit and contradicted his previous remarks. The phrase “very evasive” implies that Panji's rejection of the

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

accusation gives rise to multiple interpretations (Anisa & Al Farisi, 2023), suggesting that there is an underlying meaning Panji is trying to convey indirectly. Andy's follow-up, "You mean there have been many attempts?" further indicates his uncertainty about Panji's intended message in the ambiguous statement, "there have been many, how to resolve it." Panji's statement lacks correlation with his previous denial of accusations, and the phrase "there have been many" describes a quantity of something, while "how to resolve it" implies an action of resolution by someone or an unspecified third party. Thus, Andy processes this utterance, trying to infer what kind of resolution is being referred to and who is behind these actions, eventually forming his interpretation, as reflected in his response, "You mean there have been many attempts?"

Panji's final statement suggests that he is implicitly referring to all the false accusations made against him personally but still conceals the identity of the parties involved, as indicated by his statement, "Yes, there have been many of these statements about Al-Zaitun," which does not include a specific subject or actor. Furthermore, his effort to avoid naming any party explicitly is also signaled by his phrase, "Well, that's just what's happening freely everywhere," indicating an attempt to evade confrontation.

(4)

Andy: "Tunggu MUI itu Lembaga yang dihormati anda tampaknya tidak percaya dengan Lembaga ini" ("Wait, MUI is a respected institution, but it seems you don't trust this institution.")

Panji: "Dihormati kalau benar" ("*Respected, if they're right.*")

Andy: "Menurut anda MUI tidak benar?" ("*So, you think MUI is wrong?*")

Panji: "Lah bagaimana, wong tabayun saja ga ngerti, terus harga diri seseorang diinjak-injak!" ("*Well, how could they be right when they don't even understand tabayun, and then they trample on someone's dignity!*")

(*Kick Andy: Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun, minute: 34.52*)

Conversation Context: Andy F. Noya is seeking Panji's opinion regarding the correctness or incorrectness of the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) accusing Panji Gumilang and his institution of teaching heretical beliefs.

Panji's utterance in the above dialogue is an irrelevant response to the topic of Andy's question, "Do you think MUI is wrong?" It therefore violates the maxim of relevance in cooperative conversation. Andy's question requires a response containing a proposition of either correctness or incorrectness. If logically and explicitly stated, Andy's question would be:

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

"Is the accusation of heresy by the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) correct or incorrect?" Thus, this logical proposition calls for a contextual answer of either 'yes' or 'no.'

The utterance "How can they not understand "*tabayyun*", yet trample on someone's dignity?" is not a direct answer in the form of a concise 'yes' or 'no'. This statement explicitly lacks a proposition indicating correctness or incorrectness. However, if it is assumed to be an implicit, relevant, and logical response, it could be understood as a 'no' to Andy's question. This implied meaning is known as an implicature (Sperber & Wilson, 2009). Panji's utterance represents a particular kind of conversational implicature, requiring specific contextual interpretation beyond the direct framework of conversation. The term "*tabayyun*" used in reference to MUI refers to a cultural practice within Islamic teachings where, to ascertain the truth of a matter, a respectful discussion between two parties is required.

The implicature in Panji's utterance arises from the elliptical nature (ellipsis) of the explicit form and its misalignment with Andy's question about whether MUI's actions in accusing Panji and the Al-Zaitun institution of heresy are justified. The statement "How can they not understand *tabayyun*?" does not explicitly present a 'yes' answer, prompting listeners to infer the actual meaning Panji intends. According to relevance theory, the interlocutor's cognition will generate certain assumptions to reach a conclusive proposition. The expression "How can they not understand *tabayyun*?" is marked by the expressive particle "how" (*lab*), which emphasizes the subsequent clause, "they do not even understand *tabayyun*," semantically implying ignorance of the *tabayyun* concept.

In representing MUI's attitude as unjust for making baseless accusations, Panji uses the term "*tabayyun*", to point out a fundamental concept in religious institutions like MUI. This becomes a form of satire when an institution fails to grasp such a basic concept in its own field.

