

FLOUTING MAXIMS HAPPENED IN STEVE TV SHOW

Annisa Febrianti Prasiwi; Endang Fauziati

**Department of English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and
Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta**

Abstrak

Komunikasi memegang peranan penting. Untuk membuat komunikasi yang baik orang harus mengikuti aturan maksim, tetapi orang masih melanggar aturan dan melanggar maksim. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk (1) mengidentifikasi jenis pelanggaran maksim, (2) mengetahui strategi, dan (3) mengetahui pengaruh pelanggaran maksim. Metode yang digunakan adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Datanya adalah 87 ucapan yang mengandung pelanggaran maksim di Steve TV Show. Data dianalisis dengan menggunakan teori Grice, dan semua jenis maksim dilanggar. Pelanggaran maksim yang paling banyak digunakan adalah kuantitas dan hubungan dengan 26 data, sedangkan pelanggaran maksim cara adalah 25 dan yang paling sedikit adalah kualitas dengan 10 data. Strategi yang ditemukan adalah memberikan terlalu banyak informasi, memberikan terlalu sedikit informasi, hiperbola, ironi, mengatakan sesuatu yang tidak benar, pernyataan tidak berhubungan, mengajukan pertanyaan, mengubah topik, gagap, panjang lebar, dan ambigu. Untuk efek, berdasarkan Perlocutionary Austin, ada yang mengganggu, membosankan, meyakinkan, menyebabkan, membuat pendengar menyadari sesuatu, membuat pendengar melakukan sesuatu, dan menghina. Pelanggaran maksim umum terjadi dan biasanya dilakukan untuk mendorong pendengar merenungkan pesan pembicara, dengan tetap menjaga citra sosial pembicara.

Kata kunci: Prinsip kerjasama, Flouting maxim, Strategi, Efek

Abstract

Communication plays an important role. To make good communication people should follow maxim's rules, but people still break the rules and flout the maxim. This research aims at (1) identifying the types of flouting maxim, (2) finding out the strategy, and (3) finding out the effect of flouting maxim. The method used is descriptive qualitative. The data are 87 utterances containing flouting maxim in Steve TV Show. The data analyzed by using Grice's theory, and all types of maxims are flouted. The most flouting maxim used is quantity and relation with 26 data, while flouting maxim of manner is 25 and the least is quality with 10 data. The strategies found are giving too much information, giving too little information, hyperbole, irony, saying something untrue, unrelated statement, asking questions, changing topic, being stuttered, being lengthy, and being ambiguous. For the effects, based on Austin's Perlocutionary, there are annoying, boring, convincing, causing, getting the hearer realize something, getting the hearer to do something, and insulting. Flouting maxim is common and usually done to encourage the listener to contemplate the speaker's message, while maintaining the speaker's social image.

Keywords: Cooperative principle, Flouting maxim, Strategies, Effects

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective social interaction among individuals is reliant on communication, with language serving as the fundamental tool for establishing such communication. Language plays a crucial

role in facilitating communication, as it enables individuals to effectively articulate their thoughts and ideas. The speaker will convey a message to the listener in every communication that is carried out, so the truth and clarity of information becomes an important thing in a conversation. If the two do not communicate well, miscommunication has a very high possibility to occur. Thus, in order to prevent misunderstandings, effective communication between the speaker and the listener is imperative. An effective communication can be carried out if one adheres to the cooperative principle, as said by Grice (1989), "If the people follow the Cooperative Principle, which is realized through the four maxims conversation, they will have a successful conversation."

There are several maxims that are part of the cooperative principle that can be adhered to if one wants to ensure that the conversation is a good conversation, which are: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. According to Yule (1996), active and cooperative participation among the communicators is a crucial factor in achieving effective and successful communication. Despite the cooperative principle stated by Grice, there remain quite a few individuals who fail to follow the maxims in practice. Cutting (2002) proposes that in instances where speakers appear to disregard the maxims, they anticipate that the hearers will infer the implied meaning, thereby flouting maxims.

Four types of flouting maxim as stated by Cutting (2002) are: flouting maxim of quantity where the speaker provides information not in accordance with what is needed, flouting maxim of quality where the speaker is saying something that does not represent what they think, flouting maxim of relation is when the speaker expresses a thing by saying something that has no intention with the previous utterances, and flouting maxim of manner when the speaker gives ambiguous, obscure, and unclear statements. If someone does not obey the rules of maxim by doing these things, then the speaker commits a flouting maxim. These flouting are closely related to the strategies used, which are: giving too much information, giving too little information, hyperbole, metaphor, irony, banter, being irrelevant, and being obscure. And will have some consequential effects as stated by Austin (1962), such as convincing, annoying, causing, getting the hearer realize something, getting the hearer to do something, and insulting.

