

Gricean Maxim Violations in a Javanese Song Entitled *Slénco*

Yulius Nahak¹, Barli Bram^{1*}

¹Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia

*Correspondence: barli@usd.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Conversation, as a complex activity, requires some set of rules to be guided and worked cooperatively. However, violating the rules to create implications in some situations is a powerful and creative way to get across a point. This study attempts to discover the most dominant maxim violation in a Javanese song entitled Slénco by applying a qualitative approach. The data source is taken from the Internet in the form of dialogue manifested via musical communication, which violated Cooperative Principles of Maxims. To conduct this study, three steps were taken: Copying the song lyrics and translating them into English; categorizing them into different types of maxims violation; analysing them based on the violation of each maxim; and then concluded the reasons why the lyricists violated the Cooperative Principle of maxims in their utterances. The findings of the study showed that all types of maxims were violated: eight utterances on the maxim of quantity, three utterances on the maxim of quality, 11 utterances on the maxim of relations, and eight utterances on the maxim of manners. These violations of maxims portray the reality of dyslexia sufferers who are problematic in conversational exchanges and make the lyrics sound funny as a form of art in indirect communications.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Published September 24th 2021



KEYWORDS

Cooperative Principle, Gricean Maxim, maxim violation, Slénco, song lyrics.

ARTICLE LICENCE

© 2021 Universitas Hasanuddin
Under the license CC BY-SA
4.0



1. Introduction

Social interaction with our fellow humans is only possible when it is mediated by language. In line with that, Bauer (2007: 3) asserted that language is a social fact, a variety of social contracts that exists no longer in an individual, however in a community. That means language has gained its value when used as a communication tool to build and maintain community relationships. Banathy and Jenlink (2011: 83) stated that conversation takes place when people talk together and are engaged in full contemplation and deliberation, meaning that the knowledge transferred in conversation must be conceivable so the conversation can run smoothly. Moreover, Papke (2015) insisted that to preserve the feelings of people and their dignity in communication, specific standards of good communication are applied so that the interaction can function interchangeably. As a result, Raharja and Rosyidha (2019) concluded that the language has a more specific role: to build ties, solidarity, and collaboration within society; the language has been used to convey thoughts with feelings that the listener may sense what is being spoken.

Grounded on the idea above, Grice (1975) established a fundamental premise known as the Cooperative Principle, which stresses that when we communicate with one another, we attempt to collaborate to build meaningful dialogues. Furthermore, Grice suggested several more conversational maxims that stand as guiding principles in conversational interaction between the speaker and the hearer. Believe it or not, these general principles that we have in conversations enable us to define some daily characteristics. The importance of respecting the feelings and dignity in our conversations could be reduced if we fail to pay attention to these basic elements. In other words, these maxims help to shape a pattern to be concise, truthful, appropriate, and consistent in our conversational exchange. They lead to the interplay and signaling on how much the conversational exchange violated these maxims (Yule, 2020).

The simplest way to think of Grice's maxims is to consider general rules that we follow in speech. That is not totally correct, though. The fascinating thing about these "rules" is that we frequently break them. It means that the Co-operative maxims on some occasions have to be violated to deliver an unspoken which implies to the interlocutor (Thomas, 1995). Levinson (1983: 110) asserted that when people intentionally violate the maxims, the inferences are created, which indicates that the speakers try to perform some techniques to make their hearers capable of disclosing the implied means

behind their speeches. In the context of the song lyrics, maxim violation is an art of communication. Maxim's violations often occur in actual conversation such as stand-up comedy to create jokes, in daily conversations and talk shows to create humor or release feelings, etc. Besides, there are also Maxim violations committed within the written forms, such as movie script, song's lyrics, etc. This research study aims to identify the maxim violation in a Javanese song entitled *Slénco* since almost all the lyrics violated the cooperative principle of Maxims to create an art of communication.

Maxim violations have been examined through pragmatics, which deals with the ways human beings apply language in actual reality (Papke, 2015). It concerns how the speaker and listeners perceive the significance of an utterance solely depending on the context that affects their interpretation (Bauer, 2007: 13). In addition, Yule (2020) insisted that the meaning of the context is not in words themselves but in what we feel the speaker is supposed to express in that precise context. Therefore, this study is categorized as a pragmatic approach to discover why people often violated the Co-operative Principles of maxims in their conversational exchange.

