



Violation of Conversational Maxims Found in Netflix Documentary “Ice Cold: Murder, Coffee, And Jessica Wongso”

Dini Andyta Wardhani¹, Laila Ulsi Qodriani²

Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia^{1,2}

anditadini21@gmail.com¹, ani@teknokrat.ac.id²

Received : (April 2024)

Accepted : (May 2024)

Published : (June 2024)

Abstract

This study focuses on maxim violation done by the informants in Netflix documentary film titled Ice Cold: Murder, Coffee, and Jessica Wongsol using Grice's theory. The objectives of study are to discover the type of conversational maxim violation and the impact on effective communication. The data is conversation that contain maxim violation in the Ice Cold documentary film. This research was conducted by using qualitative descriptive method. The results of the study show that there are three maxims of the cooperative principle violated by the informants in Ice Cold documentary. These maxims are: (1) maxim of quantity, (2) maxim of relevance, and (3) maxim of manner. The dominant maxim that is violated is maxim of relevance which occurred 3 times, whereas the other maxim such as maxim of manner occurred 2 times, and maxim of quantity only occurred 1 time. The impact of those violations causes topic changing, repetition and obligation in conversation.

Keywords: cooperative principle, ice cold documentary film, maxim violation

INTRODUCTION

Exploitation is a kind of activity to take advantage of something excessively and arbitrarily without any responsibility. According to Suharto (2005), exploitation is a discriminatory attitude or treatment carried out arbitrarily. Examples of exploitation are exploitation of child, exploitation of nature, exploitation of animal, exploitation of women, and so on. Wicaksono (2012) said that exploitation of women means the use of all things attached to women, both images and signs attached to them. Women are often seen as a second class citizen which make women vulnerable to exploitation.

Analyzing women exploitation through a movie requires detail attention both sociological and cinematically. In this study, the writer analyzed the depiction of women exploitation in the movie entitled Last Night In Soho by Edgar Wright 2021. This movie is about a teenage girl namely Eloise Turner or called as Ellie who dreamed about Sandie. Sandie is a beautiful and a talented girl from 60s era and she want to be a famous singer, so that after she meet with Jack who later will be her manager, she feels like all of her dreams will be come true. Ellie soon adapted Sandie as her models, but then Ellie realizes that Sandie life is not as glamour as it seems, all of Sandie dreams turned into a nightmare because of her manager, Jack, is exploit her and forced her to do prostitution and do some violence against her. As depicted in Last Night In Soho movie, the women exploitation happened under male control and is experienced by several female characters in this movie. This study aims to describe the women exploitation that happened in Last Night In Soho movie by Edgar Wright 2021. This study used library research with descriptive qualitative method. This study used sociological approach and used theory representation by Hall, also used women exploitation theory. By those cases why this research is important to be analyzed to know how is the depiction of women exploitation in Last Night In Soho movie. The writer also hopes that this research can be useful for readers and society, to increase public awareness about the danger of women exploitation. From the definition of exploitation and the description of the Last Night In Soho movie, women exploitation can occur because of deception or coercion by someone to women, the person who does this can also be someone close to us. With the lure that they will give us a good job or can help to achieve the dreams we want, it turns out to be exploiting or even forcing us to undergo prostitution and even resort to violence.

METHOD

This research will use a qualitative mode based on the data that the writer will collect. Qualitative research is a study that aims to comprehend phenomena about what is experienced by the research subject holistically (Rido et al., 2020). By using descriptions in the form of words and language, in a particular natural context, and by employing diverse natural methodologies (Kuswoyo & Susardi, 2018). In addition, qualitative research techniques are also used to explore, locate, and informantsize the subject of investigation (Afrianto, 2017). In this study, the writer presented the results of the research in a descriptive qualitative manner, that is, the data collected was in the form of words and not numbers (Suprayogi & Pranoto, 2020). In the context of the violation of conversational maxims in —Ice Cold: Murder, Coffee, And Jessica Wongso, qualitative research provides a theoretical framework for analyzing the informants' use of language, identifying instances of maxim violations, and interpreting their communicative effects.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings will examine to answer the two research questions of this study. In addition, the findings are in the form of an identification and analysis of types of maxim violations and it impacts to the effective communication. By using Grice's theory of cooperative principle, this analysis will uncover how utterances delivery is crucial to achieve the goals of the effective communication in everyday communication.

