FLOUTING MAXIM IN EMMA WATSON'S "BEING 30 AND HAPPILY SINGLE" BRITISH VOGUE INTERVIEW

Yulia Rahayu,* Dewi Kustanti, Erfan Muhammad Fauzi

English Literature, Faculty of Adab and Humanities, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: yuliarahayu76@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was done to find out more about how a person talks. Conversations between two or more people are usually inseparable from mistakes, uncooperative actions and often exceed expectations. Therefore, an observation in an interview between Paris Lee and Emma Watson is intended to examine the flouting maxim in the speeches made. This research uses qualitative methods with Grice's supporting theories cooperative principle and flouting maxim. Several data are included in the flouting maxim, namely four data flouting maxim of quantity, three data flouting maxim of quality, four data flouting maxim of manner, and two data flouting maxim relation. From the data analysis, it can be known that the flouting maxim arises when one of the participants, Watson and Paris, insert implied meaning into their speech until they were not cooperative during the interview.

Keywords: flouting maxim, cooperative principle, utterance, conversation, interview

INTRODUCTION

In social life, language is needed by everyone to communicate with others. Wardaugh (1985) stated that it is used by people as a communication tool to interact as well as maintain or establish relationships with others. In relation to that, there will be at least a sender (speaker), receiver (listener), a message (speech), and an interpretation of the meaning (meaning) in any communication. In any conversation, what the speaker conveys must be comprehended by the listener. Therefore, it needs good cooperation between the speaker and listener to produce a mutually beneficial conversation for both parties.

Knowing about how someone says something by indirectly or inserting implied meaning into their speech becomes an interest in researching this topic. By using the Conversational Implicature Theory put forward by H. P.

Grice, a conversation between two people that occurs in an interview who is the object of this research will be examined whether both of them say what they want to say directly or insert an implied meaning in each of their words. Thus, to comprehend every utterance, people have to try to connect it to various aspects outside of language, catering the people's culture contributing in the conversation. In Pragmatics, people attempt to comprehend every utterance, namely Implicatures (Kushartanti, 2005).

The speaker can convey information to the listener, and then the listener assumes a conclusion outside of the conventional function of the speech. It compares "what is said" to the "what might be said" of the talk. The cooperative principle is a general concept that describes how participants work together to get more efficient interaction or communication (Levinson, 1983). Grice in Andy & Ambalegin (2019) said that when people make an uncooperative principle when communicating, it means that the person has already committed a flouting maxim.

This research studied an interview by Emma Watson with Paris Lee taken from the British Vogue Youtube channel. As for a brief introduction, Emma Watson is an influential actress and a social activist, who changes perspectives on gender equality issues in a sustainable fashion. Besides, she also self-branded her as a feminist, who believes and advocates equal rights based on gender equality. She frequently shares her thought on it at several big events including the HeForShe campaign in 2014. In this Interview, Emma Watson shares her incredible life, transcending child stardom, and becoming a voice for change with her speech on United Nation women's gender equality campaign which is a crucial issue that concerns many people even today. Apart from that, in this interview, both Emma as the interviewee and Paris Lee as the interviewer shared their opinions on the important issues of gender equality and transgender. Therefore, the researcher will discuss the flouting maxim in the interview between Emma Watson and Paris Lee.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Cooperative Principle

The cooperative principle is a basic assumption between the speaker and his listener when they talk to each other or involve others other than them in it. They ensure that they have tried to cooperate in exchange for talks and knowledge sharing as participants in the talks (Grice, 1975). Cooperative principle as well as its submaxims are the foundation behind implicature in a conversation. If the participants, both speaker and listener, are cooperative, they are able to get something more than just what the utterances mean. Speakers in a conversation provide space for their listeners to have or draw conclusions about the intentions and implied messages that want to be conveyed by applying the cooperative principle. Grice (1975) expressed how the four maxims determine a person's cooperative in a conversation. It became a shared secret, Grice in (Kunjana, 2005) asserted, that many people create efficient communication by following the rules specified in the four maxims: quality, quantity, manner, and relation.

