Research Article

Pragmatics in Intercultural Communication: A Theoretical Review in the Gorontalo Contexts

Abdul Wahab Thomas[1], Intan Tiara Kartika[2,✉], Afika Puluhulawa[3], and Mu'tabaratul Irbiyah Lapandri[4]

[12]Faculty of Social Science, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia.
[3]Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia.

✉ Corrsponding Athor. intantiarak@ung.ac.id

Abstract. *Intercultural communication is a crucial phenomenon in the era of globalization, where encounters among individuals from different cultural backgrounds demand high pragmatic sensitivity. In this context, pragmatics serves to understand how meanings are constructed, negotiated, and potentially misunderstood when systems of value and communicative norms differ. This article examines the relationship between major pragmatic theories particularly politeness theory, speech act theory, and conversational implicature and communicative practices among the Gorontalo people, rooted in the principle of "adat bersendikan syara', syara' bersendikan Kitabullah". Local values such as motombilu opi-opiyo (speaking carefully) and modaha hurumati lo leembo'a (preserving communal honor) shape communication norms emphasizing social harmony and respect for hierarchy. Through a conceptual literature approach and ethnopragmatic reflection, this study demonstrates that Western pragmatic theories can be enriched through integration with local cultural values. These findings expand the cross-cultural horizon of pragmatics and offer a communication model grounded in the collective ethics of the Indonesian cultural context.*

Keywords: *pragmatics, intercultural communication, Gorontalo, politeness, ethnographic communication*

1. Introduction

Globalisation has increased interaction among individuals from different ethnic, religious, and linguistic backgrounds. People now communicate more frequently in social, educational, and professional settings. In this context, understanding different communication styles is essential to prevent cross-cultural misunderstanding. Pragmatics is an important field for examining this issue because it studies how language meaning depends on context and how speakers use language to achieve social goals (Yule, 1996). Pragmatic analysis helps show that meaning does not only come from words. It also comes from intention, social roles, and cultural

values that guide communication. Thomas (1995) explains that pragmatics supports mutual understanding between speakers from different cultures because language reflects a system of values, not only a tool for expressing ideas. In intercultural settings, pragmatic study therefore extends beyond linguistic forms and focuses on how meaning is negotiated between speakers with different cultural backgrounds (Scollon & Scollon, 2011).

Gorontalo offers a relevant context for examining these issues because of its distinct cultural tradition. The well-known principle *"adat bersendikan syara', syara' bersendikan Kitabullah"* shapes how people behave and communicate. This principle encourages politeness, respect for honour (*modaha hurumati lo leembo'a*), and careful speech (*motombilu opi-opiyo*). These values prioritise social harmony and respect for hierarchy (Polapa, 2020). However, such indirect communication styles can lead to misunderstanding when interacting with speakers from more egalitarian or expressive cultures. For example, direct speaking is often viewed as honest and efficient in many Western cultures, while in Gorontalo it may be considered impolite. Pragmatics helps explain how these different expectations can create *"pragmatic failure"* when speakers do not share the same cultural assumptions (Thomas, 1983).

This study aims to connect major concepts in pragmatics, including politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1979), and conversational implicature (Grice, 1975) with communication patterns in Gorontalo society. The focus is on understanding how local cultural values shape communication strategies, politeness practices, and meaning interpretation in intercultural encounters. This discussion contributes not only to pragmatic scholarship from a non-Western perspective but also to a more inclusive and context-sensitive understanding of communication in Indonesia.

2.   Methods

This study applies a conceptual literature approach supported by ethnographic reflection. This approach is used because the aim is not to test empirical hypotheses, but to develop a theoretical understanding of how pragmatic theory relates to communication values in Gorontalo society. As noted by Booth, Colomb, dan Williams (2016), conceptual research focuses on synthesising ideas rather than collecting quantitative data.

The analysis uses three layers. First, key works in pragmatics were reviewed, including classical and contemporary pragmatic fields (Grice, 1975; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Leech, 2014; Yule, 1996) along with major intercultural communication theories (Ting-Toomey, 1999; Gudykunst, 2003; Hall, 1976; Scollon & Scollon, 2011). Second, these theories were connected to cultural realities in Gorontalo through a communication-ethnographic perspective (Hymes, 1974).This stage involved examining local values, including *modaha hurumati lo leembo'a*

(preserving communal honour), *motombilu opi-opiyo* (speaking with care), and *wolito u mo'o lamahu* (maintaining dignified modesty). Third, interpretive reflection was conducted to analyse cultural practices in everyday interaction, ritual speech, and religious and formal communication, using local sources (Polapa, 2020; Yusuf, 2019).