No	Maxim Violation	Frequency
1	Maxim of Quality	0
2	Maxim of Quantity	1
3	Maxim of Relevance	3
4	Maxim of Manner	2
Total		6

Maxim Violation

The writer found six utterances data based on —Ice Cold documentary. The writer presented six conversations as utterances data in research findings as the representative data based on —Ice Cold documentary. The six utterances data showed the types of maxim violation. In this study, the writer found three types of maxim violation done by informants in —Ice Cold documentary according to H.P Grice theory of cooperative principle: maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner.

Datum 1

(00:02:14) Producer: *"If you're in the courtroom, tell us what the courts like, right?"*

(00:05:17) Mr. Edi: *"No, I should start maybe from the first how I feel that Jessica is the killer."*

(IC/0hr/02mnt/14scd–0hr/02mnt/17scd)

The exchange takes place during a conversation between the documentary producer and Mr. Edi, who is one of the informants and is Mirna Salihin's father. An explanation of the atmosphere that prevailed in the courtroom during the trial of Mirna Salihin and Jessica Wongso was something that Mr. Edi was strongly encouraged to convey by the producer. On the other hand, Mr. Edi decides to shift the focus of the talk to his own personal sentiments over Jessica Wongso's culpability. The fact that Mr. Edi is reluctant to explicitly address the producer's favor is reflected in the fact that the topic of discussion has shifted.

The remark provided by Mr. Edi is an example of a violation of the maxim of relevance. According to this principle, individuals who are taking part in a conversation are expected to give information that is relevant to the conversations that are currently taking place. By not providing the information that the producer is interested in discussing, Mr. Edi is refusing to be relevant. The interlocutor should be relevant and say things that are pertinent to the discussion, according to the standards of the maxim of relevance, which suggests that they should be relevant. In the first place, Mr. Edi deviates from the subject matter by not responding to the question that was posed by the producer and instead chose to talk about his own opinions regarding Jessica Wongso's guilt.

Datum 2

(00:18:15) Mr. Edi: "She bought the coffee and my daughter is dead"

(00:18:18) Journalist: "Who are you referring sir?"

(00:18:21) Mr. Edi: "Sure you know, everyone knows!"

(IC/18mnt/15scd–18mnt/21scd)

During the process of this conversation, Mr. Edi makes a remark that gives the impression that everyone know the killer of her daughter without actually mentioning the name. When the journalist asks Mr. Edi to clarify the issue by naming the person to whom he is talking, Mr. Edi responds in an obscure manner, hinting that the journalist and everyone else should already be aware of the information. But Mr. Edi does not name the person. Immediately following the conclusion of the preliminary trial, Mr. Edi exited the courthouse and was approached by a number of journalists and members of the media.

The manner in which Mr. Edi reacted to the journalist's inquiry constituted a violation of the maxim of manner, which is a concept that is presented within the context of Grice's Cooperative concept framework. In other words, Mr. Edi's response violated the cooperative principle. In accordance with this theory, individuals who take part in a conversation are required to convey information in a manner that is clear and uncomplicated, avoiding ambiguity and unnecessary complexity in the process. Rather than providing a straightforward and unequivocal response to the question that was posed by the journalist, Mr. Edi provides a statement that is imprecise and somewhat evasive in response to the query presented by the journalist. Immediately after making the assertion that "sure you know, everyone knows," he leaves the journalist as well as the audience in a condition of doubt regarding the specific individual to whom he is referring. This lack of clarity not only makes it difficult for the journalist to gather information for the public matter.

Datum 3

(00: 33:00) Jessica: "I felt I was pressured to give those answers." (00:33:05)

Prosecutor: "What sort of pressure?"

(00:33:08) Jessica: "Pressure through words, just like how you pressure people sometimes." (00:33:12)

Prosecutor: "What sort of pressure? Try to answer"

(IC/0hr/33mnt/00scd–0hr/33mnt/08scd)

This conversation takes place between the representatives of the prosecution and the defendant, Jessica Wongso. Jessica explains that she has a feeling that she is under significantly of pressure to deliver specific answers while she goes through the examination. When the prosecutor seeks clarity by asking about the actual meaning of the pressure that Jessica was talking about, Jessica responds in an unclear manner by stating that it was pressure through words, which is similar to the way that the prosecutor sometimes exerts pressure on persons. It was impossible for Jessica to deliver a response that was more revealing when she was pressed for additional specifics.

