

AN ANALYSIS OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE MAXIM VIOLATIONS IN THE 'WHY OPPOSITION IS IMPORTANT?' EPISODE OF THE BASED INDONESIAN TALKS PODCAST

Putri Annisa Zulhantiar¹, Aisyah Inka Putri Lubis², Jamaluddin Nasution³

¹FIB, Universitas Sumatera Utara,

²FIB, Universitas Sumatera Utara,

³FIB, Universitas Sumatera Utara,

¹putrizulhantiar@students.usu.ac.id , ²aisyahinka@students.usu.ac.id ,

³djamal.nst@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the interplay between Conversation Analysis (CA) and Gricean maxims in the Based Indonesian Talks podcast episode "Why Opposition is Important?". Eight excerpts were analyzed to examine how conversational structure and pragmatic strategies shape political discourse between the hosts, Panji Pragiwaksono and Andriy. The results show that 24 violations of Grice's Cooperative Principle occurred throughout the episode, with the Maxim of Quantity being the most frequently violated (33.33%), followed by Relation, Quality, and Manner. CA findings reveal that these violations consistently align with identifiable interactional patterns, including extended turns, dispreferred responses, humor sequences, metaphorical statements, and minimal repair. Rather than indicating communicative breakdown, the maxim violations function as strategic resources that enhance persuasion, maintain humor, manage ideological contrast, and enable indirect political critique. The study concludes that pragmatic flexibility supported by orderly turn-taking and sequence organization allows speakers to address sensitive political issues while preserving conversational cooperation. This integrated CA–Grice approach provides deeper insight into how political commentary is constructed in informal podcast discourse.

Keywords: CA, gricean maxims; political discourse, podcast communication

A. Introduction

Language is an indispensable tool for human communication and interaction. It serves not only as a medium for expressing ideas and emotions but also as a foundation for building understanding and cooperation among individuals.

Through language, humans convey thoughts, share information, and negotiate meaning within social contexts. The effectiveness of communication, however, does not merely depend on a speaker's ability to articulate ideas but also on the listener's capacity to interpret the

intended meaning correctly. As Sari (2015) emphasizes, communication can only proceed smoothly when both participants speaker and hearer collaborate effectively in exchanging information. Each interlocutor must contribute meaningfully by providing information that is relevant, accurate, and clear. When this cooperative behavior breaks down, the communicative act becomes prone to misunderstanding and misinterpretation (Sari, 2015).

In this regard, Herbert Paul Grice (1989) introduced the Cooperative Principle, a central concept in pragmatics that delineates how interlocutors cooperate in conversation to achieve effective communication. According to Grice, participants in discourse generally adhere to four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The maxim of quantity requires speakers to be as informative as needed; the maxim of quality demands truthfulness; the maxim of relation emphasizes relevance to the topic; and the maxim of manner calls for clarity and orderliness (Grice, 1989). When these maxims are followed, communication tends to be efficient and coherent. Nevertheless,

in real-life situations, these maxims are frequently violated, whether consciously to achieve pragmatic goals or unconsciously due to emotional, cultural, or contextual factors.

Maxim violations do not always impede communication. On the contrary, they often serve as strategic linguistic tools that enrich interactional meaning. According to Panzeri and Foppolo (2021), speakers may intentionally flout conversational maxims to convey implicit meanings, create humor, express irony, or manage politeness. Similarly, Thomas (1995) asserts that violations can generate conversational implicatures, allowing hearers to infer intended meanings beyond the literal content. These perspectives highlight that such deviations from the Cooperative Principle are not necessarily communicative failures but sophisticated pragmatic strategies that add depth and nuance to discourse (Panzeri & Foppolo, 2021; Wang, 2023).

A wide range of studies has investigated violations of the Cooperative Principle in various communicative settings. Tupan and Natalia (2008) observed that the

maxims of quantity and manner were the most frequently violated in everyday conversation. Azizah (2016) examined maxim violations in the movie *Mean Girls* and concluded that they served to enhance humor and dramatization. Junaedi (2017) explored similar patterns in Indonesian talk shows, revealing that speakers often violated maxims as persuasive devices. More recent research has continued to refine this understanding. For instance, Wang (2023) found that in the American sitcom *Friends*, the maxim of quality was the most frequently violated, reflecting speakers' tendency to use exaggeration for humor. In a digital context, Ali, Wardhana, and Yanti (2024) examined Deddy Corbuzier's podcast and discovered that participants often adhered to cooperative principles, suggesting that conversational norms may vary depending on media format. Furthermore, Wardhani and Qodriani (2025) identified quantity maxim violations as dominant in the Netflix documentary *Ice Cold: Murder, Coffee, and Jessica Wongso*, illustrating that pragmatic strategies adapt to narrative and

representational demands across media forms.