The analysis process included the following stages:

1. Identifying key pragmatic and intercultural communication concepts relevant to Gorontalo concepts

2. Mapping local cultural values and their communicative functions

3. Linking global theory with local context to describe ethnopragmatic patterns

4. Interpreting communication practices based on cultural values, not only linguistic form

This approach aligns with ethnopragmatics (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2018), which emphasise that linguistic meaning is grounded in the cultural conceptualisations of its speakers. In the Gorontalo context, communication practices are embedded in religious and communal social structures. Language functions not only as a medium for conveying information but also as a mechanism for upholding dignity, maintaining social harmony, and reinforcing collective moral obligations. Accordingly, this study does not treat pragmatics as a culturally neutral field. Instead, it positions pragmatics as a dialogic space in which Western linguistic theories engage with culturally specific social values in Gorontalo. To illustrate these dynamics, the analysis draws on secondary sources representing ritual speech in *mopotilolo* ceremonies, family interaction patterns, and formal institutional discourse, including governmental meetings and customary address forms. These examples highlight how politeness, caution in speech, and deference to hierarchy are enacted in communication. The analysis is interpretive and attends to the social functions and cultural meanings associated with each communicative act. Through this lens, the article serves not only as a linguistic examination but also as a cultural reflection on how communication in Gorontalo constitutes a moral practice and a means of sustaining communal ethics.

3.   Results

3.1 Pragmatics and Intercultural Context

Pragmatics examines how meaning is shaped by social, cultural, and situational context. In intercultural communication, context involves not only the immediate interaction but also the values and belief systems that guide linguistic behaviour (Yule, 1996). Cultural differences can lead speakers to interpret the same utterance in different ways. For instance, in many Western contexts, honesty is often associated with direct expression and clarity, whereas in cultural settings such as Gorontalo, honesty is paired with politeness, respect, and social

sensitivity. Hall (1976) explains this distinction through the concepts of high-context and low-context cultures. High-context cultures, including Gorontalo, rely heavily on implicit meaning and shared understanding in interaction. Consequently, effective intercultural communication requires sensitivity to different systems of meaning-making.

In Gorontalo, social and cultural context plays a central role in shaping how messages are delivered and interpreted. Each utterance carries a "social weight" that must be considered before speaking. For example, in family settings, younger individuals will rarely disagree directly with elders. Instead, they may use a softening strategy such as *"Perhaps we can consider this from another perspective…"* This highlights that communication is not only about conveying information but also about maintaining social harmony (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Linguistic politeness operates as a tool to protect collective dignity and maintain respectful relationships. This reflects the cultural value of *modaha hurumati lo leembo'a*, which emphasises preserving honour at both individual and communal levels. As Thomas (1995) notes, failure to recognise cultural context can lead to pragmatic failure, where the intended meaning is misunderstood.

A common example in Gorontalo is the interpretation of silence. Outsiders may assume silence indicates agreement, yet in local culture silence can also signal respect, hesitation, or polite disagreement. This illustrates the significance of cultural context in determining meaning. Scollon dan Scollon (2011) further argue that each culture has its own system of interactional management, which regulates who speaks, when, and in what style. In Gorontalo, age, social status, and kinship relationships influence speaking order in formal contexts, such as customary councils or government meetings. Similar patterns appear in educational settings. For instance, university students may avoid saying "I disagree," preferring a more indirect form such as "Perhaps there is another angle we can explore." This reflects hierarchical communication norms and the desire to preserve respectful relationships. In Goffman (1967), terms, interaction involves face-work. In Gorontalo, face-work is collective, meaning that protecting another's dignity is also a way of protecting one's own.

