

AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM IN “THE LION KING 2019” MOVIE

Mutiah¹, Afriana²

Putera Batam University, Indonesia

¹ pb201210038@upbatam.ac.id, ² afriana@puterabatam.ac.id

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to identify the type of flouting maxims in the character in the movie from the data source from the movie “The Lion King 2019” which utterances flouting the maxim. The flouting maxim used the theory by Grice, (1975) cooperative principle which there are four types of flouting maxim: flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of manner and the last type flouting maxim of relation. The researcher used the qualitative method by Creswell, (2018) Then collecting the data used is an observation method. The technique used note-taking. In addition, used the theory identify the pragmatics approach used to analyze the data. The method used to analyze the data is the identification method, the techniques analysis used identity method by Merriam and Tisssdell, (2016). Results found there are fifteen types of flouting maxims there are five flouting maxims of quality, six flouting maxims of quantity, one flouting of manner, and three flouting of relation. Based on the result and discussion are very important in understanding the flouting maxim and are useful for speakers and hearers in creating cooperative communication.

Keywords: Pragmatics; Cooperative Principle; Flouting Maxim

INTRODUCTION

Communication is the most important means is one of the ways a person exchanges information, communicates opinions or interacts in adding knowledge therefore the information communicated in the conversation must be reciprocally accepted so that speakers and listeners know each other how they will respond to the information received. With the presence of science, pragmatics is very useful in directing the meaning of a person’s words. Many people don’t comprehend the context of the discourse, which disrupts the flow of the dialogue and leads to misinterpretations. Pragmatics is the study of context implications, including how a statement is understood in a specific circumstance or how a language’s meaning is interpreted and must interpret expressions based on pragmatism (Lavinson, 2008). In linguistics, adhering to the Principle of Cooperation can lead to effective communication. According to Grice (as cited in Biner, 2013 p.34) The Cooperation Principle is the participant’s input to the stage that takes place and what they do. He breaks down the Cooperative Principle into four flouting of maxims or subsidiary principles. The four flouting of maxims in question are the ones on quantity, quality, relation, and manner, the speaker must provide insightful remarks as required.

The use of language both in societal interactions and in recorded interviews like the one on Jimmy Kimmel Live, reflects the application of the Cooperation Principle issue of flouting maxim, on YouTube that was a conversation between Jimmi Kimmel as interviewer and Keanu Reeves as an interviewee, the show conversation below:

“Keanu: I had a lot of hell I want to hear about it.

Jimmy: I had a God I remember like Dr uh doctor.” (Jimmy, 2022)

The phenomenon above as identified as a flouting maxim of relation Keanu said, “I had a lot of hell I want to hear about it” and then Jimmy answer “I had a God I remember like Dr uh doctor”.

This is a flouting maxim of relation because utterance it is not related to the topic given by the speaker so floating maxim of relation, According to Grice, (1975) the phenomenon of the dialogue above can be attributed to the usage of uncooperative principles. Because the answer to the question is unrelated, it may disrupt the flow of the conversation. Therefore, it can be claimed that of maxim relation were disregarded during the conversation, which led to uncooperative principles that ended the dialogue.

“Simba: Did you see that? Man, that butterfly was right there. I almost had him.

Antelope: I thought it was a lion. You know, the other kind of lion. You know, a real lion? I mean, not that you're not a real lion. But, you know, the kind that eats. I'm gonna go.”
 (Nathanson, 2019)

One of the phenomena of uncooperative conversation found in the movie “The Lion King” 2019, analysis based on the conversation between Simba and Antelope, here Simba as the speaker and Antelope as the hearer is a flouting of the maxim relation because at the time the speakers asked whether to see butterflies there but hearer answered by making another statement, hearer stated an unclear statement saying it looked like a lion so that it caused an unrelated conversation and changed the topic of the conversation, so hearer committed a breach of flouting the maxim relation.

According to Grice, (1975) the versions of the Cooperation Principle that are not observed include maxim infractions. To express a secret meaning, it is done by will fully breaking the rule. In terms of intent, there are numerous types of flouting maxims. Speakers break the golden rule in order to convey an intended meaning to the audience. They don't intend to create false implication during the dialogue. On the other hand, breaking a maxim is done on purpose to deceive the listener's perception of something.