Thus, logically, Panji's statement should not be interpreted as a literal assertion that MUI does not understand the definition and concept of *tabayyun*, but rather as sarcastic criticism for not applying the *tabayyun* principle—meaning seeking clarification through discussion—before passing judgment on the alleged false teachings at Al-Zaitun. Instead of engaging in dialogue, MUI hastily accused Panji of heresy. This sarcastic remark leads listeners to the premise:

(1a) "Failing to engage in *tabayyun* (verification) before passing judgment on an issue or accusation is improper." Consequently, the conclusion of this implicature is that the response contains the implicit proposition:

(2a) "Yes, MUI's actions were wrong because they did not seek clarification (*tabayyun*) first, and therefore all their accusations are incorrect."

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

The phrase “trample on someone’s dignity” in Panji’s response also implicitly reinforces that MUI’s attitude toward Al-Zaitun by labelling it as heretical is highly unjust and disrespectful. The term “someone” is a deixis that does not explicitly refer to anyone (Said et al., 2024). However, the meaning conveyed implies that there is someone who feels disappointed because their honor has been degraded by MUI, which opted for a direct accusation of heresy rather than a discussion. Therefore, if we refer back to the context in which Andy F. Noya’s question was directed at Panji Gumilang, the deixis ‘someone’ can be understood as referring to Panji himself or the Al-Zaitun institution. Panji uses the third-person deixis to represent either himself or his institution as a subtle means of conveying his intention without making it explicitly clear to his interlocutor, Andy.

(5)

Andy: “Anda tadi menyebutkan bahwa MUI menuduh anda juga komunis?”
(“Earlier, you mentioned that MUI accused you of being a communist as well?”)

Panji: “Mengungkapkan di televisi!” (“They revealed it on television!”)

(Kick Andy: Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun, minute: 36.10)

Conversation Context: The previous discussion centered around allegations that Panji Gumilang was a follower of communism, made by various parties. In one of Panji’s earlier statements, he implied that one of those parties was the Indonesian Ulama Council (MUI).

Panji Gumilang’s response above does not directly answer Andy F. Noya’s question, which seeks clarification and confirmation of Panji’s previous statement that he accused MUI of being one of the parties that labeled him a communist. However, in his response, Panji does not explicitly affirm or deny what Andy asked. As a result, his response is ambiguous and lacks relevance. According to Grice’s conversational maxims, this reply violates the maxim of relevance.

If Panji’s utterance were contextually relevant, his response would fall into one of two categories: agreement or disagreement with Andy’s question, as shown in (1a) and (1b):

(1a) “Yes, they did openly accuse me of being a communist.”

(2b) “No, they were not one of the parties that accused me of being a communist.”

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang’s Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333–354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

Since Panji's explicit responses like (1a) or (1b) did not occur, his utterance needs to be interpreted for its full or implied meaning through logical hypotheses, according to the principle of relevance theory in conversation.

Panji's utterance, "They revealed it on television!", suggests several possible interpretations: (1b) Literally, it means someone revealed something or provided information on television. (2b) Contextually, given Andy's question which focuses on MUI accusing Panji of being a communist, Panji's statement could mean that MUI stated that Panji Gumilang is a communist and publicly made that accusation on television, where it was seen by a wide audience.

Interpretation (2b) is valid because it involves the conversational context. The accuracy of (2b) is further supported by the context of Panji's previous discussions about how MUI failed to engage in "tabayyun" (verification or clarification) regarding the rumors surrounding him and Al-Zaitun, and instead opted to make direct accusations. In light of this context, the implied or additional meaning of Panji's response becomes logical, especially considering the possibility that MUI might have made those direct accusations in mass media like television. Thus, Panji's utterance can be seen as an expression of his frustration and disappointment with MUI.

