

---

## Flouting Maxim Types Found in “Thor Ragnarok” Movie

*Rei Shifa Devi<sup>1)</sup>, Ambalegin<sup>2)</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> Putera Batam University  
email: pb181210023@upbatam.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> Putera Batam University  
email: Ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id

Received: 14<sup>th</sup> January 2022 | Revised: 14<sup>th</sup> January 2022 | Accepted: 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022  
Email Correspondence: pb181210023@upbatam.ac.id

### Abstract

The focus of this research is the flouting of maxim purposed by Grice (1975) theory of cooperative principle. This focus concerned on the types of flouting maxim with pragmatic as the approach. In doing the flouting the participants conciously or unconsciously tend to break the principles and unfulfill the rules in cooperative principle. The purpose of this research was to find out about the types of flouting maxim in the movie. This research used the movie directed by Taika Waititi named “Thor Ragnarok”. This study used qualitative research by Creswell (2013) in collecting the data. The observational method and the non-participatory technique by (Sudaryanto, 2015) was used to collect the data. The pragmatic identity method was used to analyze the data, and the pragmatic competence-in-equalizing technique was used as the research technique. The result of this study revealed that there were 17 data related to the flouting maxims. The frequent type found was the flouting of maxim quantity. As the character tend to give information or contribution as required. The second type found was the flouting of maxim quality with 4 times occurrences, where the characters in the movie tend to say something opposite from the factual event. The flouting maxim of relation with 2 times appearance. And lastly, the flout of maxim manner appeared 3 times in the movie.

**Keywords:** cooperative principle, flouting maxim, pragmatics

### 1. INTRODUCTION

There are elements in conversations that are important to make the conversation well conducted. They are the speaker, the hearer, and the context in the conversation. Without the speaker and the hearer, there would not be a conversation. The context in conversation is crucial because without understanding the context the participants in conversations would probably fail to understand the conversation and most likely be uncooperative. Grice (1975) explained that in order to make conversation run cooperatively there are rules and principles to follow. This principle is then called maxims. However, most of the participants in conversation do not always follow the maxims. And this phenomenon leads to the fail of

---

maxims or to be specific flouting a maxim. In flouting the maxims the speaker will intentionally break the principle maxims and wished the hearer to catch the meaning.

One of the phenomena related to the maxim flouting can be shown by example below,

Jimmy : “How about this? After this show, will we see you playing Hawkeye again?”

Jeremy : “**Who?**”

(Jimmy and Jeremy laughed)

The conversation happened between the minutes 02:01 – 02:09 in the YouTube channel by Tonight show with Jimmy Fallon. The discussion above took place with Jimmy as the listener and Jeremy as the speaker. They were discussing the speaker's next projects. Some of the speaker's future projects are classified so he needed to be careful in talking about his future project. In this conversation, the hearer attempted to get further information or spoilers from the speakers but failed since the speaker pretended not to know anything. The speaker's response was considered as flouting the relation maxim since he was uncooperative and unrelated to the question asked. The speaker tried to avoid answering the question and wants the hearer to catch the meaning behind the action. They both burst out laughing because the hearer got the meaning and understood he cannot ask the question. As mentioned by Grice (1975), maxims relation required the participants to be relevant towards the conversation. Then, if the participants fail to fulfill the maxims of relation it can be considered as flout the maxim of relation. As added by Setiawan & Haryani (2020) The maxim of relation requires the participants to respond appropriately to the topic in one conversation. So if the speaker intentionally breaks the maxim of relation then it is called as flouting of the maxim relation or relation.

According to Grice (1975), the conversation can still run cooperatively as long as the speaker and the hearer stick to the context. Additionally, to understand the conversation, context is crucial to keep the conversation on track. The speaker might choose to fail the maxim intentionally to let the hearer knows the hidden meaning. As shown in the example from the movie “Thor Ragnarok” as data source below,

Thor : “Why are you being so weird?”

Banner : “**I don't know. Maybe the fact that I was trapped for two years inside of a monster made me a little weird.**”

The conversation above happened in the minutes 1.22.19 to 1.22.26. Thor, as the speaker, and Banner as the hearer was talking about their hectic situation. The speaker said that the hearer acted weird. And because the hearer emotion was not stable, he gave unclear answered and started to lose his patience. The hearer's reaction was interpreted as flouting the maxim of manner as he became ambiguous and not brief about his statement. The hearer should simply explain why he acted weird. Instead, he became enraged by the situation and began making unnecessary statements. As added by Hadi (2018) maxim

---

manner required the participants to avoid ambiguity and be brief. Birner (2013) to flout the maxim means failing the maxims with the intention that the hearer will notice the violation. Thus, to fail the maxim of manner means the participants intentionally being ambiguous, unclear, and not brief in the conversation.