Some researchers have conducted the studies about Flouting Maxim with different concentrations they took. Some of the previous studies focused on finding only the types of flouting maxims happened, such as some studies done by Ayu et al., (2021), Devi (2022), Giriyani (2020), Hidayat et al., (2020), Juniati & Sunggu (2020), Kristiani et al., (2021), Natasya & Sari (2019). Then (Tami & Handayani, 2021) focused on the types of flouting maxim along with the strategies behind flouting the maxim. On the other hand, some

researchers seemed interested to find out about the types of flouting maxim and the effects, like H, Tracy et al., (2021) and Saputri & Sari (2016).

This study intends to investigate the flouting maxim happened in conversations, with a focus on Steve as the *emcee* of Steve TV Show and his guests. The focus of this study was to: (1) classify the types of flouting maxim, (2) identify the type of strategies to flout the maxim, and (3) explain the effects of flouting the maxim.

2. METHOD

This study used a descriptive qualitative method to analyze the flouting maxim happens in the talk show, because the qualitative method involves the systematic collection and analysis of data prior to formulating conclusions. The essence of the data is interpreted throughout the course of a qualitative study (Creswell, 2014; Novera et al., 2021). Then, content analysis is applied because the data obtained from social media is in line with the research's collection technique. In the qualitative method, the researcher analyzed the utterances uttered by Steve and his guests in Steve TV Show, and also collects the data which contains flouting maxim in the talk show. Besides, the researcher tries to understand the situations of the conversation to know the strategy and effect of flouting maxim performed by them.

The researcher used 87 dialogues stated by Steve and his guests from the Steve TV Show which contains flouting maxim. The data source is from ten episodes of Steve TV Show on YouTube. To collect the data, a documentation technique is used. According to Bowen (2009 as cited in Nurjannah et al., 2020), documentation method is a part of qualitative research which the researcher interpret the documents in the topic to give the meaning. The first step to collecting the data is to browse and watch some videos on the Steve TV Show YouTube Channel. After that, rewatch and read the subtitles to check that everything is the same. Third, the researcher documented all utterances which contains flouting maxim. Lastly, the researcher arranged the 87 data, and analyzing the types, the strategies used, and the effects of flouting maxim happened.

To analyzed the data, the researcher was using an interactive model by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) that involves four stage: data collection, data condensation, data display, and conclusion. The data were categorized according to the types of flouting maxim by using Grice's Cooperative Principle theory and Cutting's (2002) flouting maxim theory. Then, to look deeply into the strategies used by the speaker in flouting the maxim, Cutting's (2002) flouting maxim strategy was applied. Finally, the effect of flouting maxim was determined using Austin's (1962) perlocutionary theory.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents an analysis of the study's results toward the research problem: 1) the type of flouting maxim happened and its strategies, based on Cutting's (2002) theory, and 2) the effect of flouting the maxim, which based on Austin's (1962) theory. The data employed to solve these issues were sourced from ten videos of Steve TV Show on YouTube channel.

3.1 Type and its Strategy of Flouting Maxim

There are four types of flouting maxim found from 87 utterances with a strategy behind them. These four types are, flouting maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. And the strategies are categorized according to the flouting maxim that occur, which are giving too much information, giving too little information, hyperbole, irony, saying something untrue, saying unrelated statement, asking questions, changing the topic, being stuttered, being lengthy, and being ambiguous.

3.1.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

The first type is flouting maxim of quantity, it involves two strategies which are giving too much information or too little information.

Steve: "Did you have kids already of your own?"

Dr. Bennie: "No, *but I have tons of godchildren. I've helped my friends take care of their kids for years.*" (15-TMI)

Dr. Bennie's utterance flouts the maxim of quantity because she is giving too much information. She should response with a simple answer to the question, without giving too much detail than what is needed.

Steve: "Why don't we give him another chance? 'Cause sometimes it just don't work out at the beginning. He was married for a long time."

Barbara: "*52 years.*" (02-TLI)

The conversation shows that Barbara flouted the maxim of quantity by giving too little information, Barbara should give more information about the question that Steve asked and not only answer about how long she had been married. The other example is happened between Steve and Barbara's conversation which flouting the maxim of quantity by giving too much information in her statement.

Steve: That just lost his wife.