Another rationale why this study needs to be conducted is due to the limited analysis of maxim violations in song lyrics. In general, there are some current studies on analyzing the Gricean Cooperative Principles of Maxims' violation. The First study held by (Fahmi, R, 2016) aimed to determine the factors that cause the violation of Gricean maxims and which one of the Gricean maxims is often violated in daily conversation EZC students of FPBS IKIP Mataram. The result showed that the maxims violated were the maxim of quantity (30 times), the maxim of quality (20 times), the maxim of manner (10), and the maxim of relevance (5 times). The reason for violating the maxims approved to be caused by cultural factor and social distance factor. In conclusion, the maxim that was dominantly being violated was the maxim of quantity. The second study by Puspasari and Ariyanti (2019) compared the flout of the maxim by Kevin Hart and Abdur Arsyat to identify the difference between American and Indonesian stand-up comedy. In the overall assertion, they found that Kevin Hart flouts the maxim of quantity the most because American culture tends to be direct in communication. Abdur Arsyat flouts the maxim of quality the most because influenced by the Indonesian culture, which is indirect in communication. Another interesting study by Sari, Nuraini and Muthalib (2019) aimed to analyze the occurrences of maxim violations produced by the characters in the movie *Confessions of a Shopaholic* and their impacts on the effectiveness of the movie *Confessions of a Shopaholic* communication. The findings showed that there were 40 utterances containing maxim violations which produce by all characters: 19 times violated maxim manner (47.5%), nine times violated maxim quantity (22.5%), nine times violated maxim quality (22.5%), and three times violated maxim relation (7.5%). The maxim violation that affects communication effectiveness the most is a violation of maxim relation, followed by violation of maxim quantity, manner, and quality. It concluded that the less the maxims violations occur, the more effective communication ensues. The subsequent study is by Puri, and Baskara (2019) aimed to identify the types of violations of conversational maxims created by cartoon comics entitled "Be Like Bro" in the English version and describe how the humorous situation can be made from those violations. The findings show a violation of conversational maxims, which are the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner.

Moreover, it also showed that the humorous situation is created by incongruent meaning in the conversation and releasing the feeling. Last but not least is the study conducted by Manurung (2020). It found that, during the interview, the most flouting maxim was the quantity and manner maxims and the fulfillment of the quality maxim in the assertive-to-tell speech acts. The purpose of flouting the quantity and manner maxim was to make transparent and qualified information, conceal the information, be polite, and make a joke.

Thus far, profound studies of maxim violations in song lyrics have not been conducted extensively. To fill the gap, this study would explore maxim violations in a Javanese song entitled *Slénco*. The research problems are formulated as follows: 1). How do lyricists violate the maxim to emphasize the art of communication in the song *Slénco*? And 2). What maxim violation is the most dominant, and what is the reason for violating the maxim?

To review related literature, the researchers would cover the following concepts of (1) pragmatics, (2) the cooperative principle of maxims, (3) the politeness principle of conversation, (4) the maxims' violation, and (5) the meaning of song lyrics and *Slénco*.

Pragmatics

Interaction is not just an exchange of words but rather a study of the meaning contained in conversational exchange. And interpreting the meaning within a conversational context where people speak is viewed as pragmatics (Griffith, 2006: 6). Wray & Bloomer (2016) asserted that pragmatics concerns a message that is hidden in the conversation. In-depth, pragmatics is the study of hidden meaning or how we apprehend what it intended even when it is not stated or written

(Yule, 2006: 83). These ideas conclude that pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistics that concerns the use of language in social reality and how to produce and comprehend meaning based on the actual context.

Moreover, the pragmatics study of language is also connected with the politeness principle in conversation. In the study of language, politeness shows comprehension of the face of another person. Your face is your self-image in public. Face-threatening behavior poses a danger to the self-image of another person (Yule, 2006:90). This is the emotional and social feel of self that every individual has and expects everybody else to understand (Yule, 2020: 156). According to Leech in the book of Mey (1993:69) stated that the point of politeness as a principle is to minimize the effects of impolite statements or expressions (negative politeness) and to maximize the politeness of polite illocutions (positive politeness). Thomas (1995) argued that this politeness principle is a vital way applied by a speaker to reap some conversation goals, such as setting up and retaining a proper relationship with fellow humans. In this manner, social transformation targets are being urged, and good relationships are maintained.

Cooperative Principle (CP)

The co-operative principle is a fundamental assumption intended to contribute to the aim of conversation, namely cooperative conversational partners (Papke, 2015). This principle, added with the four maxims, was first described by the philosopher Herbert Paul Grice and is often referred to as the "Gricean Maxim". Grice (1975: 45), in "Logic and Conversation," proposed to make one's conversational contribution such as is required, at which it occurs, employing the ordinary motive or direction of the talk exchange in which one is engaged. We can think of reasons why someone might be uncooperative in conversation. Still, in the vast majority of conversations, it is safe to assume that both participants are trying to cooperate.