This research was conducted and supported by previous research that had a relation with the main topic discussed. As from Natasya & Sari (2019) the researchers investigated the flouting maxim's types with the movie titled "Finding Dory" as the data source. The two goals of this research were to find the types of flouting maxims and explain why the maxims of flouting were found in the movie. The main theory used in this research is (Grice, 1975) theory of cooperative principle. The finding showed 17 flouting maxims of quantity as the most frequent flouting appeared. The flouting maxim of relation as the second most frequent with 16 appearances and 1 data for the flouting maxim of quality and 1 data for flouting maxims of manner.

The previous research from Prasatyo and Kurniyawati (2021) focused on the flouting maxim and the implicature. Additionally, the data source used in this research was taken by analyzing the "Aiman's Talkshow". This research was identifying the data by using the (Grice, 1975) theory. And the result revealed that the flouting maxim of relation appeared the most with 6 occurrences. The flouting maxim of manner with 4 times occurrences, the flouting maxim of quantity and quality with each 1 occurrence. The present researchers found similarities along with the differences between the previous research and the present research. For the similarities, these previous researches used theory by Grice (1975) to identify the data. And for the differences, the present study used different media by choosing the movie titled "Thor Ragnarok". Moreover, this present research was concerned with the types of flouting maxim in "Thor Ragnarok" movie.

According to Grice (1975), to be cooperative in conversation means that the participants need to contribute as much as required and at the stage where the participants engaged. This is called the cooperative principle and to obey this principle refers to the maxims proposed by Grice (1975). However, in most conversations, people tend to not obey rules. As long as they get the context the conversation will run cooperatively. When the speakers or participants fail to fulfill the maxims as required then it is called flout a maxim by Grice (1975). Birner (2013) stated that flouting the maxim means to violate intentionally with the expectation for the hearer to understand the unstated meaning. Thus, in flouting the maxims the speaker violates the maxim with intention and wants the hearer to know it. According to Grice (1975) there are four types in flouting the maxims such as,

1. Flouting the maxim of quantity

---

Grice (1975) stated that the quantity of maxim expects the speakers to be informative as much as it required. Thus, to fail or to flout the quantity maxim refers to the phenomenon where the participants give information or contribution less or more than requested. As explained by the example below,

Dr. Rosenthal: "are you sure?"

Calvin : **"yes I'm sure!!!! She's a mother product of my imagination"**

(Lasiana & Mubarak, 2020)

The example above took from the journal article with "spark" movie as the data source. The context of the conversation happened when the speaker asked the hearer with yes or no question. However, instead of answering it, the hearer flouted the maxim of quantity and answered more than required.

## 2. Flouting the maxim of quality

In quality maxim, the speakers are expected to only say something that is factually true. To provide good conversation, the speaker should not say something that they believed to be false (Grice, 1975). Then, to flout the quality of maxim appears when the speakers or participants say something that opposite from the truth. As for instance,

Billy : "You're feeling just fine right now, aren't you Heather?"

Heather : **"I am feeling so much better"**

(Tami & Handayani, 2021)

The conversation was taken from the journal article in the TV series "Stranger Things 3". The context in the conversation occurred when Billy suspected his sister's assumption about he and heather cooperated with the monsters. Heather's response considered as flout the maxim quality as she lied about her conditions. She was actually feeling terrible about her involvement. It can be shown on the way she expressed her self.

## 3. Flouting the maxim of relation

As pointed out by Grice (1975), maxim relevance or maxim relation wants the speakers to contribute and to be relevant in the conversation. Birner (2013) also added that maxims relation focuses on processing the relationship of current utterance, the response, and the context. Furthermore, to flout the relation maxim means to be irrelevant towards the utterance or questions that are given. It can be explained by the example below,

Alice : "There! Did you see it?"

Imogene : **"He's a prince. But, he cannot marry me unless he renounces his throne. Isn't it tragic?"**

(Ayu et.al, 2021)

The conversation took from the movie titled "Alice in Wonderland" in the journal article. The context in the conversation happened when Alice chased the white rabbit. Alice informs Aunt Imogene that she sees

---

a rabbit in a tuxedo, but Aunt Imogene says she won't bother with Alice's dream again. Then Alice attempted to inform Aunt Imogene that she had seen the rabbit again and wanted her to see it. The response of Aunt Imogene is considered as the flouting maxim of relation. She failed the principle of maxims as she was giving unrelated answer.

#### 4. Flouting the maxim of manner

Grice (1975) explained that a manner maxim expects the speakers to be brief and clear towards the conversation and avoid ambiguousness. Thus, in flouting the maxim manner the speaker tends to be unclear and ambiguous in their utterances. For instance,

Seb : "Maybe you just liked me when I was on my ass 'cause it made you feel better about yourself."  
Mia : "Are you kidding?"  
Seb : "**No. I don't know.**"

(Whayuni et.al, 2019)

The example was taken from the journal article with the movie "La La Land" as the data source. The conversation had a context when Sebastian as the speaker answered Mia's question with "I don't know". Earlier in the conversation, they seemed to fight. Then the speaker felt sorry to the hearer. But, instead of saying sorry, the speaker flouted the maxim of manner and ambiguously said he did not know.