Barbara: "*Yeah, a few months ago. He had no right going out with me.*" (01-TMI)

3.1.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

The second type is flouting maxim of quality, there are three strategies identified as the ways to flout this maxim, namely: hyperbole, irony, and saying something untrue.

Steve: “*And yeah, gravity gonna take over. Cause right now, see y’all young. Your skin is sexy. Got a butterfly right here. You turn 50, the butterfly going to be a moth.*” (01-HBL)

Steve's utterance exemplifies a flouting of a maxim of quality through the use of hyperbole. It can be seen from the statement, “*The butterfly going to be a moth,*” that has not been proven to be true, and he exaggerates the statement he made.

Steve: “Cause I think he might be the guy. He just a little hurt right now.”

Barbara: “*I feel like I'm dreaming or something.*” (01-IRN)

Barbara's statement above is an example of the use of ironic strategy in flouting the maxim of quality, because it's a satire of Steve's previous statement. It is important to note that Barbara's intention was to communicate to Steve and other listeners that her thoughts do not align with Steve's.

Hillary: I texted her. And I said, the first question, "Hi! Were you the Miss Loyal Corn Fest Queen of 1983?" And she said, "Yes. Why?" *And I said, "Just wondering."* (01-UTR)

The example above happens during a phone call between Hillary and Dawn, Hillary responded Dawn's question with, “*Just wondering.*” In fact, Hillary already knew about Dawn's truth, and she wants to confirm it. The other example is the utterance stated by Steve, he is using the strategy of hyperbole when expressing his statement.

Steve: “I said, "So, y'all ain't wanna get the room?" *Trish went, "Lord Jesus."* (02-HBL)

3.1.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

Then, flouting maxim of relation also has some strategies used to flout the maxim, which are saying unrelated statement, asking a question, and changing the topic.

Steve: “You met her?”

Sunshine: “*Yeah, 'cause I love her.*” (01-URT)

The utterance said by Sunshine is flouting the maxim of relation by providing a response to Steve's question that is not related to the topic at hand. When Steve asked if she met another figure there, Barbara, she answered by saying that she loves her.

Steve: "Christian and Grayson, do y'all have anything that you'd like to say to Diddy? Yes, yeah, you can go ahead without raising."

Christian: "*Who, me?*" (01-ASK)

Christian flouts the maxim of relation by using the strategy where Christian as the speaker, instead of answering the question asked by Steve, he asks a question back to Steve.

Steve: "How you doing, Miss Barbara?"

Barbara: "*Oh, I want a hug.*" (02-CHT)

In the example above, Barbara says something that does not match what Steve expected and flouts the maxim of relation. When Steve asks about Barbara's condition at that time, she changes the topic and asks Steve to hug her instead. The other example is the conversation happened between Brent and Barbara, the utterance stated by Barbara is flouting the maxim of relation by saying unrelated statement.

Brent: "And guess what? I love to dance."

Barbara: "*Lord, have mercy.*" (04-URT)

3.1.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

The last type is flouting maxim of manner, it also has three strategies, which are being stuttered, being lengthy with words, and being ambiguous when the speaker says the ideas.

Steve: "Kayla and Kyle, *who is... Oh, they the dictionaries. Oh, they the two books.*"

Nicholas: "You mean the two characters?" (02-STR)

From the conversation above, Steve stutters through his utterance, causing Nicholas concerning the intended message. Steve's condition at that time, is an example of stuttering and flout the maxim of manner.

Barbara: "I wanna say something to you."

Steve: "Okay."

Barbara: "*God speaks through you. God couldn't be here so He's speaking through you, Steve. 'Cause He turned you around.*" (01-LTY)

Barbara employs repetitive sentences and tries to expand her utterance, although she is able to make her statement straightforward. Moreover, Barbara's utterance is the example of flouting the maxim of manner by being lengthy.

Steve: "Yeah. If you could get 20 cars, would you want 20 cars?"

Chester: "*Probably.*" (05-ABG)

The way Chester answers Steve’s question indicates that Chester is flouting the maxim of manner by being ambiguous. Chester should response the question with a clear answer and not saying probably. The other example happened between Steve and Serene. Serenes’s response towards Steve’s question is flouting the maxim of manner by being ambiguous.

Steve: “Do you know that?”