Based on Grice (1975), in a conversation, maxim of quality requires the speaker and listeners to exchange information that can be accounted for the

truth or knowledge that does occur in the actual life. Say what is known as the truth, and do not say things that are not considered accurate. Maxim quantity requires the speaker in a conversation to say something clear about what should be said and conveyed to the listener. More clearly, communicate the information and make your contribution informative or according to what is needed. Do not say anything more than what is required from a question or statement. Maxim of manner requires the speaker and listener to avoid obscurity or ambiguity as much as possible. To avoid misunderstandings or ambiguous meanings when communicating or in a conversation with others, speakers and listeners must have a relationship where they have a background knowledge that allows the listener to understand the meaning or message conveyed by the speaker even if the speaker says it indirectly (Esra and Afriana, 2020). Maxim of relation refers to what has been aforementioned to be regarding the utterance or question stated previously (Esra and Afriana, 2020). Grice (1975) disclosed that between the speaker and also the listener should be in line in communicating. Make the contribution relevant.

Flouting Maxim

Conversation implicature occurs because one of the participants in the conversation is flouting the maxim. Flouting maxim is one of the four non-observance maxims, namely violating the maxim, infringing maxim, opting out maxim, and suspending a maxim (Grice in Thomas, 2013**).** If a flouting maxim exists in a conversation, the listener will probably confuse, and the speech delivered becomes ambiguous. Because in a conversation, the speaker is intended to clearly deliver what he wants to say, and also unambiguously, informatively, and does not give rise to assumptions that will make a conversation seem to fail (Esra and Afriana, 2020). Besides, Grice as quoted in (Cutting, 2002) stated that flouting maxim can happen if the speaker intentionally or does not let his listener understand or guess the implied meaning of what is conveyed implied in several criteria of flouting maxims: flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of manner, flouting maxim of relation.

Flouting a maxim quality occurs when what the speaker is saying is not following reality or when the speaker is saying something doubtful even by himself (M. Kurniati & S. Hanidar, 2018). Speakers may be flouting a maxim quality when they say something they do not believe in or have enough evidence.

Dialogue 1
   Andi: *Do you know where the nearest atm center is located?*
   Budi: *I think it's 50 meters from here on the right side, if I'm not mistaken.*

Based on dialogue 1, it contains flouting maxim of quality because Budi answered that he was unsure if the ATM center was there. Budi should say that he knows less about it than gives an unconvincing answer.

Flouting maxim quantity is used to disseminate a variety of well-received information about an event by providing information that exceeds

what is needed to connect the incident and the consequences (M. Kurniati & S. Hanidar, 2018).

Dialogue 2

    Amara: Do you know Samuel?
    Nadia: I know him. He's the most handsome boy in our school. He's also intelligent and wealthy.

      From dialogue 2, we learn that Nadia violated the maxim of quantity by providing more information. Nadia can only answer with "yes, I know him," not with additional information that isn't needed because Amara just asks if she knows him or not.

      Flouting maxim of manner is caused by the deliberateness of the speaker who says something in an unassuming and ambiguous manner. The speaker will say something that contains other meanings in his speech or use ambiguous sentences so that the listener has difficulty capturing the meaning or meaning of the speech (Cutting, 2002).

Dialogue 3

    Jeno: What are you going to do after school?
    Mark: I'll accompany someone to go somewhere.

      Mark's answer to Jeno was ambiguous because he did not mention who he was going with and where they were going. Mark should have answered clearly whom he would go with and where they were going, but Mark deliberately didn't say that. That could be because Mark doesn't want anyone to know whom he's going to go with. Look at the other example.

      Flouting maxim of relation occurs when the listener deliberately responds to a speech made by the speaker with a response that is not relevant to the topic being discussed (M. Kurniati & S. Hanidar, 2018).

Dialogue 4

    Morris: What do you think of today's game?
    Malky: If it hadn't been raining.
    Morris: I think so.

      Dialogue 4 determines that Malky's answer to Morris' question is highly irrelevant, Morris asks Malky's opinion of a match, but Malky responds with an irrelevant statement. But if we look again, the word "if" there describes a disappointment felt by Malky. Malky regretted that the day had rained, and it could be interpreted that the match did not go well or as expected. The context of the conversation between Morris and Malky makes sense, but if we look at it from the cooperative principle side, Malky's statement flouting maxim of relation.

METHOD

      For analyzing the data, the study employed a qualitative method because the method is considered the most appropriate for this analysis.