In this research, they are pertinent to the topic of the research, the researcher has used a number of publications in this study to compare it to earlier studies. The first research study by Erdayani & Ambalegin, (2022) the title of “Flouting Maxims in “Fantastic Beasts: and where to find them” Movie” discussion about the Different varieties of floating maxims were examined used theory Grice cooperative principles and the researchers used the qualitative method by Sudaryanto (2015). Data is also analyzed used pragmatics identity methods and pragmatistic-in-equalizing competence techniques. The researcher finding statements by cast members in fifteen statements featuring a flouting maxim have occurred. There are nine cases of the flouting maxim of quantity, one instance of the flouting maxim of quality, four instances of flouting maxim of relation, and one instance of flouting maxim of manner, the rule has been repeatedly flouted by the characters in the film.

The second research study by Marlisa & Hidayat, (2020) a title “The analysis of Flouting Maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) talk show” the aim of this study is to identify the maxim adhered to by the host and guests and to identify the reason for their occurrence. This study identifies and evaluates flouting maxims by Grice cooperation principle there are quality, quantity, manner and relation from data source talk show. The researchers used qualitative method and collected the data from in Good Morning America (GMA) talkshow. The researcher found the most common flouting maxims there are flouting maxims of quantity and manner. Furthermore, this study also reveals the reasons behind the flouting maxims which are beneficial for building pleasant communication.

Similarity and different based on the previous study with the present the theory, that theory preceded the same similarity is investigate used type flouting maxim. The theory used the same theory from Grice, (1975). First, researchers identified the type of flouting maxim by Grice, (1975) there are types: flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of manner and the last flouting maxim of relevance/relation. Secondly the same of research design is used qualitative method. Meanwhile, different based on the previous study is from the data source, the researchers used the data source from the movie a title “The Lion King 2019”

by considering some of the statements above, the researchers wanted to do this study titled “An analysis of Flouting Maxim in “The Lion King 2019” Movie”.

According to Grice, (1975) Cooperative principle there are four sub-principles or maxims cooperative principles there are flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of manner and the last flouting maxim of relevance/relation. These laws are frequently broken by individuals. According to Grice, (1975) stated disregarding maxims happens when the speaker doesn't follow the cooperative principle.

The maxim is one of the cooperative principles, which refers to giving the information required and refraining from contributing more information than is necessary. As a result, each person's contribution to the discussion should be just as informative as is necessary it shouldn't be more or less instructive. And speak only as much as is necessary, without going into further or less detail. According to Grice, (1975), there are four subprinciples or maxims that make up cooperative principles. People consistently break these laws in different ways. Grice, (1975) stated flouting maxims happens when speakers don't follow the rules of collaboration. The various floating maxim categories are split into an equal number of cooperating maxims. This is the main notion behind the Grice theory. This leads to the existence of four different sorts of maxim flouting: flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of manner and the last flouting maxim of relevance/relation, a description of the kind of floating maxim is given below.

A speaker just says something that does not reflect what they truly think when they go against the rule of quality. In failing to state what is regarded to be false and refraining from saying something for which there is inadequate evidence, the speaker flouting the quality maxim, which calls for speakers to make contributions that are contributions that are true Grice, (1975). For example this dialog floating maxim of quality:

“SpongeBob: “Patrick, the zombies are swarming!”

Patrick: “They're gonna eat our brains!”

(Ramadhanisya & Hartati, 2021)

Based on the conversation Patrick's response to SpongeBob's worry in the aforementioned statement is a flouting maxim quality. Patrick believed their brains would be eaten by zombies. But instead of gathering to devour brains, the zombies convened to dance. As to Grice's theory, a speaker transgresses the maxim of quality when he says something that is incorrect or goes against the Flouting Maxim in the Spongebob Movie: Sponge on the Facts. By making false statements regarding zombies, Patrick transgresses the principle of quality.

A flouting maxim of quantity occurs when the cooperative Principle's quantity maxim is not met by the speaker in the dialogue. Whether the speaker provides less or more information than is necessary is one factor in this. When speakers go against the quantity maxim, their informational value changes (Grice, 1975). For example this dialog floating Maxim of quantity:

“Monsieur Jean : “Where are you off to?”