Serene: “*Right.*” (04-ABG)

Therefore, the summary of Flouting maxim and its strategies from 87 utterances happened in Steve TV Show:

Table 1. Flouting Maxim and its Strategies

No	Flouting Maxim and its Strategies	Number of Case
1.	Flouting Maxim of Quantity	
	Giving too much information	24
	Giving too little information	2
2.	Flouting Maxim of Quality	
	Saying something untrue	6
	Irony	2
	Hyperbole	2
3.	Flouting Maxim of Relation	
	Unrelated statement	15
	Changing topic	6
	Asking questions	5
4.	Flouting Maxim of Manner	
	Being ambiguous	11
	Being lengthy	10
	Being stuttered	4
Total		87

3.2 Effect of Flouting the Maxim

Several effects can occur to the listener when the speaker flouts the maxims. These effects found from 87 utterances include: convincing, surprising, boring, annoying, causing, insulting, getting the hearer realize something, and getting the hearer do something.

3.2.1 Convincing

The first effect takes place when the one who is speaking makes an effort to persuade the person who is listening that what they are saying is true.

Steve: "Do, you know who Jay Leno is?"

Chester: "*Yes. I watch his car show.*" (04-CV)

The answer Chester gives toward Steve's question is an example of convince the hearer as the effect, because Chester gives a response that he knows who Jay Leno is, and he wants Steve to believe that he really meant it. The other example is presented below between Walter and Alan, Alan gives a response to convince his twin, Walter, that they were cool before.

Walter: "Remember when we tried to be really cool about it?"

Alan: "*Oh, we were cool.*" (21-CV)

3.2.2 Surprising

The second effect pertains to the element of surprise, wherein the speaker delivers a sudden or unexpected statement with the intention of causing surprise from the listener.

Michael: "But I don't know. What do you think, Steve?"

Steve: "*Okay, I see you shaking your head.*" (01-SP)

Steve's answer makes Michael surprised, as he had not expected Steve to say that instead of answering his question. That's why, Steve's response towards Bob is giving the example of surprising the hearer. The other example is conversation between Benjamin and Steve, and what Steve did by asking a question as a response towards Benjamin's question makes him surprised.

Benjamin: "Hey, Steve, how you doin'?"

Steve: "*Hey, what's up*" (04-SP)

3.2.3 Boring

The third effect is that it bores the hearer, and it takes place when the speaker says anything that places the listener in a condition of boredom.

Steve: "What's the last thing you do before you go to sleep?"

Keke: "*Ah, get on my phone. I gotta stop that. It wakes me up. Did you guys know that? If you look at the light on your phone before you go to bed, it actually makes it that much more difficult for you to go to sleep? I gotta stop that.*" (01-BR)

The response given by Keke has possibility to bore Steve and other listeners, since she always repeats what she's talking about, when she is actually able to make her statement simple.

3.2.4 Annoying

The fourth effect refers to the possibility for the listener to experience annoyance in response to the speaker's utterances, particularly when the content of the message is perceived as bothersome.

Steve: "Cause you don't listen to who I tell you."

Keke: "*Them billionaires be having four, and five, and six other wives.*" (05-AN)

Keke's answer as the response of Steve's question makes Steve slightly annoyed of what she is trying to say. It happens when they are talking about the guys that Steve introduced to Keke before, then Keke gives her answer to make Steve annoyed by saying that the billionaires be having some other wives. The other example happened between Steve and Keke's dialogue, it can be seen that Keke's response to Steve's statement makes him annoyed by what Keke said before.

Steve: "Seven damn years. I have said direct opposite. But Little Miss Fast over here."

Keke: "*I'm hitting up all these women.*" (05-AN)

3.2.5 Causing

Then, the next effect is that it causes the hearer, and in most cases, it causes the hearer to feel something after hearing the utterance of the speaker.

Steve: "That just lost his wife."

Barbara: "*Yeah, a few months ago. He had no right going out with me.*" (01-CS)

Barbara response of what Steve said by saying, "*He had no right going out with me.*" When they're talking about Barbara's ex-partner that just left her after meeting at the first time without saying anything. It can be concluded that Barbara's utterance causes Steve to feel guilty by saying that. The other example is the dialogue below between Keke and Steve, what Steve said to Keke is causing Keke to feel guilty and confused about the statement.

Keke: "With a lot of these billionaire guys or these industry guys."

Steve: "*You ain't coming on this show no more.*" (04-CS)

3.2.6 Insulting

This effect takes place when the speaker intentionally says something in a way that will cause the listener to feel offended as a result of hearing what the speaker has to say.

Steve: "You need some help from Uncle Steve?"