(6)

Andy: "Lalu apa motif orang-orang itu untuk merusak, menjauhkan menjatuhkan memisahkan anda dari Al-Zaitun apakah semata-mata ingin menguasai Al-Zaitun dan menyingkirkan anda atau menurut anda adakah motif lain kalau anda tidak terima?" (*"So what is the motive of those people who are trying to damage, alienate, and separate you from Al-Zaitun? Is it simply to take over Al-Zaitun and push you aside, or do you think there's another motive if you don't agree with that?"*)

Panji: "Jangan-jangan apa yang anda ceritakan tadi, yang NII lah yang apalah, jangan-jangan itu yang mau mengembalikan lagi" (*"Perhaps it's what you mentioned earlier, NII or whatever else, maybe they're trying to bring it back."*)

(Kick Andy: *Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun: Minute 54.25*)

Conversation Context: Andy is asking Panji about the possible motives of the parties accusing him of being part of NII, apart from the aim of separating him from Al-Zaitun.

Panji's response above clearly does not answer Andy's question, making it irrelevant to the context of the inquiry (Dzihni et al., 2020). Andy's question sought to uncover the potential motives or reasons behind the efforts to separate Panji from his educational institution or whether there

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

were other underlying motives. However, Panji's response, in the form of the proposition "Perhaps it's what you mentioned earlier, NII or whatever else, maybe they're trying to bring it back," only touches upon the issue of NII and does not address Andy's inquiry regarding any other 'motive' or reason. Furthermore, Panji's utterance fails to provide the clear information or answer that the interlocutor (Andy) was seeking.

Panji's response reflects an expressive intention to 'refute by counteraccusation.' The intention of 'refuting by accusation' here means that Panji deflects the accusation that he is a member of NII by accusing the parties making the allegations against him of attempting to revive the disbanded organization, as implied by his statement "maybe they're trying to bring it back," referring to the group seeking to restore the organization outlawed by the government. Thus, the response does not explicitly address Andy's question, as it does not contain any explanation regarding the motives of external parties beyond trying to separate Panji from Al-Zaitun.

The irrelevance of Panji's response to Andy's question creates a contextual effect for the interlocutor, requiring the cognitive ability of the listener to process the utterance to make it relevant to their understanding. Therefore, relevance theory in conversation is applied to deduce and interpret Panji's intended meaning.

The statement "Perhaps it's what you mentioned earlier NII or whatever else maybe they're trying to bring it back" generates logical assumptions that need to be processed in the listener's mind, pointing to an implicature that can align with the context of the conversation between Panji and Andy. Considering the previous discussions between Andy as the host and Panji as the guest, where Andy frequently brought up accusations regarding Panji's alleged membership in NII, it can be assumed that Panji intends to reaffirm that the accusation of his membership in the Indonesian Islamic State (NII) is utterly false. This is because Andy's explicit question does not mention NII at all.

Panji's reference to NII in his response actually connects to earlier conversations with Andy about the NII membership accusations. Additionally, it can be assumed that:

(1a) The utterance expresses Panji's frustration with those accusing him, and he attempts to retaliate by offering a thought-provoking stimulus or logical challenge to the interlocutor.

Upon analysis, assumption (1a) implies that Panji Gumilang believes that those who fervently accuse others of being members of the Indonesian Islamic State (NII) may themselves be members of the organization. The phrase "perhaps" naturally encourages the interlocutor to engage in critical thinking about the subsequent proposition, "maybe they're trying to bring it back," suggesting that the accusers who allege Panji's NII affiliation may, in

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

fact, be the ones seeking to revive the banned organization. Thus, in the process of interpreting Panji's true intention at this stage, the listener will either accept or reject the counteraccusation based on their beliefs, experiences, and knowledge about the background of these parties.

Panji's statement carries implicature within a specific conversational context, where the mention of NII requires a particular interpretation grounded in historical context. This is then correlated with the phrases "what you mentioned earlier" and "maybe they're trying to bring it back," referring to the groups or individuals accusing Panji Gumilang of being a member of an organization that has been banned in Indonesia since the New Order era.