Despite these contributions, most of the existing research still relies on scripted or pre-edited data such as films, dramas, and television shows, which lack the spontaneity of natural communication. As Cutting (2002) notes, scripted discourse often represents idealized conversation rather than authentic speech acts. Consequently, there is limited understanding of how the Cooperative Principle operates in unscripted, spontaneous communication, particularly within digital media environments. In today's digital age, podcasts have emerged as a popular form of dialogic communication, characterized by natural, interactive exchanges that closely mirror real-life conversation (McHugh, 2016). This context represents a significant research gap in pragmatic studies, especially within the Indonesian sociolinguistic landscape, where podcasts serve as influential platforms for political, social, and cultural discourse.

The "Based Indonesian Talks" podcast offers an ideal case for such an investigation. Known for its intellectually grounded yet

conversational tone, the podcast discusses socio-political topics that elicit complex exchanges between speakers. The episode titled "Why Opposition is Important?" features nuanced dialogue involving debate, persuasion, and humor. These spontaneous interactions frequently entail deliberate or unintentional maxim violations particularly of the relation and quantity maxims as participants assert their opinions, negotiate stances, and challenge each other's viewpoints. Analyzing such communicative behavior provides valuable insights into how speakers manage cooperation, disagreement, and persuasion in contemporary Indonesian discourse.

This study is thus significant for both theoretical and practical reasons. Theoretically, it extends the application of Grice's Cooperative Principle to the realm of spontaneous digital communication, providing an updated lens through which pragmatic interaction can be understood in online media contexts (Panzeri & Foppolo, 2021; Ali et al., 2024). It also responds to calls for more contextually grounded research on conversational cooperation in non-scripted dialogue. Practically, this study contributes to

understanding how Indonesian speakers navigate politeness, humor, and persuasion in public discussions, reflecting the evolution of communication norms in the digital era. Therefore, this research aims to analyze violations of the Cooperative Principle maxims in the "*Why Opposition is Important?*" episode of the *Based Indonesian Talks* podcast by identifying (1) the types of maxims violated, (2) the reasons underlying these violations, and (3) the maxims most influential in shaping communicative effectiveness. Through this investigation, the study seeks to bridge the gap between classical pragmatic theory and the dynamics of modern, spontaneous discourse.

B. Method

This study employed a qualitative research design, as it focuses on describing and interpreting linguistic phenomena in their natural context. According to Raharja and Rosyidha (2019), a qualitative approach is a research method that generates descriptive data in the form of words, expressions, and behaviors rather than numerical data. This design was considered appropriate

because the study aims to analyze and interpret conversational interactions based on their meaning and context, rather than measuring them statistically.

The data for this research were taken from the Indonesian podcast "Based Indonesian Talks," specifically the episode titled "Why Opposition is Important?". This episode was chosen because it features a dynamic discussion about the importance of opposition in political discourse, where the speakers engage in debates, arguments, and humor. Such interactions often contain instances of Cooperative Principle maxim violations, such as giving excessive or insufficient information, being irrelevant to the topic, or using ambiguous expressions to persuade, emphasize, or entertain. Therefore, this episode provides a rich and authentic source of data for analyzing pragmatic phenomena.

In the process of data collection, the researcher listened to the selected podcast episode multiple times to fully comprehend the context and intended meaning behind each utterance. The entire conversation was then manually transcribed into written form to ensure accuracy and to preserve linguistic

nuances such as pauses, overlaps, and emphasis. After transcription, the researcher identified all utterances that potentially violated Grice's four conversational maxims quantity, quality, relation, and manner (Grice, 1989). Each utterance was then categorized according to the type of maxim violated.