Belle: “To return this book to Pere Robert, it is about two lovers in Fair Verona.”

(Florentina & Ambalegin, 2021)

In the article from Florentina & Ambalegin, (2021) explain Grice's theory of quantity maxim Belle should only contribute as much information as is necessary in a conversation. However, in this instance, Belle goes beyond what is required and gives more information about the book than is necessary because it might be irrelevant or unnecessary.

A speaker who fails to communicate in a relevant way to the dialogue is in the floating maxim of relevance. If flouting maxim of relevance, speakers typically become irrelevant. However, being irrelevant does not always imply a speaker's lack of interest in being relevant. When people speak without regard for the audience's interests, they may be trying to conceal

information or make statements outside the topic (Grice, 1975). For example this dialog floating maxim of relevance:

“Ruby: Were you disappointed? When you got to know me?”

Calvin: How can you ask that?” (Lasiana & Mubarak, 2020)

In the article from Lasiana & Mubarak, (2020) explain when Calvin did not provide a direct response when Ruby posed the inquiry. when Calvin says, "How can you ask that?" in flouting of relevance because they don't want to answer directly. Calvin decided to remain silent. He broke the flouting maxim relevance for that reason.

The flouting maxim of manner is all speakers want to be as clear as possible while expressing themselves. But occasionally, whether the speaker intended it or not, misunderstandings do arise as a result the maxim of manners is not satisfied Grice, (1975). For example, this dialog flouting maxim of manner:

“Mowglie: The red flower doesn’t seem so bad

Balo: Let it loose, and it destroys everything it touches” (Sembiring & Ghozali, 2017)

In the article from Sembiring & Ghozali, (2017) explain that Balo as the hearer, does not respond to Mowglie's statement instead, if the hearer wishes to say something but the hearer clarifies something else and makes an ambiguous statement, making it more difficult for the listener to understand the speaker's intended message.

METHOD

This research discusses the type of flouting maxim found in the movie “The Lion King 2019”. According to Creswell, (2018) stated that the qualitative research method is a method for analyzing and understanding the importance that individuals or organizations place on something human or social. Then collecting the data used is an observation method. The technique used note taking. First, researchers watching and listening the phenomena in data source from talk show YouTube channel. Secondly, the researchers write the script from the talk show. Third, the researchers taking the notes to find the data related to the discussion, namely the types of flouting maxim. The researchers used in this study is identity method by Merriam and Tisssdell, (2016) there are some steps to analyze the data. First, the researchers highlight the role data sentences in talk show based on the type of flouting maxim. Secondly, the researchers selected the data based on the type of flouting maxim because analyzing same the data finds the main data. Third, the researchers analyzing the main data and connecting the data with the theory type of flouting maxim by Grice, (1975) and the last four is the researchers describe phenomena with the main data analyzed based on the type of flouting maxim.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This research revealed that flouting maxim in the movie “The Lion King 2019” from the role the main data there are sixty-seven flouting maxims of quality, fifteen flouting maxim quantity, ten flouting maxim of manner and the last sixteen flouting maxim of relevance/relation, then selecting the role data flouting maxim as from the following table the final of results:

Table 1. Results of Flouting Maxim

No	Type	Frequency
1.	Flouting Maxim of Quality	5
2.	Flouting Maxim of Quantity	6
3.	Flouting Maxim of Manner	1

4.	Flouting Maxim of Relation	3
	Total	15

Discussion

1. Flouting Maxim of quality

Data 1

“Simba : An elephant graveyard? Whoa.

Scar : Oh, dear, I've said too much. Though I suppose you'd have found out sooner or later, you being king and all.”

Analysis based on the conversation between Simba and Scar, Simba as a speaker and Scar as a hearer is a flouting of maxim quality because the speaker provides misunderstanding or false information, the truth is there is no elephant grave there, the intention of the speakers is only to trap the hearer because the grave of elephants is not a grave of the elephant but rather a place for the deceased speaker to be killed by the inhabitants of the place that is not of their class, because the hearer are lied to by the speaker and do not know the actual informed then the hearer committed a breach of flouting the maxim quality. Based on the theory by Grice in the article (as cited in Melinda Kurniati, 2015) The speaker must be truthful in order to uphold the quality maxim dishonest or lying remarks impede communication and lead to misunderstandings.