It is a violation of the maxim of manner, which is mentioned within the scope of Grice's Cooperative Principle, that Jessica Wongso reacted to the prosecutor's inquiry in the manner that she did. In accordance with this principle, it is anticipated that communicative actors will offer information in a manner that is clear and well-organized, hence reducing the amount of ambiguity that is present by avoiding excessive complexity. Jessica gives an answer that is unclear in response to the prosecutor's inquiry about the actual feeling of the pressure that she experienced. Instead of providing a response that is plain and precise, Jessica gives a response that is

ambiguous. Despite the fact that she asserts that it was "pressure through words" and draws parallels between it and the actions of the prosecutor, she does not provide any concrete data or instances to clarify her allegation. She does not provide any examples or details.

Datum 4

(00: 44:28) *Producer: "In your view, one, was this a murder? And two, if so, was Jessica guilty?"*

(00: 44:30) *Dr. Budi: "Wow, that's a difficult question to answer."*

(IC/44mnt/28scd-0hr/44mnt/30scd)

This discussion took place between the producer and Dr. Budi regarding the creation of the documentary. As a toxicologist, Dr. Budi is asked to provide information regarding cyanide in one of the segments of this documentary. Two direct questions are directed to Dr. Budi by the producer. The first question is whether or not he believes the case at this point is a murder, and the second question is whether or not Jessica is responsible for the murder if he determines that the case is really a murder. In contrast, Dr. Budi provides a response in which he indicates that the questions would be difficult to answer. He says this in his response.

Within the framework of Grice's theory of the Cooperative Principle, the explanation that Dr. Budi offered in response to the producer's inquiry indicates a violation of the maxim of relevance. In accordance with the previously stated maxim, it is anticipated that communicative participants will provide information that is relevant to the converses that are now taking place. However, rather than immediately replying to the producer's questions about the specifics about the case and Jessica's guilt, Dr. Budi dismisses the questions as being difficult to answer. It is impossible for the conversation to take place in a cooperative manner because of these refusals to engage with the producer's line of questioning and reveal information that is relevant to the conversation. Such refusals also limit the documentary's ability to examine the case.

Datum 5

(00:46:20) *Producer: "So it was you who wrapped the coffee up and put it aside?"*

(00:46:32) *Rangga: "I took the coffee, wrapped it, and put it over there. When the police arrived, they took the coffee."*

(IC0hr/46mnt/20scd-0hr/46mnt/32scd)

This conversation unfolds between the producer and Rangga, a barista at Olivier Café, the crime scene of Mirna Salihin's death. The producer seeks confirmation from Rangga about whether he wrapped the coffee and put it aside at the café where Mirna Salihin's death occurred. The scene suggests that the producer may only be expecting a simple yes or no response, possibly followed by additional explanation if necessary.

Rangga's response to the producer's question represents a violation of the maxim of quantity within Grice's Cooperative Principle framework. This maxim dictates that conversation participants should provide as much information as is necessary for the conversation, without over explaining it with unnecessary details. Instead of offering a concise yes or no answer to the producer's question, Rangga proceeds to provide a detailed explanation of the coffee's condition from the moment it affected Mirna until the police arrived at the scene. By delivering more information than what was required to answer the producer's question, Rangga violates the maxim principle of quantity.

Datum 6

(00:58:41) *Beng-beng Ong: "I wouldn't suspect that it's cyanide. I would consider other causes including natural disease."*

(00: 58:50) *Prosecutor: "When did you come to Indonesia?"*

(IC/0hr/58mnt/41scd-0hr/58mnt/50scd)

The conversation takes place within the courtroom. Beng-beng Ong, qualified pathologist from Singapore, has expressed his opinion that it is probable that Mirna Salihin's death was not caused by cyanide but rather by a natural disease. After that, the prosecutor takes the questioning in a different direction by asking about

Beng-beng Ong's entry in Indonesia, which is the primary topic of discussion at this point.