Qualitative research uses descriptive methods, classifications, and words to present the experiences and realities of human life from the perspective of research subjects. The most common and widely used sources of qualitative research include interviews, observations, and documents (Patton, 2002). Explanations of a person's life experience, events, or situations are often interpreted as the thickest part (Denzin, 1989). In the study, researchers used video interviews from Emma Watson and Paris under the title "Emma Watson Talks Turning 30, Working With Meryl Streep, And Being Happily Single" to research conversational implicature and also flouting maxim. Researchers used subtitle transcripts that were automatically available on the video and converted them into a document file. The 30-minute video was uploaded on November 5, 2019 on British Vogue's YouTube channel.

To collect the data, the following steps were conducted: (a) watching the video with the subtitles that have been provided automatically by YouTube. The subtitle can be a little mistaken because the subtitle is automatic which there are some wrong words when changed into writing; (b) copying the existing subtitle transcript and make it a document where researchers can edit it if it finds errors or inequalities with what the person in the video is saying. After the transcript was completed, the researcher watched and watched the transcript to ensure that the speech and transcript were in sync; and (c) identifying and selecting the chunk of utterances that might be conceived conversational implicatures; and (d) writing the data and numbering them into data card.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

After identifying the data that have been found, the data will be analyzed and presented using the theories used, cooperative principle, and flouting maxim by Grice (1975). From these data, the researcher found out 10 data which most of the maxims that flouted were the maxims of quantity and quality. In the data that has been identified, it is found that 3 data flouting maxim of quality, 4 data flouting maxim of quantity, 1 data flouting maxim of manner, and 2 data flouting maxim of relation. Data that were collected and analyzed in the study were presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Type of data*

NO	Type of data	Quantity
1	Flouting maxim of quantity	4
2	Flouting maxim of quality	3
3	Flouting maxim of manner	1
4	Flouting maxim of relation	2
Amount		**10**

Flouting maxim of quantity

Data 1
Paris*: You're following Gloria Steinem. Wanna tell me about how you met her?*
Watson*: oh my goodness, she's the dream. I did this speech for the UN; this campaign that we launched called HeforShe, and I had a massive case of the imposter syndrome because suddenly I was like me coming out as this feminist was kind of concern, I was like "okay, Wow, to what do I." Anyway, the impostor syndrome hit hard, and I was kinda I need to go to some people who've been doing this for a while and talk to them,*
Paris*: And she went to the top*

Based on the conversation above, Watson is flouting the maxim of quantity by providing answers that contain more information than what is needed. From Paris' question, "how" here can mean two things, which is "chronology" and "the reason" where Watson and Gloria met. Paris was able to tell they met because Watson followed Gloria on Instagram, which she didn't. Here, Watson answered by providing information on how she got Imposter Syndrome when she would give a speech for a campaign held by the UN. Watson flouted the maxim of quantity in the conversation by providing more information than needed because she was too excited about Paris's question about Gloria. This can be seen by how Watson said, "*oh my goodness, she's the dream,*" as the first sentence she uttered after hearing Paris' question. From this sentence, we can see that Watson admires Gloria so much that she calls it a "dream" which means that Gloria is someone she really wants to meet. That intrigued Watson and ended up providing an answer that contained a lot more information than was needed.

Data 2
Paris*: Does it gets you?*
Watson*: How I, oh my goodness. Yeah, yeah. I've had many days where I call them the bad days. I'm just like can't, just it's really hard yeah and um, but what I wanted to say was, I also got some useful critical feedback that I wouldn't have got I wouldn't have maybe heard if I hadn't been engaging in that way and engaging in that space. I saw the white feminism coming up again and again, and I was like 'hey this is clearly something that I have to meaningfully engage with.*

Based on the presented conversation, Watson is flouting the maxim of quantity. Watson gives way too much information than what is needed. Previously, Paris and Watson discussed how criticism can make someone feel afraid and doubt themselves or the Imposter Syndrome. Watson explained that comments on social media are often hate speech made by someone anonymously. Therefore, Paris asked whether these comments had any effect or impact on Watson herself. Watson can answer Paris question by simply saying "yes" or "no" because Paris did not add a question that required Watson to include other information to answer.