Thus, intercultural pragmatics in the Gorontalo context is not limited to social settings. It reflects a system of values that shapes communicative behaviour. Cultural principles such as *motombilu opi-opiyo* (speaking with caution) and *wolito u mo'o lamahu* (honourable modesty) show that meaning is closely tied to ethical considerations. For this reason, pragmatics in intercultural settings must treat language not only as a communication tool but also as a reflection of cultural beliefs and moral expectations (Hymes, 1974). Awareness of such context enables cross-cultural interaction that is linguistically effective and culturally and ethically sensitive.

3.2 Politeness as Social Morality

In Gorontalo communication, politeness is not only a linguistic strategy but also a form of social morality grounded in religious and cultural values. The principle *"adat bersendikan syara', syara' bersendikan Kitabullah"* positions Islamic ethics and customary norms as the basis for communicative behaviour. Brown dan Levinson (1987) define politeness as a means of protecting the face of both speaker and listener to maintain harmonious interaction. However, in Gorontalo, face is understood collectively rather than individually. Offending another person does not only affect one's own reputation but can also harm the honour of the family or community. This cultural orientation aligns with the value of *motombilu opi-opiyo*. which emphasises speaking with care to avoid causing embarrassment or conflict. In everyday communication, politeness appears through lexical choices, intonation, and indirect forms of expression. For instance, instead of refusing a request directly, individuals may respond with *"Insya Allah, if time permits."* Such expressions signal respect and avoid confrontation. Leech (2014), tact and modesty maxims help explain this pattern, in which speakers minimise imposition and practice humility to maintain social balance. Intergenerational communication further demonstrates this practice, where indirectness and softened expressions—such as maybe, probably, or could be—serve to honour elders and signal deference.

Politeness is also visible in formal settings, including customary events and government meetings. Public officials often open speeches with religious greetings and expressions of humility, such as *"Assalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh, dengan segala kerendahan hati saya menyampaikan..."* This reflects (1967), concept of deference, which represents respect for social structure and communal values. Such formulaic expressions do not operate merely as rhetorical embellishments. They reinforce moral legitimacy and demonstrate alignment with collective norms of respect and humility. From an intercultural perspective, Gorontalo politeness practices may be misinterpreted by speakers from more direct communication cultures. Scollon dan Scollon (2011) refer to this as a cultural discourse system, where communicative norms align with social hierarchy and collective values. In Gorontalo, communication is not evaluated based on efficiency or clarity alone but on the extent to which it sustains harmonious social relations. As a result, outsiders may perceive indirectness as lack of assertiveness, while for local speakers it reflects responsibility and moral discipline in interaction.

Politeness in Gorontalo therefore represents an integration of linguistic practice and collective ethics. It functions as a social mechanism to preserve dignity, strengthen solidarity, and prevent conflict. The practice extends beyond verbal choices to include non-verbal signals such as respectful gestures, calm speech tone, and meaningful silence. As Gudykunst (2003) notes, effective intercultural communication requires awareness of different politeness systems

and cultural expectations. In this context, Gorontalo politeness is not simply a communication style but a reflection of communal morality and spiritual commitment guiding social interaction.

3.3 Indirect Speech Acts and Social Harmony

Austin (1962) and Searle (1979) explain that speech acts do more than convey information; they also perform social actions. In Gorontalo communication, indirect speech acts are a key strategy for maintaining social harmony. Direct or forceful expressions are generally avoided, as they are seen as potentially disruptive to interpersonal relationships. For instance, rather than declining a request explicitly, a speaker might say, *"I will think about it first," which functions pragmatically as a polite refusal. This reflects the cultural value of motombilu opi-opiyo (speaking with care), where language use prioritises emotional sensitivity and the preservation of social ties.*

This preference for indirectness is rooted in a collectivistic worldview that places group harmony above individual assertiveness. Leech (2014), notes that indirect expressions can protect politeness principles by preventing face-threatening acts. This pattern is evident in customary gatherings such as *Modulohupa Lo'u Lipu* (village deliberation), where disagreement is typically expressed through analogy or proverb. A phrase such as "Water does not flow upstream" politely signals rejection of a proposal without challenging the authority or dignity of others. Through such practices, indirect speech acts serve as a bridge between personal expression and communal ethics.

These patterns reveal that communication in Gorontalo extends beyond linguistic form to fulfil social and moral functions. As Scollon dan Scollon (2011), note for many Southeast Asian contexts, deferential communication styles prioritise relational respect over direct clarity. In Gorontalo, young speakers often preface differing opinions with phrases like "It may not be entirely correct, but allow me to add…" This style does not reflect hesitation, but rather demonstrates social intelligence and a commitment to relational balance.