Data 2

“Scar: My friends. It will take some time, but together we will build our army. Kamari: "Friends", huh? I thought you said we were "revolting scavengers"?

Azizi: Yeah. That you wanted to kill us? Scar: No, no. Let me explain. I was trying to fool him. We will rule together.”

Analysis based on the conversation between Scar with Kamari and Azizi, Simba as a speaker and Mufasa as a listener is a flouting of maxim Quality because Initially, Scar uses a derogatory term to refer to the hyenas, but then he attempts to clarify by referring to them as "friends". This makes the conversation seem inconsistent and indirectly related to the previous conversation where Scar referred to them as "revolting scavengers". The reason for the maxim flouting in this conversation is to highlight Scar's manipulative and devious nature. He tries to trick the hyenas by speaking in two contradictory languages, by insulting them first, but then claiming that he actually wants to ally and rule with them. By not providing consistent and direct information related to the topic, Scar attempts to manipulate the hyenas for his own benefit. Based on the theory by Grice (as cited in Cutting, 2022 p. 35) states that the speaker must give the audience the information they require in order to follow the quantity principle. The amount of information supplied shouldn't exceed or fall short of what is required.

Data 3

“Nala: Simba, get down. It could be dangerous.

Simba: Danger? I laugh in the face of danger. Cool. You hear that, Nala?

Nala: Simba, come on. You've proved how brave you are. Now the sun is going down, I'm not just gonna sit here and...”

Analysis based on the conversation between Nala and Simba in this context explains that Simba commits a flouting of the Maxim of Quality, Simba states that he is not afraid of danger, but this may be perceived as a lie or an over-assertion, Nala then tries to alert Simba to the danger, but Simba does not respond directly to Nala's concerns. He chooses to continue his bravado, ignoring the message conveyed by Nala. hence This conversation shows how Simba tends to be careless. Based on the theory by Grice (as cited in Bayu Andika Prasatyo, 2021)

states where the speaker is expected to provide a correct response or where the speaker does not have sufficient evidence to provide a response to the speaker.

Data 4

“Simba: All lions? Even my dad?”

Scar : Even Mufasa came here when he was your age. Refused to leave until his roar could be heard above the rim.”

Analysis based on the conversation between Simba and Scar, Simba as a speaker and Scar as a hearer is a flouting of maxim quality because in fact the hearer says something is not true indeed not single one lion gone to a place even a king named Mufasa does not come at the place it. So the hearer committed a flouted the maxim quality. Based on theory by Grice (as cited in Sinaga & Handayani, 2020) In this maxim, Grice explains that an utterance must actually be said based on what happens in real life. Obviously, if the utterance is not true, it is based on what happened in reality.

Data 5

“Nala: We've never been that far before. What if we get lost?”

Simba: Relax, Nala. I patrolled the entire kingdom this morning with my dad. There's nothing to worry about.”

Analysis based on the conversation between Nala and Simba, Nala as a speaker and Simba as a listener is a flouting of maxim quality because the listener gives false information where the hearing never went as far as the place but answered never went to the place only to convince the speaker so with this hearer committed a breached of flouted the maxim quality. As explained theory by Grice (as cited in Pratiwi et al., 2021) information should be given by both the speaker and the listener in accordance with actual events. This implies that everyone participating in the discussion should state what they think is true and likely to happen.

2. Flouting Maxim of quantity

Data 6

“Simba : You rule all of that?”

Mufasa: Yes. But a king's time as ruler rises and falls like the sun. One day, Simba, the sun will set on my time here and will rise with you as the new king.”

Analysis: the conversation between Simba and Mufasa, Simba as speaker and Mufasa as hearer, in this case included in the of flouting maxim quantity because hearer provides more additional information, speaker only asks rule all to the hearer, but hearer explains additional information about the ruling king such as sunrise and sinking which should not be informed, the hearer committed a flouted the maxim quantity. Based on theory by Grice (as cited in Tasyarasitaa & Wibowob, 2022) states flouting maxim of quantity when the speaker flouting of maxim quantity because it provides too much information with is not related the topic and little information with topic from speaker.

Data 7

“Nala: So, what are you gonna do?”

Simba: My father once told me to protect everything the light touches. If I don't fight for it, who will?”