Grice's basis for the Cooperative Principle suggests that the prosecutor's response to Beng-beng Ong's declaration indicates a violation of the maxim of relevance. This is because the prosecutor's position contradicts the principle. It is said in this maxim that individuals who take part in a conversation are required to provide knowledge that is pertinent to the topic that is currently being discussed. The prosecution decided to shift the subject to a topic that was absolutely unconnected to the issue at hand, which was the time when Beng-beng Ong arrived in Indonesia. Instead of responding to Beng-beng Ong's statement or demanding clarification on his expert opinion, the prosecution chose to divert the subject to a topic that was completely unrelated to the matter at hand. This shift in debate does not address the actual issues that were brought up by Beng-beng Ong's comment, which not only weakens the significance of the discourse but also diminishes the significance of the conversation itself.

Impact to the Effective Communication

Effective communication is the process of conveying a message to someone or a group of people in a way that ensures the intended meaning is understood by the receiver without any distortion or misinterpretation. Regarding to Akilandeswari, et al (2015). There are several criteria for a communication can be categorized as effective, namely: enhance listening skills by being more attentive and responsive, ensuring clear expression and thorough articulation of thoughts. State intentions clearly in conversations, seeking consent from others. Instead of complaints or criticisms, convert them into specific requests and provide explanations. Foster deeper dialogue by asking open-ended and creative questions. Show gratitude and appreciation more often, prioritizing effective communication as a vital aspect of daily routines.

Topic Changing:

Producer: "If you're in the courtroom, tell us what that court's like, right?"

Mr. Edi: "No, I should start maybe from the first how I feel that Jessica is the killer." Producer: "I'm going to start about you first."

Mr. Edi: "Understand."

(IC/0hr/02mnt/14scd–0hr/02mnt/19scd)

Mr. Edi's violation of the maxim of relevance disrupts effective communication within the documentary. By failing to address the producer's inquiry about the courtroom atmosphere, Mr. Edi introduces ambiguity and confusion into the conversation, hindering effective communication. In this conversation, the producer asks Mr. Edi to describe the atmosphere in the courtroom, but Mr. Edi attempts to divert the discussion to his personal feelings about Jessica's guilt. The producer then reasserts the intended focus by clarifying, "I'm going to start about you first," which Mr. Edi acknowledges.

The impact of this violation in the given conversation lies when there is a redirection disrupts the flow of communication. This situation impacts effective communication in several ways. Firstly, it demonstrates a lack of responsive listening, as Mr. Edi was not fully attentive to the producer's specific request. Effective communication requires careful listening to ensure responses are relevant, and the need for the producer to restate and clarify the topic disrupts the conversation's efficiency, potentially causing topic changing. Secondly, the producer's repetition and clarification of topic changing underscore the importance of clearly stating conversational intent and ensuring both parties understand and consent to the discussion topic. This helps realign the conversation's focus and emphasizes the importance of staying on topic. Thirdly, Mr. Edi's initial response deviates from providing a clear and complete answer, highlighting the necessity of clear and complete expression to maintain conversation relevance. Lastly, in attempting to shift the conversation, Mr. Edi indirectly communicates dissatisfaction with the current topic.

Repetition:

Jessica: "I felt I was pressured to give those answers." Prosecutor:

"What sort of pressure?"

Jessica: "Pressure through words, just like how you pressure people sometimes." Prosecutor:

"What sort of pressure? Try to answer."

(IC/0hr/33mnt/00scd–0hr/33mnt/08scd)

In response to the prosecutor's inquiry concerning whether or not she felt forced to provide particular answers during the trial, Jessica provides somewhat vague and ambiguous response, which is what prompted the prosecutor to inquire about further explanation. After that, Jessica makes an unclear reference to the pressure being exerted by verbal persuasion, comparing it to the action employed by the prosecutor to the other people. In an effort to elicit a more lucid response, the prosecution reiterates the inquiry in an effort to obtain additional information. During this conversation between Jessica and the prosecutor, Jessica's initial statement is not clear and does not provide enough specifics, which makes it difficult for them to communicate effectively.