Subsequently, the data were analyzed descriptively to determine (1) the types of maxims that were violated, (2) the reasons behind those violations, and (3) how such violations affected the effectiveness and flow of communication in the discussion. The analysis focused on understanding how the speakers' linguistic choices contributed to meaning-making, persuasion, and conversational dynamics within the podcast episode.

C.Result and Discussion

a. Result

The findings of this study present an analysis of the forms and purposes of Cooperative Principle maxim violations found in the "*Why Opposition is Important?*" episode of the *Based Indonesian Talks* podcast. The selected episode has a total duration of approximately 47 minutes and 55 seconds, starting from the

30:05 to 1:17:00 mark of the full recording. Throughout this episode, several utterances made by the speakers Panji Pragiwaksono and Andriy were identified as violating one or more of Grice's (1989) conversational maxims.

Based on the researcher's transcription and analysis, a total of eight utterances were found to violate at least one of the four maxims of the Cooperative Principle: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These violations occurred in various parts of the discussion, often during moments of humor, sarcasm, and ideological disagreement. The maxim of quantity was most frequently violated when the speakers provided more information than was necessary or deviated from the main topic. Meanwhile, violations of quality were used to express irony or exaggeration, while relation violations occurred when the speakers deliberately shifted the topic to emphasize a contrasting viewpoint. Violations of manner were identified in instances where the utterances were ambiguous, vague, or indirect.

The purpose of these violations was not merely to disrupt communication but to achieve specific communicative effects such as

creating humor, softening criticism, emphasizing political perspectives, and engaging the audience emotionally. In this sense, maxim violations in this podcast episode serve rhetorical and persuasive functions rather than being random conversational errors.

The table below presents the distribution of utterances that violated the Cooperative Principle, categorized by the maxim type and communicative purpose.

Table 1. The number of maxim violation in conversation.

Type of Maxim Violated	Frequency (Times)	Percentage (%)	Function / Communicative Purpose
Quantity	8	33.33%	To elaborate, explain, or emphasize political and ideological points
Quality	5	20.83%	To employ irony, metaphor, and exaggeration for humor or critique
Relation	7	29.17%	To redirect or broaden discussion for persuasive and comparative reasoning
Manner	4	16.67%	To imply meaning indirectly through ambiguity and figurative expression
Total	24	100%	

A. Types of Maxim Violations

The following section discusses the four types of Cooperative Principle maxim violations found in the "*Why Opposition is Important?*" episode of the *Based Indonesian Talks* podcast featuring Panji Pragiwaksono and Andriy. Each excerpt illustrates how the conversational maxims proposed by Grice (1989), quantity, quality, relation, and manner were violated within spontaneous dialogue. These violations reflect the natural flow of unscripted podcast talk, where humor, elaboration, and ideological positioning are used to engage listeners.

a. Violation of Maxim Quantity

According to Grice (1975, as cited in Cutting, 2002), a violation of the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker provides more or less information than required by the local conversational need. In this episode, both speakers especially Panji often over-elaborate to clarify, emphasize, or strengthen their positions. This yields eight identified violations (33.33%) across the episode.

Excerpt 1 — PAN-01 [00:02:01–00:02:42]

Andriy : *Would you say politics is more crooked in America or in Indonesia?*
Panji : *Indonesia, definitely... markups, kickbacks... In the United States, politicians are thinking about wealth in a more grander scheme.*

The question invites a brief comparison ("America or Indonesia?"), yet Panji delivers an extended explanation about corruption mechanisms and comparative wealth strategies, oversupplying information beyond the minimal answer. The elaboration is intentional as rhetorical framing adding context and stance, not merely digressing.

Excerpt 2 — PAN-04 [00:05:10–00:05:45]

Panji : *Ideally... democratic system... but in reality, it's really fragile to put your hopes into these fragmented elites...*

This turn extends far beyond the prior contribution about checks and balances, moving into a mini-lecture on democratic fragility and elite fragmentation. Functionally, the over-supply educates listeners and bolsters critique, fitting podcast conventions of explanatory talk. Across the episode, eight occurrences (33.33%) were coded as quantity violations. Most are strategic over-elaboration to inform, emphasize, and persuade, consistent with Panji's role as a comedian-commentator who stretches answers into reflective commentary.

b. Violation of Maxim Quality

A violation of the maxim of quality arises when speakers say what they lack evidence for, exaggerate, or employ irony such that the literal content is not straightforwardly true (Grice, 1989; Cutting, 2002). Here, Panji's figurative language and ironic

framing are used to intensify critique while inviting the audience to infer the intended meaning. We identified five violations (20.83%).