(7)

Andy: "Anda dilaporkan. Ini serius sekali karena datang ke polisi yang melaporkan dengan tuduhan menista agama dengan beberapa contoh. Saya ingin bertanya anda kesiapan anda untuk menghadapi pemeriksaan?" (*"You've been reported. This is very serious because the report has been filed with the police, accusing you of blasphemy with several examples. I want to ask, how prepared are you to face the investigation?"*)

Panji: "*Saya tidak pernah menistakan agama!* Kalau ditanya saya tidak pernah menistakan agama apalagi itu agama saya, agama lain saja tidak pernah saya nistakan!" (*I have never committed blasphemy! If you ask me, I have never insulted religion, especially not my own. I haven't even insulted other religions!*)

Andy: "Anda siap dipanggil polisi?" (*"Are you ready to be summoned by the police?"*)

Panji: "*Jangan ngomong siapa, kan masih kalem!*" (*"Let's not talk about being ready, I'm still calm!"*)

(Kick Andy: *Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun: Minute 1.25.45*)

Conversation Context: Andy is asking Panji about his readiness to face the progression of the accusations of heretical teachings, which have reached the stage of a formal police report and the potential for a police investigation.

Panji's initial response is a statement aimed at defending his position against the accusations of blasphemy, as raised by Andy's question. However, Andy's question was actually focused on Panji's preparedness for the police investigation, not on whether or not Panji had committed blasphemy. Panji's response, "I have never committed blasphemy!" in the context of the cooperative principle, does not provide the information Andy was seeking. What Andy was looking for in this context was an explanation from Panji regarding his readiness and preparation for the upcoming police

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

investigation, covering all aspects of the accusations. Thus, Panji's response violates the conversational maxim of relevance. In the cooperative principle, any response that does not align with the context of the conversation may carry hidden intentions that need to be identified. Panji's response invites interpretation to uncover why he chose to respond in this manner rather than addressing the specific information Andy sought.

In the process of interpreting Panji's first response, natural human cognition would assume several possibilities to deduce Panji's actual intention:

- (1a) Panji is informing that he has never insulted any religion, including Islam.
- (2a) Panji is denying all accusations that he has insulted a religion.
- (3a) Panji is deeply concerned about the report and strongly dreads the possibility of a police investigation.

Meaning (1a) is a literal interpretation based solely on the form of the statement without considering the context of the question. However, this interpretation is less appropriate because the conversation's context involves a sensitive personal matter discussed in a public interview viewed by a wide audience. Thus, meaning (2a) is more logical than (1a) because a denial seems more contextually relevant to Andy's initial question. However, to accurately understand Panji's intended meaning, it is necessary to scan all of his responses within the conversation.

Meaning (3a) is the most accurate interpretation, even though (2a) may seem more logical in the context of Andy's first question. When considering Andy's second question, it can be assumed that Panji's true intention in his statements is that he is highly reluctant to undergo the police investigation.

Andy's second question reflects his understanding of Panji's first response, that Panji is reluctant and afraid of the accusations reaching the stage of a police investigation. Andy's use of the term 'ready' in his second question reflects Panji's attitude in his first response, indicating that Panji is fearful and genuinely unprepared for the investigation into his allegedly heretical teachings.

The appropriateness of meaning (3a), rather than (2a), is also reflected in Panji's second response, "Let's not talk about being ready," which portrays his fear and anxiety about the possibility of the police investigation actually taking place.

(8)

Andy: "Karena selama ini banyak orang mengatakan anda ini kebal hukum"

("Because people have been saying you're immune to the law")

Panji: "Bagaimana?" (*"Sorry, How"*)

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

Andy: “Anda punya beking, kebal hukum tidak tersentuh. dari dulu anda diperkarakan tapi belum pernah ditangkap sampai diperiksa dimasukin penjara” (*“You have a backer, you're untouchable. You've been in court for a long time but you've never been arrested until you've been put in jail”*)

Panji: “Itukan khayal mereka!” (*“That's their fantasy!”*)

Andy: “Jadi, omong kosong menurut anda?” (*“So that's nonsense to you?”*)

Panji: *“Yaa tidak kosong, wong sudah ngomong kok ! (tersenyum sedikit)”* (*“Well, it's not empty (nonsense), you already said it! (smiles a little)”*)

(Kick Andy: Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun: Minute 1.26.44)

Conversation Context: Andy is seeking clarification from Panji regarding rumors that he has protection from influential figures, which has supposedly shielded him from legal consequences despite his controversial statements over the years.