Data 3
Paris : *Can I.. I've actually brought a book for you actually which is quite um.. is on topic too. Do you speak French?*
Watson *: Not fluently but I do..*
Paris : *Can you yeah read it? It's the first book since Ronnie's book that really blew me away*
Watson *: Wow*
Paris *: And he's he's so young, he's like 26,*
Watson : *I'm about to say habout say he's so young*
Paris : *He's so young and he grew up in rural France, and he's gay, and he was bullied relentlessly and he had all sorts of problems at home. And it's it's as much about class, as it is about homophobia, and it's just so powerful and actually weirdly, it's got a lot of parallels with my own stories.*

Although Watson didn't say anything about the author, an overexcited Paris enthusiastically said a few things about the writer such as how he was a gay man living in an isolated area of France, bullied harshly, and exiled simply because of social class issues and homophobia. Paris also said that it had a big impact on her because Paris felt that what the writer experienced was exactly the same and also had a connection with her story. Therefore, in the conversation above, the statement uttered by Paris is flouting maxim of quantity.

Paris gave too much information which Watson did not even ask. The amount of information that was conveyed by Paris about the author was due to her enthusiasm to introduce the author of the book she bought to give to Watson so that Watson was interested and as enthusiastic as her

Data 4
Paris : *And so many different amazing women that you've worked with in your career. Have you met Malala?*
Watson : *Malala Yousafzai?*
Paris *: yeah yeah because she she cited use them as inspiration and I just thought your reach is so global, I wonder what that meant?*
Watson : *I mean is she she actually, I was interviewing her when she told me that the reason she had wanted to identify with feminism was because of was because of my speech and I, I teared up in the interview and I was like am I gonna be able to keep asking questions because it did really I was like if if Malala can be affected by what I've what I'm doing what I've said then that's kinda how I was meaningful as it gets really. so that was really big, um and then there's also you know like I spend time in silence every year I do ten days social experience*

Based on the conversation above, Watson's answer to the question Paris is floating maxim of quantity. Paris and Watson are talking about Malal Yousafzai, an activist in the field of education for women and the youngest Nobel Peace Prize laureate, at the age of 17. Paris is interested in talking about how Malala, a well-known activist, was inspired by Watson's speech. Paris said that the impact of the speech would have spread all over the world if Malala

had been inspired by the speech. Therefore, Paris asked what really happened until Malala said that she was inspired by Watson's speech.

When Watson could answer Paris' questions with appropriate answers and not flouting any maxims, her excitement and pride made Watson unable to avoid it. When someone gets excited when talking about things that excited or things that have great memories and impact on theirselves, information will flow by itself without being asked.

Flouting maxim of quality

Data 1
Paris: *I know that you've got a real heart and care about these things, but you don't have to do them, you know, for your career do you know that there are people who have successful acting careers that don't take on all of these projects and you devote so much time and energy, to it like where does that come from?*
Watson: *I think I've always been this way, and I don't know why. Without this part, honestly, it's got to the point it renders everything else that I do meaningless. It just feels empty, or I can't. I feel uncomfortable taking up as much space I'm taking up, and I'm not speaking about any of the stuff. It just doesn't feel right.*

Based on the data above, Watson's floating maxim of quality. Watson's answer to Paris' question was doubted even by herself. Paris asked about what made Watson decide to become an activist or feminist who fought for equality and the rights of many people. Watson answered by saying, "*I think I've always been this way, and I don't know why.*"

"*I don't know why*" uttered by Watson makes it seem like she doesn't know the exact reason why she does all the things that are now her job. Watson can answer Paris' questions by telling the truth about why she decided to do activities that concern the interests of many people. She can say, "*I did it because I felt that they deserved equality*" or "*I decided to do it. it is because there is too much discrimination and inequality between women and men which causes women to lose opportunities in many ways,*" to answer Paris question. But here, Watson says something that makes her look unsure of her reasons, which puts the quality of her answer to Paris' question into doubt.

Data 2
Paris: *What is your political persuasion? Is anybody actually happy with the state of this country in particular or just all in general? What do you feel the biggest threats are?*
Watson: *There's a great quote I'm gonna, I'm going to, I'm gonna actually say it to the wrong person I think, but you know they say that when disaster strikes, that's when artists get to work, that's when we roll up our sleeves, and we go okay.*

Based on the conversation above, Watson is flouting the maxim of quality. The answer she gave Paris was doubtful, even by herself. Watson said,

"*There's a great quote I'm gonna, I'm going to, I'm gonna actually say it to the wrong person, I think,*" which she wasn't sure about. In this case, Watson could have named the wrong person so that the 'quote' she said did not belong to that person. In addition, what makes the quality of Watson's answer questionable because she cannot name the correct person is whether the quote she said in the answer is doubtful or not. Whether the truth about the quote has been said or not is also doubtful or can be judged as a lie.