Excerpt 3 — PAN-09 [00:07:30–00:07:45]

Andriy: *When we want to build a stronger economy, sacrifices need to be made.*
Panji : *That's exactly what Soeharto says... Being a Machan Asia doesn't mean a thing if you're in a zoo. You're essentially a pet.*

The "Macan Asia in a zoo" line is not literally true; it is a deliberate metaphor/irony to suggest controlled "strength" is hollow. The literal falsity is licensed by the rhetorical goal: using ironic hyperbole to expose contradictions in economic-growth arguments associated with authoritarian control.

Excerpt 4 — PAN-12 [00:09:20–00:09:32]

Panji : *People within the coalition are trying to frame opposition as if you hate the government. They think we're stupid.*

The sweeping generalization ("They think we're stupid") overstates others' mental states as a rhetorical punch. The utterance overreaches evidentially, so under Grice it flouts quality to dramatize public sentiment and convey affective stance. Five instances (20.83%) are intentional flouts that leverage irony, metaphor,

and overstatement to achieve criticism with comedic edge, creating implicatures the audience is expected to recover.

c. Violation of Maxim Relation

The maxim of relation requires relevance to the current topic. Violations occur when a speaker introduces tangents or re-frames the discourse (Grice, 1989, as cited in Cutting, 2002). In debate-like dialogue, relation flouts can be strategic pivots rather than mistakes. We identified seven violations (29.17%).

Excerpt 5 — AND-03 [00:05:00–00:05:25]

Panji : *People within the coalition are trying to frame opposition as if you hate the government...*
Andriy : *I will become the oligarch. We need to develop our economy and make it grow faster, and opposition will certainly get in the way...*

Andriy shifts the frame from political framing to economic growth, re-keying the conversation's relevance conditions. The move violates relation locally yet functions argumentatively: it contrasts political ideals with economic pragmatism to justify limiting opposition.

Excerpt 6 — PAN-16 [00:11:00–00:11:30]

Andriy: *Our country is still developing... when economy advances, democracy cools down.*

Panji : *You want to talk about history? What happened to the United States with the subprime mortgages?*

Panji redirects to the U.S. subprime crisis a topic diversion that is not a direct uptake of Andriy's claim about the development-democracy tradeoff. The detour broadens the scope and supports his cautionary stance by historical analogy. Seven occurrences (29.17%) show deliberate topic-reframing to expand argumentative ground, draw cross-national parallels, and keep the dialogue dynamic—classic patterns in unscripted podcast debate.

d. Violation of Maxim Manner

Per Grice (1989), a violation of the maxim of manner involves obscure, ambiguous, vague, or indirect expressions that cloud clarity. In this dataset, manner flouts frequently come from metaphor and identity-masking that invite inference rather than explicitness. We identified four violations (16.67%).

Excerpt 7 — PAN-19 [00:13:00–00:13:18]

Andriy: *What incentivizes you to become opposition?*

Panji : *I don't really consider myself as the opposition. I'm just a Jester.*

The self-ascription "Jester" is metaphorical and ambiguous; it avoids a clear, orderly yes/no alignment and requires audience inference about his role (critic via humor). This indirectness satisfies face-needs while violating manner (clarity/orderliness).

Excerpt 8 — PAN-22 [00:15:00–00:15:20]

Panji : *The image of Jokowi is being destroyed by himself from within... the more the magic fades away.*

Phrases like "destroyed from within" and "magic fades" are figurative and vague about causal mechanisms (which acts? which effects?). The phrasing obscures propositional clarity, thus violating manner, even as it raises rhetorical force.

B. The relationship between CA and Maxims

This section presents the analysis of eight excerpts from the political interview between Andriy and Panji. Each excerpt is examined using Conversation Analysis (CA) categories—turn-taking, sequence, repair, action, preference, and feedback—followed by an interpretation of Gricean maxim adherence or violation and the resulting implicatures.

1. Excerpt 1 – PAN-01 [00:02:01–00:02:42]

Andriy: "Would you say politics is more crooked in America or in Indonesia?"