Panji's response, “Well, it's not nonsense, since they've already talked about it!” violates the maxim of relevance in conversation, as it is not directly related to Andy's question. Panji's reply seems disconnected from Andy's intent of asking whether Panji considers the accusations of having backing as mere "nonsense."

In Andy's question, the term "nonsense" refers to baseless claims or statements that cannot be substantiated. Therefore, a more relevant response to Andy's question would have been something like “Yes, it's just nonsense/their fabrication; it can't be proven,” if Panji intended to agree with Andy's point, or “No, I believe their accusations are true and not baseless,” if he wanted to refute it. However, given the context, a direct denial of the rumors is unlikely, as it would imply confirming the allegation of having influential backing, which could damage Panji's public image amidst his legal controversies at the time.

Panji's statement, “Well, it's not nonsense, since they've already talked about it!” invites several interpretations regarding Andy's question:

(1a) Nonsense: meaning “nothing has been said yet.”

(2a) Nonsense: meaning "baseless talk or claims that cannot be proven."

Interpretation (2a) aligns more with the serious tone of Andy's question, while interpretation (1a) occurs when the listener understands it in a non-serious manner or when a humorous effect is intended.

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333–354. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

In the context of Panji's response, meaning (1a) is more plausible given Panji's interpretation of "nonsense" in Andy's question. Panji's phrase, "since they've already talked about it," suggests that interpretation (1a) makes more sense. Thus, Panji's intention in responding with an irrelevant statement appears to be creating a humorous effect, which is marked by his slight smile after speaking.

(9)

Andy: "Menurut masyarakat keberadaan Al-Zaitun ini tidak memberikan manfaat apa-apa" (*"According to the community, the existence of Al-Zaitun doesn't provide any benefits at all."*)

Panji: "Justru dengan adanya pertanian dan koperasi di Al-Zaitun para tetangga dan warga sekitar jadi mempunyai pekerjaan dan penghasilan serta manfaat dengan memberikan mereka modal untuk bertani setelah itu hasil dibagi dua, apakah itu tidak bermanfaat?" (*"On the contrary, with the agriculture and cooperatives at Al-Zaitun, neighbors and local residents are given jobs and income. It benefits them by providing capital to farm, and the profits are then split. Isn't that beneficial?"*)

Andy: "Sekali lagi omongan anda ini bisa dibuktikan ya?" (*"Once again, can you prove what you're saying?"*)

Panji: *Panggil semua sini juga bisa! Saya tidak ngomong begitu-begitu tanpa bisa dibuktikan!* (*"Call everyone here! I don't speak without being able to prove it!"*)

(Kick Andy: Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun: Minute 1.23.44)

Conversation Situation: Andy is asking Panji to respond to some opinions that the Al-Zaitun boarding school, which is seen as grand by the public, does not provide any benefits to the surrounding residents.

Panji's response violates the cooperative principle of conversation because Panji's statement does not directly answer Andy's question in context, such as by responding with, "Yes, I can prove it," or "No, I can't prove it." Panji's statement is irrelevant to the expected response, thus violating Grice's maxim of relevance.

Every statement that is irrelevant to the context of the question from the interlocutor contains an implicit meaning or implicature that the speaker intends, rather than conveying it explicitly. This includes Panji's statement above, which is irrelevant to Andy's question. Therefore, there must be an implicit meaning that needs to be understood for the conversation to remain communicative.

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354.
<https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

Panji's statement, "Call everyone here!" when analyzed using relevance theory, has several possible meanings:

(1a) Panji is asking the interlocutor to call the local residents around Al-Zaitun.