Data 3
Paris : *What would you say, I don't want to dwell on this for too long, but what would you say to those people who would have an issue sharing a public bathroom with me?*
Watson : *Oh my goodness, say that's another human being, how can you.. I understand fearing what you don't know. I understand kind of thing like, I don't really understand about this and I've never met someone and, but "go and speak, go and, go learn, go speak, go look into the whites of someone's eyes, had this experience, and tell me after you've done that." you do not see or feel their humanity or understand their story or that you felt like there's any part of you that feels that it's okay to make that person not feel included.*

In the conversation above, Watson is flouting maxim of quality by saying "I *understand fearing what you don't know.*" But later Watson also said that she didn't really understand it, which how people can feel uncomfortable when they have to share the same toilet with a transgender because Watson has never met someone who has had a problem with it.

Flouting maxim of manner

Data 1
Paris: *I'm very curious because you're somebody who's actually engaged with that criticism and what feels like a very meaningful way. Why was that so important to you, and why do you think it's so difficult for people to examine their own privilege?*
Watson: *Social media is a really interesting space, and I'm always trying to figure out how to take care of myself self-care. Reading comments that are intended to be nothing other than cruel and unkind is not good for my psyche on a daily basis.*
In the conversation above, Watson is flouting the maxim of manner by giving an answer that contains too many implied meanings or makes it difficult for the listener to understand the meaning of the speaker's utterance. Watson expresses the answer to Paris' question in a way that is not easy to understand. Watson said that social media was a unique place and helped her figure out how to protect herself or self-care. At first glance, Watson's answer has nothing to do with Paris' question, but on closer inspection, Watson tries to say that social media is a place where those concerns arise, a place where the criticisms of the question arise.

Flouting maxim of relation

Data 1
Paris: I want to start off with the question that I think we're all wondering, which is why don't you follow me on Instagram, babe?
Watson: I really know you will gonna say that. I was really felt nervous for a second, but now I am really nervous.
Paris: Why should you be?
Watson: But that is actually crazy. I was looking at your Instagram just yesterday, and I was like, Paris is really good at taking selfies.

The conversation above shows that Watson flouting of maxim relation. Paris asked why Watson didn't follow her on Instagram, but Watson replied with another thing. Giving reasons and diverting the flow of conversation is one way to avoid a topic that you don't want to talk about or, in this case, to avoid feeling awkward and feeling guilty. Watson said, "*I really know you will gonna say that I was really, I felt nervous for a second, but now I am really nervous*" to avoid any awkwardness between her and Paris.

Data 2
Paris: You're out there. I'm just wondering how do you meet 'cause obviously, if it's a transwoman, it's quite complicated with that. How do you can't just be a link man on Tinder, can't you?
Watson: I can't
Paris: How'd you be sure they're coming to you?
Watson: Dating apps are not on the cards for me. I'm very lucky in the sense that because I went to university and because I've kind of done these other things outside a film. My friends are really good at setting me up. Really good and what's nice as even things that, even things that haven't worked out romantically, some of my best friends are people I got set up on a date with.

In the conversation above, Watson is flouting maxim of relation because the answer she gave did not relate to what was asked by Paris. Paris asks how Watson knows that they (men who want to approach her and have a relationship with her) come to Watson, or Watson realizes they are approaching her. Watson responded by saying that dating apps like Tinder and so on were not something she would try. At first glance, Watson's answer is sufficient to answer Paris's question. But here, Paris asks how Watson realized that they (men who wanted to approach her) were coming to her. However, Watson answered by explaining how her friends became people who could set her up with someone, which made Watson's statement flouting maxim of relations.

Based on the findings above, the researcher saw several flouting maxims that occurred in the interview between Emma Watson and Paris Lee. There are 4 data flouting maxims of quantity, 3 data flouting maxims of quality, 2 data flouting maxims of manner, and 2 data flouting maxims of relation. The flouting maxim of quantity is the most flouting maxim found. This

is in line with previous research, namely (Novianingrum, 2015)where the flouting maxim of quantity is the most flouting maxim that can be found. From these findings it can be assumed that the maxim of quantity is often violated to avoid misunderstandings about what is conveyed. The resource person in each interview who is the object of research is an important person who has great influence in the world of politics. Therefore, further explanation regarding the statements or opinions of the two requires further explanation in order to avoid misunderstandings.