From an intercultural perspective, frequent use of indirect speech acts can lead to misunderstanding when interacting with speakers from low-context cultures, who may interpret directness as honesty and efficiency Hall (1976). For Gorontalo speakers, however, excessive directness may appear impolite or disrespectful. These contrasting assumptions can result in pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983), such misunderstandings are often unavoidable in intercultural interaction. Developing awareness of these differing interpretive frameworks is therefore crucial for enhancing intercultural communicative competence, particularly within professional and academic environments characterised by cultural diversity.

In this regard, indirect speech acts in Gorontalo operate as a culturally embedded mechanism designed to maintain equilibrium between individual intention and collective social stability. This communicative strategy should not be interpreted as a sign of rhetorical weakness or hesitancy, but rather as an indicator of refined social sensitivity and relational intelligence. Within the framework of face negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey, 1999), indirectness constitutes a form of collective face management, where preserving communal honour holds greater importance than individual assertiveness. Consequently, speech practices in Gorontalo represent not merely linguistic behaviour, but also the embodiment of interrelated moral, religious, and social principles.

3.4 Conversational Implicature and Meaningful Silence

Conversational implicature, as proposed by Grice (1975), refers to meaning inferred by the listener based on context, even when it is not expressed explicitly. In Gorontalo society, this concept takes on a distinctive form. Meaning is often conveyed through silence, gesture, or symbolic expression. For instance, in *mopotilolo* (traditional welcoming rituals), the silence and lowered gaze of an elder do not indicate indifference. Rather, they signal deep respect and acceptance. This practice challenges Western assumptions that effective communication must be explicit and verbal. In the Gorontalo cultural context, silence functions as a moral language rich in social meaning and is often regarded as more dignified than excessive speech.

Understanding silence as a communicative act enhances our grasp of cross-cultural pragmatics. Locally, silence is not considered an "absence of message," but rather the "most respectful form of communication." Leech (2014) notes that in harmony-oriented cultures, Grice's cooperative principle is supplemented by a harmony maxim. For example, in formal meetings, silence following a leader's statement is interpreted as agreement, even if no verbal affirmation is given. Conversely, interruption may be seen as disrespectful. This contrasts with many Western settings, where verbal participation is viewed as engagement. In Gorontalo, silence reflects social structure and serves as a means of maintaining moral balance in interaction.

Conversational implicature also appears in layered verbal symbols. Within families, elders may use proverbs such as "Do not spread muddy water," meaning one should not embarrass others. Pragmatically, this proverb acts as moral advice without direct confrontation, demonstrating how ethical guidance can be communicated through subtle and indirect forms. This aligns Hymes (1974) perspective that language is inseparable from cultural systems and functions to sustain social order.

In formal contexts, silence also carries political and symbolic weight. Leaders who refrain from responding immediately to criticism may be exercising reflective restraint rather

than avoidance. Goffman (1967) views such restraint as a face-saving act, protecting dignity without escalation. From an intercultural perspective, this behaviour may be misinterpreted as passivity. However, within the Gorontalo cultural logic, it represents self-control, ethical judgement, and relational maintenance. Scollon dan Scollon (2011) similarly note that in many Asian cultures, "not speaking" often signifies relational management rather than disengagement.

In summary, silence and implicature in Gorontalo extend the boundaries of classical pragmatics, which often privileges explicit verbal expression. Gorontalo communication demonstrates that effective meaning-making does not always require overt speech. Instead, moral and relational meaning frequently emerges within spaces of deliberate quietness. This challenges Western communicative models that equate effectiveness with verbal clarity. Understanding silence in this cultural context therefore requires recognising it as a central element of Gorontalo social ethics, where speaking is not always necessary and silence can embody the highest form of respectful communication.

3.5 Ethnopragmatics and Religious-Communal Values

Ethnopragmatics emphasises that the meaning of utterances can only be fully understood by engaging with the cultural framework of the speakers (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2018). In the Gorontalo context, language forms an integral part of the social and religious structure. Utterances carry not only informational content, but also spiritual significance, reflecting Islamic and customary values. Expressions such as "Let us begin with Bismillah" or "Alhamdulillah, we have reached agreement" serve not merely as ritual formulae. They affirm that communication itself is regarded as a moral act grounded in religious devotion. Thus, linguistic etiquette and religious belief are closely intertwined, positioning communication as an expression of worship and ethical responsibility.