The influence that maxim violations have on the efficiency of communication is brought to light by the conversation that took place between Jessica and the prosecutor. As a result of Jessica's ambiguous comments, the flow of communication is impeded, and the prosecutor is required to ask the same questions multiple times in an effort to shed light on her statements. In order to encourage meaningful discussion and prevent misunderstandings, it is essential to express oneself in a way that is both clear and comprehensive. This repetition emphasizes the significance of doing so. Additionally, it highlights the importance of asking open-ended questions in order to encourage responses that are detailed and insightful, which eventually results in an increase in the efficiency of communication exchanges

CONCLUSION

From the data collected, it was found that the most dominant type of maxim violation in the documentary is maxim of relevance with 50% percentage. Participants often failed to address the topic at hand or provide relevant responses to inquiries, thereby disrupting the flow of communication. Maxim Violation of Quality has a 0% percentage means that the violation of maxim of quality did not appear on this documentary. According to Kudeikina & Kija in 2023, in legal proceedings, individuals who have a direct affiliation with the victim or suspect are generally more inclined to be truthful compared to those who lack such a relationship. The moral and legal responses to violence are influenced by the social roles of the victim and offender. It can be seen from the analysis of this research that show none of the informant violate the maxim of quality; by being truthful nor telling lies in the courtroom and inside the process of the interview with the producer of Ice Cold documentary.

Several maxim violations that occurred in the conversation of Ice Cold: Murder, Coffee, and Jessica Wongso has impacting to the elements of effective communication based on Akilandeswari, et al (2015). There are 3 elements and actions that have been proven to be carried out by several informants in Ice Cold documentary. There is topic changing, repetition and objection. Maxim violations found in the documentary is to underscore the importance of adhering to cooperative principles in communication. Effective communication relies on mutual understanding and clarity among participants, which can be achieved by following the maxims outlined by Grice.

REFERENCES

- Afrianto, A. (2017). Grammatical Cohesion In Students'writing: A Case At Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 2(2), 97-112.
- Alfina, E. O. (2016). The Maxim Violation on Mata Najwa Talk Show _Selebriti Pengganda Simpati_. *LANTERN (Journal on English Language, Culture and Literature)*, 5(2).
- Andy, A., & Ambalegin, A. (2019). Maxims violation on —night at the museumI Movie. *Jurnal Basis*, 6(2), 215-224.
- Arofah, S., & Mubarok, H. (2021). An analysis of violation and flouting maxim on teacher-students interaction in English teaching and learning process. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(2), 249-256.
- Astaman, O., & Rido, A. (2023). Direct Commissive Speech Act in President Joe Biden's Address to Congress. *TEKNOSASTIK*, 21(2), 78-92.