Gricean Maxim (GM)

Grice came up with the following maxims of conversation that need to be obeyed. A "maxim" is a kind of rule containing behavioral wisdom. However, these rules are not nearly as hard and as fast as the Cooperative Principle. First is the quantity maxim, which concerns how much information it is appropriate for a speaker to give in a discourse. This is proposed to make your contribution as informative as is required. Second, the quality maxim expresses our expectation of honesty in conversation. This is argued to say that which you believe to be true. Third, the relation maxim is suggested to be relevant. This maxim has a central role in maintaining the organization of conversation by preventing random topics. From the hearer's perspective, the maxim of relevance helps us figure out what others mean by their utterance. Fourth, the manner maxim is asserted to be clear, brief, and orderly (Yule, 2006: 97).

In an extra easiest saying, we are predicted by our conversational partners to make succinct, honest, applicable, and clear contributions to the interplay and to notice to us if these maxims are now not being followed (Yule, 2020: 174). By obeying these elements in the conversations, we are prevented from such meaningless discourse. However, in conversational exchange, these maxims are constantly violated for some reasons.

Thomas (1995: 73) described maxims violation as a scenario in which a speaker purposefully generates false implicature in a discussion by disobeying a conversational maxim. Moreover, Papke (2015) argued that violations of maxims happen differently and for several reasons: First is the cooperative principle's violation. A speaker might break the maxim of quality to deceive the listener. In this case, the cooperative principle is also exploited. Jorfi (2019: 364) contended that the violation of maxims commits when the maxims are intentionally manipulated so that the speaker misleads the interlocutor. The second is called signaling a violation (minor violation). An individual would possibly appear and tell you he is violating a maxim and why? The third is known as maxim clash between two or more maxims. For instance, a speaker might violate the maxim of quantity to preserve the maxim of quality. And the last is "flouting," a maxim (major violation) to create a conversational implicature. By violating a maxim, one can imply something beyond what is said. In other words, the maxims can be exploited to communicate indirectly because doing so could hurt us or someone else (Papke, 2015). Therefore, flouting maxims to create implications can be a powerful and creative way to get across a point.

The meaning of song lyrics and term *Slénco*

Hornby (1995) defined the song as a short rhyme or collection of music verses intended to be sung. Moreover, Pettijohn and Sacco (2009) stated how songs tell stories in a way equivalent to how people connect and interact with listeners. And with regards to the meaning of lyrics, Firdaus (2013) asserted that they are printed as a form of communication between the author and the readers. Hence, song lyrics are short-printed rhymes used to communicate with each other by way of singing. Definitively, one of the interesting song lyrics considered an art of communication is a Javanese song entitled *Slénco*. This song's lyrics were violated all the Gricean Principles of Maxims.

Slénco refers to a composition of the Karawitan (a Javanese term for the softness of feelings contained in gamelan art), which is used to represent dyslexia that focuses more on communication problems or incompetence communication. Literarily, *Slénco* means unsuitable, not fitted, and not connected with a commonplace or anything in general. Technically, the word *Slénco* was chosen to affirm the essence of a work that conveys a language communication that cannot be well received by dyslexic sufferers.

The *Karawitan* composition work *Slénco* was developed in the composition of the melody and its rhythmic by experiments worked, both vocals and musicals with the Javanese *Karawitan* system and Western music. *Slénco*'s composition work aimed to relay to the audience the message of knowledge of dyslexia symptoms and to open up space for the world reach of *Karawitan* composition by capturing social phenomena of society more diverse and open than separate types of creativity (Amir: 1).

The latest *Karawitan* composition entitled *Slénco* speaks about the dyslexia phenomenon's incompetent and incompatible contact between people with dyslexia and those around them, manifested via musical communication (Amir: 3). Besides, *Slénco* was the title of a Cak Diqin's *Campursari* song recorded by *Dasa Studio* in 2008. The mixed version of *Slénco* by Cak Diqin explores the lack of contact between two people (a man and a woman) expressed by a lyric.

Knowing the background of the term *Slénco* in both *Karawitan* composition and the *campursari* song lyrics is essential to be opened to the different realities of communication and delivering messages in the context of people with dyslexia and the people around them. It is considered an art of communication, though it violated all the cooperative principles of maxims in the conversational exchange. The limitation of this study is focused mainly on analysing maxims violation in the *Campursari* song lyrics of *Slénco*.

2. Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive qualitative approach that involves a detailed rendering of facts regarding people, places, or activities in a setting (Cresswell, 2012: 247) to analyze Cak Diqin's *Campursari* song entitled *Slénco*. Wray and Bloomer (2016) argued that the qualitative approaches, by definition, involve description and analysis rather than, for example, the counting of features.

The sources of data collection were video downloading from the YouTube site, and song lyrics downloaded online. The data were the utterances in the form of a dialogue between the man and the woman in the song lyrics *Slénco*, which contain iolations of Cooperative Principles of maxims.

This research was carried out in three steps: (1) translating song lyrics from Javanese to English, (2) classifying them of maxims, and (3) analyzing them based on each maxim's violation. Finally, the researchers conclude on the most dominant maxim's violations and the motivations for violating them.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

As the current study explored the violations of the cooperative principle of maxims in the *Campursari* song's lyrics of *Slénco*, the researchers analyzed all the utterances uttered by the lyricists in detail. It has been discovered that all types of maxims were violated, as shown in Table 1.

The percentage overview of violation maxims uttered by the lyricists from the song lyrics of *Slénco* is listed on the table below:

Table 1. The violations maxims found in the song lyrics of *Slénco*

No.	The Types of Maxims' Violations	Frequency	$X = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$
1	Quantity	8	26.7%
2	Quality	3	10%
3	Relation	11	36.7%
4	Manner	8	26.7%
	Total	30	100%

Table 1 above revealed 30 utterances of maxims' that the lyricists uttered in the song lyrics *Slénco*. First, there were eight utterances (26.7%) that violated the maxim of quantity. Violation of quantity maxim happened because the respondent was always uninformative or not going directly to the point of dialogue. Second, there were three utterances (10%) that violated the maxim of quality. The respondent violated the maxim of quality because he exaggerates the speech and says something that he believes to be false. Third, there were 11 utterances (36.7%) that violated the maxim of relation. It happened when Cak Diqin (the male singer) suddenly switched the topic of the conversation, leaving the interpretations depending on the listeners themselves. And lastly, there were eight utterances (26.7%) that violated the maxim of manner because the lyricists exaggerate the items.

3.2. Discussion

Based on the above results, the violation maxim of relation was the most common violation of maxims in the song lyrics of *Slénco* by Cak Diqin. The relation maxim is recommended for contact to be meaningful. That implies that there must be a connection between what the speaker says and what the addressee hears that is linked to each other. However, in this song *Slénco*, there is no connection between the one who asked and the other who responded. In *Slénco*, Cak Diqin (the respondent) purposely turned the subject suddenly to portray how people with the phenomena of dyslexia view various ways of interacting with those around them. This song, thus, violated the most maxim of relation up to 11 utterances (36.7%).

After the maxim of relation, the second dominant type of maxim that Cak Diqin provides was quantity because Cak Diqin made uninformative responses that confused the listeners. In addition, Cak Diqin also did irony or said sarcastic statements. All those efforts are carried out to explore the lack of contact between two people expressed by a lyric and make the song sound funny. The third maxim that Cak Diqin violated to answer the questions of his dialog partner in the song was the maxim of the manner. It was up to 8 utterances that he violated this maxim (26.7%), specifically he made the communication unclear and disorder by switching the topic of conversation that is not needed. The last three utterances (10%) were a violation of quality's maxim. It showed that the minimal infringement by Cak Diqin was the maxim of quality. Cak Diqin has scarcely broken the maxim of quality because it appears to use ambiguity or violates cryptic utterances.

After addressing the complete breach in the song lyrics entitled *Slénco*, the researchers presented examples of Gricean Cooperative Principles of Maxims (GCPM) violations.

a. Violation of Maxim of Quantity

The violation of quantity maxim happens: (a) When or not the speaker conducts circumlocution or not direct to the point; (b) when the speaker is uninformative; (c) when the speaker talks too briefly; (d) when the speaker talks too much; and (e) when such terms are repeated by the speaker (Grice, 1975). Below are the concrete examples of quantity maxim violations in the song lyrics of *Slénco*:

Example 1

Perempuan : "Mas kangmas namine sinten"

Laki-laki : "Sakniki dintene Sabtu"

Translation

Woman : Brother, who is your name

Man : Today is Saturday

This first dialogue is classified as a violation of a maxim of quantity because the man did not give a proper answer to the question asked by the woman. The necessary information should be given in this dialogue about the person's name. But the man intentionally gave different information that was not needed to portray how the abnormal people are having a conversation. This can also exaggerate and dramatize to make the dialogue more creative, although it violated the conversational rules.