These religious and communal values reinforce the collective dimension of Gorontalo discourse. The principle *modaha hurumati lo leembo'a* teaches that safeguarding communal honour takes precedence over individual assertion. As a result, communicative strategies are selected with careful regard for their impact on the group. In customary councils, for example, participants avoid open confrontation in order to maintain the appearance of unity and respect. This aligns with Brown dan Levinson (1987), concept of collective face, in which politeness functions to protect the dignity of the group rather than the individual alone. Ethnopragmatics in Gorontalo therefore highlights the inseparable relationship between communication, social honour, and religious piety.

Religious metaphors also serve as persuasive strategies. Community leaders often employ proverbs with spiritual resonance, such as "Knowledge without manners is like a tree

without fruit." Such utterances convey ethical guidance through aesthetically rich and layered language. As Scollon dan Scollon (2011), observe, this reflects a symbolic-harmonic model of Asian communication, where moral instruction is transmitted through narrative and analogy rather than direct directive forms. This phenomenon expands pragmatic understanding by showing that meaning is not limited to linguistic structure but emerges from social faith and cultural virtue.

Ethnopragmatics in Gorontalo also functions as a means of cultural preservation in the era of globalisation. As national and foreign languages increasingly dominate public communication, local speech practices anchored in cultural values become a form of cultural resistance. The use of traditional greetings in governmental proceedings, for instance, reflects a collective effort to maintain identity. This resonates with Hall (1997) concept of cultural representation, emphasising language as a key medium for sustaining identity and social continuity. In this light, communication in Gorontalo is not only pragmatic behaviour, but also a declaration of cultural presence and continuity.

Taken together, these values illustrate that Gorontalo ethnopragmatics operates across both religious and social dimensions. Religious belief provides the moral framework guiding linguistic behaviour, while communal values shape the interpretation and social function of meaning. These elements converge in everyday communication, rendering speech rich with spiritual and social significance. Ethnopragmatics therefore reveals not only how people speak, but how they think, believe, and coexist. Gorontalo thus exemplifies how global pragmatic theory can be enriched by local wisdom grounded in spirituality and collective solidarity.

3.6 Integrating Global Theory and Local Wisdom

Integrating Western pragmatic theory with Gorontalo cultural values demonstrates that universal linguistic theory must be understood contextually. Brown dan Levinson (1987), politeness theory, for example, emphasises the protection of individual face. In Gorontalo, however, face is collective. This difference illustrates the need to adapt Western theories to societies that prioritise social solidarity. An ethnopragmatic perspective bridges this conceptual gap by interpreting face as a communal resource rather than a purely personal one. Accordingly, polite communication functions not only to safeguard individual dignity but also to uphold collective honour.

Similarly, Grice (1975) cooperative principle, which highlights rational cooperation, expands when viewed through the lens of Gorontalo's emphasis on social harmony. In this cultural context, the purpose of conversation is not solely to convey information efficiently but to foster peace and mutual respect. Thus, Grice's maxims are complemented by Leech, (2014) maxim of respect and maxim of harmony. Through this lens, pragmatic theory becomes more

inclusive of non-Western communication models that place moral values at the centre of social interaction.

The integration of global and local perspectives also offers opportunities for developing a more empathetic model of intercultural communication. Ting-Toomey (1999) face negotiation theory finds practical resonance in Gorontalo through traditions of deliberation and politeness that avoid direct confrontation. Global theory is therefore not only adopted but also tested and enriched through lived local experience. This process illustrates how dialogue between Western theoretical frameworks and Indonesian cultural values can generate a more humanistic paradigm of communication.

Furthermore, such integration has implications for education and cultural diplomacy. In academic settings, context-sensitive pragmatic understanding can help students better navigate intercultural differences. In diplomatic contexts, awareness of divergent politeness systems can prevent communicative misunderstandings across nations. Gudykunst (2003), argues that successful intercultural communication depends on the ability to navigate differing value systems without compromising cultural authenticity. In this regard, Gorontalo serves as a micro-model for global harmony grounded in local principles.