Analysis based on the conversation between Nala and Simba, Nala as a speaker and Simba as a listener is a flouting of maxim quantity because the conversation between Nala and Simba in this context explains that Simba did not provide more specific information about what he was going to do and how he was going to protect what he called the illuminated area. He should have given a more concrete answer to Nala's question. Based on theory by Grice (as cited in Gustary & Anggraini, 2021) When a speaker gives too much information or too little information, they are breaking the rule of quantity.

Data 8

“Nala : Oh, where have you been? I thought you were dead.

Pumba: You thought he was dead? I thought I was dead. I thought you were gonna eat me.”

Analysis based on the conversation between Nala and Pumba, Nala as the speaker and Pumba as the hearer is included in the Flouting of the maxim of quantity because the listener provides additional information to the speaker by asking back and giving opinions that do not need to be told, also does not answer the question appropriately when the speaker asks from anywhere but is not answered by the hearer so that the listener flouting maxim of quantity. According to Grice (as cited in Ulfah & Afrilia, 2018) following to the maxim of quantity participants in a discourse must contribute the amount of information that is required. This maxim is broken when one speaks during a conversation more than is necessary. When speaking, individuals should gauge how much information is truly required and just supply what is required.

Data 9

“Simba : But, Dad, don't we eat the antelope?

Mufasa : Yes, Simba. But let me explain. When we die, our bodies become the grass, and the antelope eat the grass, and so, we are all connected in the great Circle of Life.”

Analysis based on the conversation between Simba and Mufasa here Simba as the speaker and Mufasa as the hearer has committed a flouting of the quantity maxim, here the hearing gives more additional information that is delivered so that the listening has ignored the maxim quantity. The speaker just asked if they ate a straw, but the listener answered and added an explanation that should not be required to be informed by the hearer committed a flouted the maxim quantity. Based on the theory by Grice (as cited in Wahyuni et al., 2019) when someone gives information that is not related to the listener, this occurs. Put otherwise, the speaker does not go right to the point. It's possible for the speaker to provide too much or too little information, which could cause misunderstandings.

Data 10

“Simba: And we'll always be together... right?

Mufasa: Simba, let me tell you something my father told me. Look at the stars. The great kings of the past... look down on us from those stars.”

Analysis based on the conversation between Simba and Mufasa, Simba as a speaker and Mufasa as a listener is a flouting of maxim Quantity because this conversation explains that Simba expressed his desire to always be with Mufasa, but Mufasa gave an indirect answer to Simba's question. Mufasa chooses to give a teaching on the wisdom he received from his father about the greatness of the deceased kings. This does not directly answer Simba's question about their togetherness. As a result, the conversation Mufasa changed the topic from question Simba and too much information. According to Grice (as cited in Holifatunnisa & Wuryandari, 2023) The maxim of quantity states that a speaker must provide the information or contribution needed and not provide information that exceeds what is asked or needed.

Data 11

“Simba: Rotting bones? Oozing mud?

Scar: Promise me you'll stay away, Simba. Now, you run along. And remember, it's our little secret, Your Majesty.”

Analysis based on a conversation between Simba and Scar is a flouting of maxim quantity where the hearer answers the question with unnecessary information and does not explain the question from the speaker, hearer responds by suggesting not to approach the place and keep it secret without explaining what place the speakers are asking, Therefore, hearer was committed of flouted the maxim quantity. According to Grice (1975) (as cited in Devi & Ambalegin, 2022) the quantity maxim requires speakers to give as much information as necessary. Therefore, when participants in a discourse give more or less information than asked, it is considered a

breach of the quantity maxim. Less information than what the speaker requests is provided to the listener by the data.

3. Flouting Maxim of manner

Data 12

“Simba: What are you guys doing here?

Pumba: We were not worried.”

The analysis of the conversation above happened between Simba and Pumba, Simba as a speaker and Pumba as a hearer is flouting the maxim manner because aggregation here speaker asks what they are doing but the hearer doesn't explain what they're doing but hearer answers with an unclear statement answer so the hearer is committed to flouting the maxim manner. According to Grice (as cited in Saputri & Sari, 2022) states that speakers should convey clear and direct information and avoid imprecise or ambiguous information. therefore, ambiguous expressions and unclear statements will be considered as a flouting proverb.