(2a) Panji agrees to Andy's challenge to prove his previous statement about the benefits of Al-Zaitun to the local residents.

Panji's statement expresses his frustration with Andy's question by offering to provide proof through a request. Therefore, meaning (2a) is the more logical conclusion rather than merely interpretation (1a), as (1a) focuses only on the literal form of the statement without considering the broader context of the question, where there is a question-and-response scheme between Andy and Panji.

In the context of the previous question, Andy presented the public opinion that Al-Zaitun provides no benefits, which Panji then refuted. Afterward, Andy pushed Panji to substantiate his refutation.

Based on the conversational scheme between Andy and Panji, it can be concluded that Panji's statement was an attempt to substantiate his claim that Al-Zaitun does provide benefits to the residents, as Andy requested. Therefore, meaning (2) is the actual intent of Panji's statement.

The analyses above show Panji Gumilang's avoidance of explicit answers, indicating a temptation to avoid utterances that could harm his case and aggravate his position during the investigation period. Due to all his implications which possibly seem to be crucial data in this famous case, this study suggests that the inquiry officers need to reanalyze all of Panji Gumilang's statements including the statements from such interview to obtain real, clear, and inevitable statements for the most fair inquiry results (Rahma et al., 2019).

CONCLUSION

Panji Gumilang's utterances contained in the YouTube video of Kick Andy's TV program entitled 'Gonjang-Ganjing Al-Zaitun', according to Grice's Principles of Conversation theory (1975) and Sperber and Wilson's Theory of Relevance (2009) are found to be irrelevant to the context of the question from his speech partner, Andy F Noya so that the process of interpreting the meaning of implicature needs to be done so that the conversation remains relevant and communicative. The maxims of relevance that Panji violates mostly indicate his 'avoidance' attitude from information that he wants to hide or an interview discussion that he wants to avoid. If it is associated with the problems he is facing now, namely various accusations such as heresy, money laundering, fraud etc. which even involve the police and the central

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333-354. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

government, it can be assumed that Panji's avoidant utterances generally imply that he is trying to find safety and does not want to deal with the police or the government.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Allah SWT for providing the opportunity and ability so that this research can be carried out. The thank is also delivered to the linguist colleagues of Padjajaran University who have contributed in providing advice in research.

REFERENCE

- Abadi, S. C., Salliyanti, & Siregar, A. (2024). Kepatuhan dan Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Grice pada Podcast Denny Sumargo di Youtube : Kajian Pragmatik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(1), 6265–6272.
- Ahsanurrijal. (2017). Analisis Implikatur Dan Prinsip Kerja Sama Dalam Acara Talkshow Mata Najwa. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional II*, 40–47. <https://prosiding.upgris.ac.id/index.php/SEMISTRA17/SEMISTRA2017/paper/view/2048>
- Al-Farisi, M. Z. (2013). Aspek Relevansi Dalam Terjemahan Tindak-Tutur Kinayah Al-Qur'an. *KARSA*, 21(2), 161–174.
- Anisa, & Al Farisi, M. Z. (2023). Teori Relevansi dalam Dakwah Humor Sheikh Assim sebagai Alternatif Dakwah Kontemporer: Kritik terhadap Prinsip Kerjasama. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 9(2), 919–930. <https://e-journal.my.id/onoma>
- Audina, N. S. (2022). Implikatur Percakapan Dalam Dialog Interaktif Hotman Paris Show Inews (Conversational Implicatures In The Interactive Dialogue Of Hotman Paris Show Inews). *JBSP: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pembelajarannya*, 12(1), 111–128.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (fifth). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017044644>
- Cutting, & Joan. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse - A Resource Book for Students* (P. Stockwell, Ed.). Routledge. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/keris/Doc?id=10016807&page=1>

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333–354. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