Example 2

Perempuan : "Duh aduh jenengan pripun"

Laki-laki : "Sakniki pun mboten ngalor"

Translation

Woman : Oops what's wrong with you

Man : Now I don't go north

The context of this conversation is that the woman asked about the man's situation of what's wrong with him, but the response she received was uninformative. In this regard, the man (Cak Diqin) violated the maxim of quantity because the sentence "now I don't go north" does not need to be known by the women. It should be replaced with I am not feeling well or I am just fine. Still, this kind of violation aims to create art of conversation that portrayed the conversational exchange between people with dyslexia with other people around them.

b. Violation of Maxim of Quality

The violation of quality maxim happens: (a) When the speaker lies or says something that is known to be false; (b) when the speaker makes humorous or derogatory statements; (c) when the speaker denies something; and (d) when knowledge is skewed (suddenly changed direction or position) by the speaker (Grice, 1975). Regard the song lyrics of *Slénco*, and there are some examples of quantity maxim violations:

Example 1

Perempuan : "Aduh kok njengkelke"

Laki-laki : "Dijak ngendikan kok mrono mrene"

Translation

Woman : Oops why are you so annoying

Man : I talk with you but you're saying gibberish (or nonsense)

The sentence 'I talk with you, but you're saying gibberish' violates the maxim of quality because the man said something that was believed to be false. This utterance reveals that the conversation is not honest. In other words, the truth was being manipulated to put the blame on others. However, this is the reality that sometimes happened among the people that are having problems in conversations. This kind of violation of the quality maxim portrayed a misunderstanding of how people with dyslexia perceived a conversational exchange.

Example 2

Perempuan : "Ndadi ora karuan"

Laki-laki : "Estunipun menopo saliwang"

Translation

Woman : It becomes so complex

Man : The truth is the opposite

In this sentence, the man violated the maxim of quality because he skewed the knowledge uttered by the woman 'it becomes so complex' to different knowledge, namely 'the truth is the opposite'. This violation of quality maxim aims to raise a phenomenon on how people with dyslexia are communicated with other people. It reveals that the rules of conversation are often violated in a particular case of abnormal people. But this dialogue seems funny and has an artistic sense of humour, so people don't care much about the rule.

c. Violation of Maxim of Relation

Violation of the maxim of relation happens: (a) when the speaker makes the conversation unparalleled with the subject; (b) when the speaker suddenly switches the topic of the conversation; (c) when the speaker avoids talking about something; (d) when the speaker hides something or hides a fact; and (e) when the speaker does the wrong causality (Grice, 1975). There are two examples of relation maxim violations that are seen in the song lyrics of *Slénco*:

Example 1

Perempuan : "Dene menopo kok wangsul ngidul"

Laki-laki : "Kulo niki namine sinten"

Translation

Woman : Why do you return to the South

Man : What is my name

This dialogue violated the maxim of relation because the response uttered by the man, "what is my name," has no connection to the woman's question, "why do you return to the South". In addition, the second speaker suddenly switches the topic of the conversation to be unmatched by the first speaker. In this case, it violated the maxim of relation. And this violation of the maxim of relation was to project a kind of reality of conversational exchange among those who have a problem is communication with other people, such as the dyslexia sufferers.

Example 2

Perempuan : "Kulo mboten udud"

Laki-laki : "Rumiyin kulo teng Suroboyo"

Translation

Woman : I do not smoke

Man : In the past, I lived in Surabaya.

The utterances in this dialogue violated the maxim of relation, which is approved with the first sentence from the woman: "I do not smoke," which has no relation with the second sentence from the man: "In the past, I lived in Surabaya". This violation is a portrayal of disconnected dialogue, which often happened among problematic people. But, the motive of this violation is to raise the issue of people with dyslexia that often turned the conversation into a mess. Still, it is understood to be a kind of humorous conversational exchange. There is no intention of abusing the rules of communication.

d. Violation of Maxim of Manner

The violation of the maxim of manner happens: a) When the speaker uses ambiguous language; (b) when items are exaggerated by the speaker; (c) when the speaker uses slang in front of people who do not understand it; and (d) when the sound of the speaker is not loud enough to be heard (Grice, 1975). Here are the examples of violation of the maxim of the manner in the song lyrics of *Sléncó*:

Example 1

Perempuan : "Ping kuping walah opo jamur"

Laki-laki : "Ora mungkin mripatku lamur"

Translation

Woman : Is that ears or mushrooms

Man : It is impossible for my eyes to be blind

The response of the man, "It is impossible for my eyes to be blinded" was a violation of maxim of manners because it was irrelevant with the question of the woman, 'Is that ears or mushrooms'. One of the aspects of the maxim of manner is to emphasize the clearness in the conversational exchange. However, the lyricist intentionally violated this maxim to reveal the problem of unclear communication by people with dyslexia.