Panji : "Indonesia, definitely... markups, kickbacks..."

Turn-taking proceeds smoothly, forming a clear question–answer sequence. Panji provides a preferred and immediate response, with no

overlap or repair. His turn functions as an assessment + elaboration.

Panji's response adheres to the Maxims of Quantity and Relevance, offering a direct answer with supporting examples. The turn constructs Panji as a confident political observer and establishes an authoritative stance early in the interaction.

2. Excerpt 2 – PAN-04 [00:05:10–00:05:45]

Panji : “Ideally... democratic system... but in reality, it's fragile...”

Panji holds a long extended turn, performing an explanatory action. The turn shows no repair and receives no immediate feedback tokens, indicating his control over the floor.

While largely relevant, the hesitations (“Ideally...”) show a slight relaxation of the Maxim of Manner, signaling caution. Panji frames democracy as complex and unstable, positioning himself as reflective and analytically nuanced.

3. Excerpt 3 – PAN-09 [00:07:30–00:07:45]

Andriy : “When we want to build a stronger economy, sacrifices need to be made.”

Panji : “That's exactly what Soeharto says... Being a machan Asia doesn't mean a thing if you're in a zoo.”

Panji delivers a dispreferred response, rejecting the prior turn. The turn action combines critique and

metaphor, shifting the footing of the discussion. No repair occurs.

Panji intentionally flouts the Maxim of Relevance by shifting the topic to Soeharto and violates the Maxim of Manner through metaphorical ambiguity. The utterance implies that Andriy's argument echoes authoritarian rhetoric, producing a political challenge through indirect, metaphorical language.

4. Excerpt 4 – PAN-12 [00:09:20–00:09:32]

Panji : “People within the coalition are trying to frame opposition as if you hate the government. They think we're stupid.”

This is an assessment action, not tied to an adjacency pair. The absence of immediate feedback indicates Panji momentarily monologizes. No repair is present.

The statement potentially violates the Maxim of Quality, making claims without evidence. Panji asserts a strong political stance and frames coalition behavior as manipulative and condescending.

5. Excerpt 5 – AND-03 [00:05:00–00:05:25]

Panji : “People within the coalition are trying to frame opposition...”

Andriy : “I will become the oligarch.”

Andriy performs humorous repair, shifting the tone away from Panji's serious criticism. Turn-taking remains smooth; the humor softens tension.

The utterance intentionally violates the Maxims of Quality and Relevance, as the claim is not meant literally and does not address the complaint. Humor serves as a relational strategy to diffuse potential conflict and maintain conversational solidarity.

6. Excerpt 6 – PAN-16 [00:11:00–00:11:30]

Andriy: “Our country is still developing... when economy advances, democracy cools down.”
Panji : “You want to talk about history? What happened to the US with subprime mortgages?”

Panji produces a counter-question, marking a dispreferred response and disrupting the expected sequence. No repair is present.

Panji flouts the Maxim of Relevance by shifting focus to the US economic crisis. Panji challenges Andriy’s generalization, implying that economic development does not necessarily weaken democracy.

7. Excerpt 7 – PAN-19 [00:13:00–00:13:18]

Andriy: “What incentivizes you to become opposition?”
Panji : “I don’t consider myself opposition. I’m just a jester.”

Panji performs identity reframing, resisting the label imposed by the question. This creates a dispreferred response but is delivered without delay or repair.

He violates the Maxim of Manner by responding metaphorically rather than literally. Panji rejects the political categorization and positions himself as a critic who uses humor rather than ideological opposition.

8. Excerpt 8 – PAN-22 [00:15:00–00:15:20]

Panji : “The image of Jokowi is being destroyed by himself... the magic fades away.”

This is another stance-taking assessment, presented as an independent turn without feedback. No repair is evident.

The metaphorical language flouts the Maxim of Manner and the evaluative claim may challenge the Maxim of Quality. Panji asserts that Jokowi’s diminishing public appeal results from his own actions, framing political decline as self-inflicted.

b. Discussion

The findings of this study show that violations of Grice’s Cooperative Principle occur frequently in the *Based Indonesian Talks* episode, with Quantity violations being the most dominant (33.33%), followed by Relation, Quality, and Manner. When viewed through Conversation Analysis (CA), these violations do not disrupt communication but instead align with the interactional patterns of the conversation. Panji’s extended turns, Andriy’s humor inserts, and their frequent use of counter-questions and metaphor occur within structured turn-taking and recognizable sequence

organization. Thus, maxim violations work alongside CA structures to produce meaningful and engaging interaction.