- Dzihni, M. Y. S., Khasanah, I., & Degeng, P. D. D. (2020). Ideology Behind Implicature Meaning of Gus Dur's Humor to Social, Political and Religious Critics. *NUSA*, 15(2), 174–189.
- Fudhaili, A. (2024). Dialectics and Madurese Language Accent in the Perspective of Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastran, Dan Budaya*, 14(1), 145. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.1.2024.145-160>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation* (Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3). Academic Press.
- Gunas, T. (2021). Pragmatisme Politik Dan Implikatur Dalam Debat Publik Pilkada Kabupaten Manggarai Tahun 2020. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik Dan Sastra (Semnalisa)*, 267–277.
- Kamariah, K. (2017). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerjasama Dan Prinsip Kesantunan Serta Implikturnya Dalam Novel Komedi Manusia Setengah Salmon Karya Raditya Dika (Violation Of Conversation Principle And Modesty Principle And Implicature In The Novel Comedy Of Manusia Setengah Salmon By Raditya Dika). *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pembelajarannya*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.20527/jbsp.v5i2.3723>
- Levinson, S. C. (2008). *Pragmatics* (Nineteenth). Cambridge University Press.
- Megawati. (2018). Analisis Teori Relevansi Dalam Acara “Ini Talkshow” Sebagai Kritik Terhadap Prinsip Kerjasama Grice. *JIPIS*, 26(2), 18–32.
- Monica Sari, D., & Wijayanti, D. (2020). Jenis Implikatur Pada Gaya Bahasa Rocky Gerung Dalam Acara Aliansi Pengusaha Nasional Di Youtube Tahun 2019. *Metabahasa: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 3(1), 63–77. <http://journal.stkipyasika.ac.id/index.php/metabahasa/indexJournal>
- Pauziah, D. I., Adham, M. J. I., & Setiawan, H. (2022). Aspek Pragmatik Dalam Wacana Humor Stand Up Comedy Indonesia Season 7 Di Kompas Tv. *JPBSI: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 12(2), 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jjpbs.v12i2.41047>
- Pramukti, D. I., & Utomo, A. P. Y. (2020). The implication of humor discourse in the Tonight Show television program. *Journal of Social Studies (JSS)*, 15(2), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jss.v15i2.31939>

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastran, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333–354. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>

- Rahma, Y. W., Sumarti, & Riadi, B. (2019). Prinsip Kerja Sama Dalam Gelar Wicara Kick Andy Dan Implikasinya Terhadap Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Kata*, 1–15.
- Said, U. M. R., Arsyad, H., Haidar, A., & Al Farisi, M. Z. (2024). Politeness in Language and Speech Events in War Situations: Analysis of Abu Ubaidah's Speech. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(1), 104. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.1.2024.104-125>
- Saifudin, A. (2020). Implikatur Percakapan Dalam Studi Linguistik Pragmatik. *Jalabahasa*, 16(1), 15–24.
- Senft, G. (2014). *Understanding Pragmatics* (B. Comrie & G. Corbett, Eds.; First). Routledge.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2009). *Teori Relevansi: Komunikasi Dan Kognisi* (A. S. Ibrahim, Ed.; 1st ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode Dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa* (First). Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sukma, B. P., & Prayoga, R. A. (2024). Spanduk Peringatan Bahaya Covid-19: Mengurai Tingkat Relevansi dan Efek Humor. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 21(3), 497–512. <https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v21i3.7923>
- Wardianto, B. S., Suharto, A. W. B., & Soo, K. Y. (2023). Expressive Speech Act on Pamphlet Demonstration Rejecting the Omnibus Law Bill. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 13(2), 276. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.13.2.2023.276-288>
- Wijana, D. P. (1996). *Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik* (First). ANDI.
- Yulianti, S., Arafah, B., Rofikah, U., Idris, A. M. S., Samsur, N., & Arafah, A. N. B. (2022). Conversational Implicatures on Saturday Night Live Talk Show. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.17507/JLTR.1301.22>

How to Cite (in APA 7th Edition):

Panji, A. N. R., Lukman, F., & Ardiati, R. L. (2024). Implied Relevance in Panji Gumilang's Violation in Kick Andy Interview: A Cognitive Pragmatics. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 14(2), 333–354. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.14.2.2024.333-354>