In addition, this finding is also linked to the previous study (Rofa Marlisa, Didin Nurrudin Hidayat, 2020) where the flouting maxim of quantity is the most flouting maxim found in the study. The reason for this was explained that further explanation was needed to avoid misleading information and also misunderstanding by listeners.

The second most common flouting maxim found in this study is the flouting maxim of quality. This research is linked to the previous study (Nuringtyas, 2018) where the flouting maxim of quality occurs for almost the same reason, namely hiding the truth about something and also being unsure of one's own opinion. Apart from that, research (Nuringtyas, 2018) says that the reason why someone hides the truth is a widely used reason for flouting maxim of quality.

This is followed by flouting maxim of manner and flouting maxim of relation in which 2 data are found each. This research is linked to (Rofa Marlisa, Didin Nurrudin Hidayat, 2020) where the flouting maxim of manner and flouting maxim of relation occur for several reasons, namely to make jokes and also to seduce the listener by saying ambiguous things and answering questions that are not in accordance with the questions. Even so, it can be said that there will always be reasons for someone to flouting the maxim depending on the circumstances during the conversation.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the above data, the researcher concluded that both Paris Lee and Emma Watson flouting maxim. Paris and Emma both do a lot of flouting maxim but Emma does it more than Paris. This is because Emma is a resource person whose answers or opinions regarding the questions raised are unpredictable and there is an attempt to avoid misleading and misunderstanding by her listeners. The most widely found flouting maxims are flouting maxims of quantity and flouting maxims of quality. This is because the resource person or speaker wants his opinion to be conveyed clearly to his listeners.

Based on the conclusions above, the flouting maxim can arise unintentionally when two people are having a conversation—flouting maxim arises when one of the participants, Watson and Paris, insert implied meaning into their utterance until they are not cooperative during the interview. In addition, it can be known that understanding cooperative principles and flouting maxims is very beneficial for everyday conversations, both formal and non-formal. Because by understanding cooperative principles and flouting maxims, people can avoid misunderstandings and uncooperative actions when having conversations with others. In addition, research using video

interviews with no special scripts provided makes the research more interesting because the words issued by the speaker are unexpected and have many interesting sides.

REFERENCES
Arikunto, S. (1998). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
Cresswell. (2008). *Educational Research.*
Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse.* London: Routledge.
Esra and Afriana. (2020). Flouting Maxim in "Wonder Woman" Movie. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA)*.
Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 41-58.
Hidayat, F. M. (2015). *The Study of Implicature Used by the Host and Jaya Suprana in "Kick Andy Show";kelirumologi episode.* Brawijaya University.
Jauhari, H. (2015). *Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah.* Bandung: Pustaka Setia.
Kunjana, R. (2005). *Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia .* Jakarta: Erlangga.
Kushartanti. (2005). *Pesona Bahasa : Langkah awal memahami linguistik.* Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
L. R. Horn, Gregory Ward. (2008). *The Handbook of Pragmatics.* Wiley-Blackwell.
Lestari, N. (2019). An analysis of flouting maxims in conversation speaking of the main character in the movie of Home Alone 2 "Lost In New York" By John Hughes. *Journal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching*, 1-11.
Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
M. Kurniati & S. Hanidar. (2018). The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims in the Movies Insidious and Insidious 2. *LEXICON Volume 5*, 65-76.
Novianingrum, D. (2015). *Conversational Implicature on ABC Interview Between Barbara Walters and Syrian President Bashar Al-Assad.* Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University.
Nuringtyas, S. (2018). *Flouting Maxim Analysis on Dialogue of Characters in Pitch Perfect Movie.* Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
Rofa Marlisa, Didin Nurrudin Hidayat. (2020). The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) Talkshow. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education and Humanities*, 132-142.
Vickie A. Lambert, D. R., & Clinton E. Lambert, P. R. (2012). *Qualitative Descriptive Research: An Acceptable Design.* Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research.
Wardaugh, R. (1985). *An Introduction to sociolinguistic.* USA: Blackwell Publishing.