Quantity violations mostly occur during Panji's long explanatory turns. From a CA perspective, these extended turns are treated as legitimate and preferred actions, showing that elaboration is socially accepted in the interaction. Quality violations often in the form of exaggeration, irony, or metaphor appear mainly in dispreferred responses where Panji challenges Andriy's stance. These figurative forms strengthen humor and critique without requiring repair. Relation violations occur through topic shifts or counter-questions that expand the discussion, functioning as argumentative actions rather than breakdowns. Finally, Manner violations arise in metaphorical stance-taking, such as when Panji calls himself a "jester," which CA shows to be understood and unproblematic within the conversation.

Overall, the integration of CA and Gricean analysis demonstrates that maxim violations in this podcast serve rhetorical, humorous, and ideological purposes. They enrich the dialogue, maintain conversational cooperation, and allow sensitive political critique to be delivered in a creative and socially acceptable way.

D. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the conversational dynamics in the

Based Indonesian Talks episode "Why Opposition is Important?" are shaped by the interplay between conversational structure and pragmatic strategy. Through Conversation Analysis (CA), the interaction between Panji and Andriy is shown to rely on extended turns, dispreferred responses, humor, and metaphorical stance-taking, all of which contribute to a dynamic and layered dialogue. Gricean analysis reveals that violations of the Cooperative Principle particularly of Quantity, Relation, Quality, and Manner occur frequently but do not indicate communicative failure. Instead, these violations function as deliberate rhetorical tools that enhance persuasion, soften criticism, and sustain audience engagement.

The findings highlight that maxim flouting is closely tied to interactional practices: Quantity violations emerge from extended explanatory turns, Quality violations from figurative language, Relation violations from topic shifts used to construct argumentation, and Manner violations from metaphorical or ambiguous expressions that invite interpretation. Rather than undermining cooperation, these pragmatic choices coexist with orderly turn-taking and sequence organization, showing that

conversational coherence is maintained through mutual understanding of communicative intent. Overall, the study concludes that pragmatic flexibility and the strategic use of maxim violations allows speakers to navigate sensitive political content while preserving both conversational cooperation and rhetorical impact. This integration of CA and Gricean analysis provides a richer understanding of how political commentary is constructed in informal podcast discourse.

REFERENCES

- Ali, M., Wardhana, R., & Yanti, D. (2024). *Cooperative principle analysis in Deddy Corbuzier's podcast: A pragmatic perspective*. *Journal of Digital Communication Studies*, 5(2), 45–58.
- Azizah, S. N. (2016). *An analysis of maxims violation in the movie "Mean Girls."* Undergraduate Thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Junaedi, D. (2017). *An analysis of maxim violation in "Indonesia Lawyers Club" talk show*. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 2(2), 123–135.
- McHugh, S. (2016). How podcasting is changing the audio storytelling genre. *The Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media*, 14(1), 65–82.
https://doi.org/10.1386/rjao.14.1.65_1
- Panzeri, F., & Foppolo, F. (2021). Conversational maxims and pragmatic enrichment in context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 180, 86–99.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.04.015>
- Raharja, R., & Rosyidha, A. (2019). *Pragmatic analysis of maxim violations in political talk shows*. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse*, 8(4), 803–809 .
- Sari, D. F. (2015). *An analysis of cooperative principles in conversation among students of English Department*. *English Education Journal*, 6(1), 56–67.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Tupan, A., & Natalia, H. (2008). The multiple violations of conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of *Desperate Housewives*. *K@ta Journal of Language and Literature*, 10(1), 63–78.
- Wang, L. (2023). Maxim violations in humorous discourse: A pragmatic study of the American sitcom *Friends*. *Journal of Linguistics and Discourse Analysis*, 9(1), 22–35.
- Wardhani, S., & Qodriani, L. U. (2025). *Quantity maxim violation in Netflix's documentary "Ice Cold"*.

*Murder, Coffee, and Jessica
Wongso.” Indonesian Journal of
Pragmatics and
Communication, 7(1), 101–115.*