4. Flouting Maxim of relevance

Data 13

“Pumbaa: Is it behind that terrifying rock?

Timon : Talk about your fixer-upper. I like what you've done with it, although a bit heavy on the carcass.”

Analysis based on conversations between Pumba and Timon here Pumba as a speaker and Timon as a hearer is a flouting of maxim relation because give statements that are not related to unnecessary questions, then speaker asks about terrifying rock but is answered about fixer-upper which does not include the topic of the question, the hearer answer has nothing to do with the question, so the hearer was considered to flouted the maxim relation. Based on the theory by Grice (1975) (as cited in Sunggu & Afriana, 2020) states demonstrate that in communication, there needs to be relevance between the speaker and the listener. Nothing that is unrelated to the topic at hand, off-topic, or outside the scope of the conversation should be said by the speaker.

Data 14

“Simba: What question? Who are you?

Rafiki: I know exactly who I am. The question is, who are you?

Simba: I'm nobody. So leave me alone. All right?”

Analysis based on the conversation between Simba and Rafiki here Simba as the speaker and Rafiki as the listener is a flouting of the maxim of relation because it gives a statement that returns and does not answer the question, then the speaker Simba answers with “I'm nobody, so leave me alone” Flouting principle of relevance by not providing adequate information and distancing himself from Rafiki's question. then Rafiki also does not provide an answer about his identity, therefore the listener is considered to flouting maxim of relation. In article from Melania & Afriana, (2023) explain when a speaker responds to a listener irrelevant, they are breaking the relationship maxim. According to Grice (1975) everything spoken by the speaker needs to be connected to what the other partner says.

Data 15

“Nala: So, where are we really going?

Simba: How did you know?”

Analysis based on a conversation between Nala and Simba this includes in the flouting of maxim relation where the speaker asks where to go but is answered with a question that has nothing to do with the question from the speaker. The hearer answer by asking another question, so the hearer is believed to have flouting maxim relation by making questions that are not related to a topic and change the conversation, so the hearer has committed a breach of flouting the maxim relation because the hearer is did not answer a question from speaker with relevance. In an article from theory Grice in Cutting (as cited in Arofah & Mubarok, 2021) States that

attempts by speakers to shift the subject of discussion or distract attention are examples of flouting maxim relevance.

CONCLUSION

In conversations that are often carried out daily, they often flouting maxims in the movie “The Lion King 2019” there are sixty-seven from the role the main data, there are twenty six flouting maxim of quality, fifteen flouting maxim quantity, ten flouting maxim of manner and the last sixteen flouting maxim of relevance/relation. The type of flouting the maxim by uttered includes flouting the quantity maxim, flouting the quality maxim, flouting the manner maxim, and the last flouting the relation maxim. This study result and discussion analyzing the data become fifteen data there are six flouting maxims of quality, four flouting maxims of quantity, one flouting of manner and the last four flouting of relation. Based on the findings and discussion are very important in understanding the flouting maxim and are useful for speakers and listeners in creating cooperative communication.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are no words that can express my gratitude to Allah SWT who has given me strength and guidance during the writing of this journal. I would like to say thank myself, and My gratitude also goes to my supervisors who have provided valuable guidance, encouragement, and input so that this journal can be completed and published.

REFERENCES

- Arofah, S., & Mubarak, H. (2021). An Analysis of Violation and Flouting Maxim on Teacher-Students Interaction in English Teaching an. *LANGUAGE CIRCLE: Journal of Language and Literature*, Vol 5 No 2, 249–256. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i2.28148>
- Bayu Andika Prasatyo, Y. K. (2021). An Analysis of Flouting of Maxim in Aiman’s Talkshow “Tudingan Konspirasi Di Balik Korona.” *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, Vol 8 No 1, 38–45. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.259>
- Biner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Blackwell.
- Creswell, J. (2018). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fifth Edit). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cutting, J. (2022). *Pragmatics and Discourse A Resource Book for Students*. Oxford University Press.
- Devi, R. S., & Ambalegin. (2022). Flouting Maxim Types Found in “Thor Ragnarok” Movie. *HUMANITATIS: Journal of Language and Literature*, Vol 8 No 2, 249–260. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v8i2.1648>
- Erdayani, & Ambalegin. (2022). Flouting Maxims in “Fantastic Beasts: and where to find them” Movie. *Jurnal BASIS*, 9, 41–49. <https://doi.org/2527-8835>
- Florentina, S., & Ambalegin. (2021). Floating Maxims in “Beauty and the Beast” Movie. *Ide Bahasa*, 2, 41. <https://doi.org/2774-1605>
- Grice, P. H. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Academic Press, Inc. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ls/study/packs/Grice-Logic.pdf>
- Gustary, D. T., & Anggraini, S. (2021). The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in “UP!” Movie. *Jurnal Ilmiah Lingua Idea*, Vol 12 No. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jli.2021.12.2.4118>