- Ayasreh, A. M., Al-Sabti, N., Suleiman Awwad, A., Mansoor, M., & Razali, R. (2019). Instances of violation and flouting of the maxim by Gaddafi interview during the Arab spring. *International Journal of English and Education*, 8(1), 185-193.
- Betti, M. J., & Yaseen, K. S. (2020). The Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of Conversational Maxims at the University Level. *Education, Language and Sociology Research*, 1(1), 43-60.
- Capone, A. C. (2021). Istvan Kecskes, English as a lingua franca: The pragmatic perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. *Journal of Linguistics*, 57(1), 214-218.
- Chaniago, E. P., & Kuswoyo, H. (2023). Teacher's Directive Illocutionary Acts In English Language Classroom. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 4(2), 216-220.
- Ceballos, C. T., & Sosas, R. V. (2018). On court proceedings: A forensic linguistic analysis on maxim violation. *Journal of Nusantara Studies (JONUS)*, 3(2), 17-31.
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative sociology*, 13(1), 3-21.
- Eklesia, G., & Rido, A. (2020). Representation of people with HIV/AIDS in The Jakarta Post and Jakarta Globe: A critical discourse analysis. *Teknosastik*, 18(2), 120-133.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Gulö, I., & Rahmawelly, T. V. (2019). An analysis of omission in students' English writings. *Teknosastik*, 16(2), 55-59.
- Handayani, M., & Pranoto, B. E. (2023). Theo van Leeuwen's Exclusion and Inclusion Strategies: An Analysis of President Joe Biden's Political Speech. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 4(1), 65-72.
- Hazelwood, K., Blalock, E., & Cates, J. (2018). Portrayal of Gender and Race in Popular Television Shows. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 62(1), 1-20.
- Ivana, P. S. I., & Suprayogi, S. (2020). The representation of Iran and United States in Donald Trump's speech: A critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 1(2), 40-45.
- Jati, D. A., Muslim, M. U., & ARYANI, U. (2017, October). Grice Maxim Violation in Schizophrenic Patients' Speech. In *Sixth International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2017)* (pp. 122-125). Atlantis Press.
- Kudeikina, I., & Kaija, S. (2023). Truth in Criminal and Civil Proceedings: Ensuring Sustainable Development of Society and Social Peace. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 12(4), 355-355.
- Kurniadi, S. (2021). A Gricean Maxim Analysis in Teaching and Learning Process at Higher Level Education. *Jurnal Inotera*, 6(2), 112-118.
- Kuswoyo, H., & Rido, A. (2019). Process types of transitivity system in engineering lecture introduction: A pedagogic discourse. *Lingua: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 19(2), 85-96.
- Kuswoyo, H., Sujatna, E. T. S., Indrayani, L. M., & Rido, A. (2020). Cohesive conjunctions and and so as discourse strategies in English native and non-native engineering lecturers: A corpus-based study. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(7), 2322-2335.
- Kuswoyo, H., & Susardi, S. (2018). Thematic Progression in EFL Students' Academic Writings: A Systemic Functional Grammar Study. *Teknosastik*, 14 (2), 39.
- Loock, K. (2018). American TV series revivals: Introduction. *Television & New Media*, 19(4), 299-309.

- Sari, P. I., & Pranoto, B. E. (2022). an Analysis of Illocutionary Act and Perlocutionary Act Towards the Queen Elizabeth'S Speech Entitled We Will Succeed and Better Days Will Come. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 3(1), 24-33.
- Sartika, L. A., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). Analysis of Humor in the Big Bang Theory By Using Relevance Theory: a Pragmatic Study. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 2(1), 1-7.
- Suprayogi, S., & Pranoto, B. E. (2020). Virtual Tourism Exhibition Activity In English For Tourism Class: Students'perspectives. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 7(2), 199-207.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a qualitative document analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(1), 64-77.
- Östman, J. O., & Verschueren, J. (2022). Handbook of Pragmatics. *Handbook of Pragmatics*, 1-1904.
- Qodriani, L. U. (2021, April). English interference in bahasa Indonesia: A phonology-to-orthography case in Instagram caption. In *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings (Vol. 3, pp. 349-355)*.
- Qodriani, L. U., & Wijana, I. D. P. (2021, March). The new'adjacency pairs in online learning: categories and practices. In *Ninth International Conference on Language and Arts (ICLA 2020)* (pp. 121-125). Atlantis Press.
- Raharja, A. U. S., & Rosyidha, A. (2019). Maxim of cooperative principle violation by Dodit Mulyanto in standup comedy Indonesia season 4. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 62-77.
- Rahmi, S. S., Refnaldi, R., & Wahyuni, D. (2018). The violation of Conversational Maxims found in political conversation at Rosi Talkshow. *English Language and Literature*, 7(1), 1-14.
- Rido, A., Kuswoyo, H., & Nuansa, S. (2020). Questioning strategies in English literature lectures in an Indonesian university. *Lingua Cultura*, 14(2), 241-253.
- Rovita, A., & Gulo, I. (2022). Politeness Strategy in Refusal of The Guests of The Ellen Show. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 3(1), 48-60.
- Sari, D. F., Nuraini, L., & Muthalib, K. A. (2019). An analysis of maxim violations in a movie and their impacts on effective communication. In *Proceeding of The International Conference on Literature (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 711-720)*.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1978). On Some Questions and Ambiguities in Conversationl Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Current trends in text linguistics*, 2, 81.
- Tumimomor, K., Tuna, J. R., & Kamagi, S. (2023). An Analysis Of Maxim Violation In The Legend Of Dragoon Game. *Jotell: Journal of Teaching English, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(5), 613-637.
- Toerien, M. (2014). Conversations and conversation analysis. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis*, 327-340.