Example 2

Perempuan : "Penak meneng ora caturan"

Laki-laki : "Memang aku ganteng tiada tandingan"

Translation

Woman : It's better to be quiet instead of speaking

Man : Indeed, I am incomparably handsome

This utterance 'Indeed, I am incomparably handsome' is violated the maxim of manners because the man exaggerated the items. 'Completely handsome' is an exaggeration because no one is handsome completely without any imperfection in reality. This exaggeration is done to make the conversation sound interesting and humorous.

4. Conclusion

It is concluded that lyricists, especially the man violated all the maxim of cooperative principles in various ways to create an art of communication portraying the phenomenon of how people with dyslexia are communicated with other people around them. The man violated the maxim of quantity by changing the information being expected to a piece of different information that is not needed from the conversation. The man violated the maxim of quality by telling the listeners what is believed to be false. At the same time, the man violated the maxim of relation by making the dialogue which is unparalleled with the topic of the conversation. Moreover, the man violated the maxim of manners by using overstatements to make the communication alive. In addition, the man did all these violations only to project the reality of people with dyslexia who are problematic in conversational exchanges and have no other purposes.

The findings of this study can be used as additional material in linguistics studies because the violation of the cooperative principle of maxims in communication is not always negative. Instead, it can be used to create humor in real life, create art of communication, make teaching methods more attractive to lecturers and courses, for example. Therefore, the researchers suggest that lecturers or teachers discuss Gricean Cooperative Principle of Maxims. Future researchers are encouraged to explore further maxim violations and their purposes in other song lyrics, which will be excellent contributions to the academic studies of linguistics.

References

- Amir, F. (2016). *Sléncó*. Undergraduate thesis. Institut Seni Indonesia Yogyakarta. Retrieved from <http://digilib.isi.ac.id/1922/1/Bab%201.pdf>
- Banathy, B. H., & P. M. Jenlink, (2011). *Dialogue as a means of collective communication*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Bauer, L. (2007). *The linguistics student's handbook*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: (4th ed.)*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Fahmi, R. (2016). An analysis of Grice's maxims violation in daily conversation. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 4(2), 91-97.
- Firdaus, E. A. (2003). Textual meaning in song lyrics. *Passage*, 1(1), 99-103.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In Martinich, A. P. (ed). *Philosophy of Language*. (pp. 165-175). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Griffith, P. (2006). *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford advanced learners dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jorfi, L., & Dowlataadi, H. (2015). Violating and flouting of the four Gricean cooperative maxims in friends the American TV series. *International Review of Social Sciences*, 3(8), 364–371.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Manurung, L. W. (2019). Flouting maxims in hitam putih talk show. *Suar Bétang*, 14(2), 151-166. <https://doi.org/10.26499/surbet.v14i2.126>
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Papke, J. P. (2015). *Pragmatics: The relevance of context* (chapter 7). <https://www.coursehero.com/file/73334691/Chapter-7-Pragmaticspdf/>.
- Pettijohn, T. F., & Sacco, D. F. (2009). The language of lyrics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 28(3), 297–311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x09335259>
- Puspasari, M. A., & Ariyanti, L. (2019). Flouting maxims in creating humor: A comparison study between Indonesian and American. *Prosodi*, 13(2), 75-88.

- Raharja, A. U. & Rosyidha, A. (2019). Maxim of cooperative principles violation by Dodit Mulyanto in Stand-up Comedy Indonesia season 4. *Satria: Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 43-61. <https://doi.org/10.1836/jopr.v1i1.62-77>.
- Sari, D. F., Nuraini, L. & Muthalib, K. A. (2019). An analysis of maxim violations in a movie and their impacts on effective communication. *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Literature: "Literature as a Source of Wisdom" (ICoL) XXVIII*.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Wray, A. & Bloomer, A. (2016). *Projects in linguistics. A practical guide to researching language*. (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language*. (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language*. (7th ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.