- Holifatunnisa, N., & Wuryandari, D. A. (2023). An analysis of flouting maxim in the Adam Project movie. *Lililacs Journal: English Literature, Language, and Cultural Studies Journal*, Vol 3 No 1, 37–45. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21009/lililacs.031.05>
- Jimmy, K. L. (2022). *Keanu Reeves on Creating a Comic Book, His Marvel Dream Role & Wanting to Become a U.S. Citizen*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=79Uk-8lCCbU>
- Lasiana, & Mubarak, Z. H. (2020). An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Ruby Spark Movie. *IDEAS: Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, Vol 8 No1, 321 – 331. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v8i1.1348>
- Lavinson. (2008). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/52-129414-2>
- Marlisa, R., & Hidayat. (2020). The analysis of Flouting maxim in Good Morning America(GMA) talkshow. *Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 7(2), 133–140. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630>
- Melania, P., & Afriana. (2023). Types of Flouting Maxims analysis in Jurassic World Dominion movie. *HUMANITATIS: Journal of Language and Literature*, Vol 9 No 2, 295–305. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v9i2.2470>
- Melinda Kurniati, S. H. (2015). The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims in the Movies Insidious and Insidious 2. *LEXICON*, Vol 5 No 1, 65–76. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v5i1.41282>
- Merriam, S. ., & Tisssdell. (2016). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implication* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Nathanson, J. (2019). *The Lion King*. <https://www.hotstar.com/id/movies/the-lion-king/1260014782/watch>
- Op.Sunggu, E. J., & Afriana. (2020). Flouting Maxims In “Wonder Woman“ Movie. *Linguistics, English Education and Art (LEEA)*, Vol 4 No 1, 1–12. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v4i1.1394>
- Pratiwi, I. A. P. W. dari U., Verayanti, N. M. D., & Nyoman, N. A. (2021). The types of Flouting Maxim found in Alice in Wonderland movie. *ELYSIAN JOURNAL: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, Vol 1 No 1, 22–30. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36733/elysian.v1i1.1547>
- Ramadhanisya, & Hartati. (2021). Floating Maxim in the Spongebob Movie: Sponge on the run. *Journal of English Education*, Vol 1 No 3, 173–179. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30998/jedu.v1i3.5969>
- Saputri, A. F., & Sari, P. (2022). Flouting Maxims in the Movie “Zootopia” 2016: Pragmatics Study. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal*, Vol 5 No 2, 13496–13507. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i2.5206>
- Sembiring, E. H. B., & Ghozali, I. (2017). An analysis of Maxims Flouting in “The Jungle Book” movie script. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching (JELLT)*, Vol 1 No 2, 33–39. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36597/jellt.v1i2.1869>
- Sinaga, R., & Handayani, N. D. (2020). Flouting Maxims in “White House Down“ movie. *Journal of English Education*, Vol 6 No 1, 37–44. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30606/jee.v6i1.409>
- Tasyarasitaa, A. Z., & Wibowob, A. H. (2022). Flouting of Conversational Maxims Analysis of Characters and Social Contexts in “All The Bright Places” Movie. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, Vol 5 No 2, 59–73. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v5i2.24>
- Ulfah, R. A. A. N., & Afrilia, R. (2018). An analysis of Flouting Maxim in “The B.F.G” movie. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, Vol 1 No 5, 687–695. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i5.p687-695>
- Wahyuni, M., Arifin, M. B., & Lubis, I. S. (2019). An analysis of Flouting of Maxims done by main characters in La La Land movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan*

Budaya, Vol 3 No 3, 384–392.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v3i3.2212>