Keke: "*Uncle Steve. Uncle Steve is always trying to get me with the billionaire. I'm like Uncle Steve, I don't need the billionaires. I just need some simple, simple stuff, you know*" (02-IS)

From the utterances stated by Keke, it can be seen that Keke's utterance gives the effect of insulting towards Steve. The way Keke answers Steve's offer about helping her, it insults Steve that Steve's help was not helping at all. Another example is the conversation happened between Keke and Steve, while Steve saying something and has a possibility to make Keke feel offended.

Keke: "They're putting everyone on blast these days."

Steve: "*Another millennial problem.*" (04-IS)

3.2.7 Getting the Hearer Realize Something

There is also an effect that causes the listener to realize something, and that effect is when the speaker anticipates that the listener will comprehend the speaker's words in a deeper way.

Steve: "So, Miss Barbara, what do you think? Okay, get yourself a drink."

Barbara: "*This is too much.*" (14-RS)

Barbara's response towards Steve's question happens when Steve invites some guys to do a dating segment. By saying, "*This is too much.*" Barbara wants Steve to know that she seems like she can't handle the situation. The other example is the conversation between Steve and Benjamin while Benjamin makes him to realize what is the meaning behind his utterance.

Steve: "You're obviously a good guy."

Benjamin: "*Yeah, I work a lot too, so.*" (17-RS)

3.2.8 Getting the Hearer Do Something

The last effect takes place when the speaker anticipates that the hearer will require in an act as a consequence of hearing the speaker's speech.

Steve: "How you doing, Miss Barbara?"

Barbara: "*Oh, I want a hug.*" (01-DS)

The conversation happens when Steve asks Barbara to come to him, then he asks a question, then Barbara response towards Steve's question is, "*I want a hug.*" It intends to make Steve hug her. The other example is happened between Steve and Barbara, by saying that she needs a drumroll, Barbara wants Steve and the other listeners to give her a drumroll.

Steve: "So Miss Barbara, you have to make a decision."

Barbara: "*I need a drumroll!*" (02-DS)

The summary of the effects of flouting maxim from 87 utterances happened in Steve TV Show:

Table 2. Effects of Flouting maxim

Effects Used	Number of Case
Getting the Hearer Realize Something	36

Convince the Hearer	22
Annoy the Hearer	8
Cause the Hearer	6
Insult the Hearer	5
Getting the Hearer Do Something	5
Surprise the Hearer	4
Bore the Hearer	1
Total	87

3.3 Discussion

There are three parts of the discussion section based on the following findings, types of flouting maxim, strategies used to flout the maxim, and effects of flouting the obtained from the Steve TV Show talk show's utterance.

The researcher found four types of flouting maxims, namely: (1) flouting maxim of quantity, (2) flouting maxim of quality, (3) flouting maxim of relation, and (4) flouting maxim of manner. The results of this study support previous research conducted by Ayu et al., (2021), Devi (2022), Giriyani (2020), Hidayat et al., (2020), Juniati & Sunggu (2020), Kristiani et al., (2021), and Natasya & Sari (2019).

However, the results of this study have differences with the findings found by Ayu et al., (2021), Devi (2022), Giriyani (2020), Hidayat et al., (2020), Juniati & Sunggu (2020), Kristiani et al., (2021), and Natasya & Sari (2019). In the research done by Ayu et al., (2021), 25 data were found with the most dominant type being flouting maxim of relation. Research conducted by Devi (2022) found as many as 17 flouting maxim, in which flouting maxim of quantity has the highest frequency. Then, Giriyani (2020) found 20 data where flouting maxim of quality is the highest frequency. Furthermore, research by Hidayat et al., (2020) found 17 data and flouting maxim of quantity became the highest frequency. Then, Juniati & Sunggu (2020) found 12 data and flouting maxim of relation is the highest type. Then, (Kristiani et al., 2021) found 20 flouting maxim with the flouting maxim of quantity being the dominant one. Lastly, (Natasya & Sari, 2019) with their research found 35 data and flouting maxim quantity is the highest frequency.

Then for the strategies, the results of the research conducted show that in each flouting maxim there are strategies used to make it happen, namely: (1) strategies in flouting maxim of quantity, (2) strategies in flouting maxim of quality, (3) strategies in flouting maxim of relation, and (4)

strategies in flouting maxim of manner. Even so, the results of this study are in line with previous research conducted by Tami & Handayani (2021).

Furthermore, the findings of this study are not in line with Tami & Handayani (2021). The current study found all strategies in flouting the maxim, but in the previous study conducted by Tami & Handayani (2021) only found the irony strategy in the flouting maxim of quality, then in the flouting maxim of relation only labelled it with the strategy of being irrelevant, the same thing also happened in the flouting maxim of manner where it was only known that the strategy used was being obscure.