Based on this argument, the integration of global theory and local wisdom is not merely adaptation but an epistemological dialogue between knowledge traditions. Pragmatic theories originating in the West can gain new depth when engaged with cultural wisdom such as *motombilu opi-opiyo* and *modaha hurumati lo leembo'a.* The result is a more human-centred pragmatics, one that explains not only how people speak, but why they choose to communicate in culturally respectful ways. Accordingly, intercultural pragmatics must remain open to value pluralism to reflect the moral and social diversity of human communication.

4. Discussion

The discussion highlights that pragmatic competence plays a crucial role in facilitating effective communication in intercultural contexts, particularly in culturally rich societies such as Gorontalo. The findings of this study support the view that meaning in communication is not solely determined by linguistic forms, but is deeply influenced by cultural norms, social hierarchy, and shared values. Consistent with Yule (1996) and Thomas (1995), the analysis demonstrates that speakers rely on contextual cues and culturally embedded expectations to interpret intentions, which can lead to misinterpretation when these expectations are not mutually shared.

In the Gorontalo context, communication practices are strongly shaped by the cultural principle *"adat bersendikan syara', syara' bersendikan Kitabullah,"* which emphasizes politeness,

restraint, and respect for social hierarchy. These values manifest in indirect speech, careful word choice, and avoidance of face-threatening acts, aligning closely with Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. However, when Gorontalo speakers interact with individuals from more direct or egalitarian cultures, these strategies may be misunderstood as evasive or unclear. This supports Thomas's (1983) concept of pragmatic failure, where breakdowns in communication occur due to differing cultural assumptions rather than linguistic incompetence.

Furthermore, the application of speech act theory reveals that the intended force of an utterance in Gorontalo communication is often implicit and context-dependent. Acts such as requesting, refusing, or criticizing are frequently performed indirectly to maintain social harmony and honor (*modaha hurumati lo leembo'a*). While such strategies are effective within the local cultural framework, they may pose challenges in intercultural interactions where explicitness is valued. Similarly, Grice's (1975) notion of conversational implicature helps explain how Gorontalo speakers rely on shared cultural knowledge to convey meaning beyond what is explicitly stated, which may not be accessible to outsiders.

Overall, this discussion underscores the importance of incorporating local cultural perspectives into pragmatic and intercultural communication studies. By situating Gorontalo communication practices within established pragmatic theories, this study contributes to a more inclusive understanding of how meaning is negotiated across cultures. It also highlights the need for intercultural awareness and pragmatic instruction, particularly in educational and professional settings, to reduce misunderstanding and promote mutual respect among speakers from diverse cultural backgrounds.

5. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that pragmatics in the intercultural context of Gorontalo is inseparable from its underlying cultural and religious values. Politeness theory, speech acts, and conversational implicature take on renewed significance when contextualised within the principle *"Adat bersendikan syara', syara' bersendikan Kitabullah"*. Cultural concepts such as *modaha hurumati lo leembo'a* and *motombilu opi-opiyo* show that communication is not merely a process of transmitting information but a moral act that protects social harmony. Integrating global theory with local wisdom produces a more comprehensive pragmatic understanding, where meaning emerges as a dialogue between language, culture, and ethics. Thus, pragmatics does not only explain how people communicate, but also why they choose to speak in ways that uphold universal human values.   .

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford University Press.

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2016). *The craft of research* (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H. (2016). *Communication accommodation theory: Negotiating personal relationships and social identities across contexts.* Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* Anchor Books.

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (2018). *Ethnopragmatics and semantics: Meaning and culture in language.* Oxford University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Gudykunst, W. B. (2003). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices.* Sage Publications.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.* University of Pennsylvania Press.

Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness.* Oxford University Press.

Polapa, A. (2020). *Adat dan bahasa dalam budaya Gorontalo: Kajian etnografi komunikasi.* Gorontalo: Lembaga Adat Daerah Provinsi Gorontalo.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2011). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts.* Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics.* Longman.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures.* Guilford Press.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford University Press.

Yusuf, H. (2019). *Nilai dan bahasa dalam masyarakat Gorontalo: Sebuah refleksi sosial budaya.* Gorontalo: Ideas Publishing.