The last, the results obtained after conducting the research, the researcher found that there are eight kinds of flouting maxim effects, namely: (1) annoying, (2) boring, (3) convincing, (4) causing, (5) getting the hearer to realize something, (6) getting the hearer to do something, (7) insulting, and (8) surprising. The results of this study are in line with Saputri & Sari (2016). This is likely to happen because researchers both use Austin's (1962) framework, where Austin mentions the theory of Perlocutionary acts.

However, when viewed more deeply, the results of this study contrast with H, Tracy et al., (2021). This difference lies in the number of various effects in flouting maxim, where the research conducted by H, Tracy et al., (2021) only found seven kinds of effects in flouting maxim, namely: (1) annoying, (2) boring, (3) convincing, (4) causing, (5) getting the hearer to realize something, (6) getting the hearer to do something, and (7) insulting. The difference in this study is likely due to the difference in the speaker's situation.

4. CLOSING

To conclude, it is frequently seen in conversation situations for individuals to flout maxims by intentionally ignoring them. Based on the findings, it is posited that the speaker's flouting behaviour is motivated by a desire to encourage the listener to contemplate the speaker's message, while simultaneously preserving the speaker's social image and the convivial atmosphere of the event. Hence, given the prevalence of flouting maxims, it is advisable to limit its usage in order to lessen the chance of misinterpretation. The introduction of the cooperative principle as a means of preventing the flouting maxim carries significant pedagogical implications.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Ayu, I., Wulandari, P., Made, N., Utami, V., & Deni, N. N. (2021). *The Types of Flouting Maxim Found In Alice In Wonderland Movie*. 1(1).

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Fourth Edi). SAGE Publications.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge. <https://www.ptonline.com/articles/how-to-get-better-mfi-results>
- Devi, R. S. (2022). *Flouting Maxim Types Found in “ Thor Ragnarok ” Movie*. 8(2), 249–260.
- Giriyani, P. (2020). *Flouting Maxims On The Dialogue Of Characters In Up! Animated Movie*. 3(4), 512–517.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- H, T. R., Lubis, M., & Nasution, E. H. (2021). Flouting Maxim Performed By the Main Character in the Edge of Seventeen Movie. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 29(2), 273. <https://doi.org/10.46930/ojsuda.v29i2.1080>
- Hidayat, D. N., Nurlia, V., Alek, A., & Septiawan, Y. (2020). Maxim Flouting in “David Letterman Show”: an Episode With Aishwarya Rai. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 5(2), 135–145. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v5i2.2322>
- Juniati, E., & Sunggu, O. (2020). *Flouting Maxims In “ Wonder Woman “ Movie*. 4, 1–12.
- Kristiani, M. M., Made, N., Utami, V., & Juniarta, I. W. (2021). *Types of flouting maxims in the movie a star is born*. 1(2).
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (Third Edit). SAGE Publications.
- Natasya, D., & Sari, N. (2019). *Flouting Maxim in Finding Dory Movie*. 1999, 321–328. <https://doi.org/10.22216/jk.v3i2.4457>
- Novera, M. K., Winaya, I. M., & Udayana, I. N. (2021). *Maxim Flouting In “ Brooklyn Nine - Nine.”* 4(4), 685–691.
- Nurjannah, J., Daud, B., & Fata, I. A. (2020). *I , I , I I*. 5(February), 26–38.
- Puspitasari, C., Faridi, A., & Wahyuni, S. (2022). Conversational Implicature to Hide Meaning in the Dialogue Script of Alice Through the Looking Glass. *English Education Journal*, 12(2), 274–283.
- Saputri, A. F., & Sari, P. (2016). Flouting Maxims in the Movie “Zootopia” 2016 : Pragmatics Study. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal*, 13496–13507.
- Tami, T., & Handayani, N. D. (2021). Flouting maxim analysis in “Stranger Things 3” television series: pragmatics approach. *Jurnal Riset Teknologi Dan Inovasi Pendidikan (Jartika)*, 4(1), 01–10. <https://journal.rekarta.co.id/index.php/jartika/article/view/126>
- Vahini, P. P., Budiarsa, M., & Netra, I. M. (2022). *Flouting Grice ’ s Maxim in Jumanji : The Next Level*. 6(1).
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics by George Yule. In *Spain: OUP Oxford*. (p. 9).