From the examples above can be seen how context matters in understanding the conversation. If the participants failed to get the context they would be likely to do violation or fail to comprehend the conversation. As the context is very crucial for understanding the meaning of conversation, this study then explored the flouting on maxims according to the context in one conversation. Moreover, the researcher identified the types of flouting maxim with Grice (1975) as the main expert in "Thor Ragnarok" movie.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

As for the research method in this paper, the researcher used descriptive qualitative research since the data in this research is presented in words, phrases, and sentences. According to Creswell (2013) qualitative research starts with assumptions and the application of interpretive or theoretical frameworks to the investigation of social or human issues. The data was collected utilizing the theory from the observational method in this study by (Sudaryanto, 2015). This research was classified as a non-participatory technique since the researchers were not directly involved in data collection. First, the researchers watched the movie titled "Thor Ragnarok". After watching the movie the researchers collected the utterances from the movie that relates to the Types of flouting maxim (Grice, 1975). For the

method in analyzing the data, this research used the pragmatic identity method and pragmatic competence- in equalizing as the technique. For the data analysis steps, the researchers first looked at the context of the data. And after that the data is analyzed based on the types of maxim flouting.

### 3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1. Findings

The objective of this research was the types of flouting maxim found in the movie “Thor Ragnarok”. And below were the findings of the data source based on the types of the flouting the maxims.

Table 1 The findings of flouting maxim types

No	Types	Frequency
1.	The flouting quantity maxim	8
2.	The flouting quality maxim	4
3.	The flouting relation maxim	2
4.	The flouting manner maxim	3
<b>Total</b>		17

#### 3.2. Discussion

As shown in the finding above, Grice (1975) theory was applied to identify the types of flouting maxim in “Thor Ragnarok” movie. The below utterances are the 17 data found that best represented the types of flouting maxims.

##### Data 1

Lead Scrapper : “Are you a fighter or are you food?”  
Thor : “**I'm just passing through.**”

The data above was taken between the minutes 28.08 – 28.14. The context of the conversation above happens when Thor as the hearer just landed on a strange land. The Lead Scrapper here as the speaker asked him about whether he was a fighter or a food. The speaker’s question required the hearer to answer only between the fighter and the food. However, the hearer did not give the right answer and the hearer said that he was just passing through. The hearer’s response referred to the flouting maxim of quantity as he gave the answer that was not asked. He failed to fulfill the manner maxim and delivered more information than required. As mentioned by Rahmawati (2018) the quantity maxim was supposed to give information less or more than it needed.

##### Data 2

Scrapper : “Alright then I guess I go through you.”  
Lead Scrapper : “**More food.**”

---

The conversation above happened between the minutes 29.33 to 29.37 in the movie “Thor Ragnarok”. The Scrapper as the speaker here said that she will fight the lead scrapper. But then the Lead Scrapper as the hearer answered with “more food”. The hearer’s response was identified as flouting in the maxim of relation. The hearer implicated that the speaker will lose and become their food. The answer given by the hearer was irrelevant to the statement before it. According to Latifatun Nuzulia (2020) flouting maxim appeared when the participants uttered unrelated information towards the question. Thus, the hearer failed to fulfill the maxim of relation.

### Data 3

Cousin Carlo : “Please. I'm sorry.”  
Grandmaster : “**Carlo... I pardon you.**”  
Cousin Carlo : “Thank you. Thank you.”

The conversation took on the minute 38.39 to 38.39 with Cousin Carlo as the hearer and the Grandmaster as the speaker. The context here happened when the hearer was tied on the chair and waited his turn to be executed. The hearer said sorry and begged for forgiveness. The speaker reacted and said that he forgave the hearer. The response from the speaker concluded as flouting in the maxim of quality because after the hearer said thank you the speaker killed him right away. This action then showed how the speaker lied to the hearer and failed to fulfill the quality of the maxim.

### Data 4

Loki : What are you doing here?  
Thor : “**What do you mean, what am I doing? I'm stuck in this stupid chair.** Where's your chair?”

The data above happen in the minute 39.59 to 40.02 with Loki and Thor as the participants. This conversation happened when Thor was tied on the chair and cannot move his body. Once he arrived at the hall by the moving chair he shocked because he saw Loki his brother at that place. Loki was surprised too and he asked what Thor was doing there. Thor was pissed off because he cannot move from the chair and instead of giving the right answer he then repeated Loki’s question. Thor did not deliver the right amount of answer and he did not provide enough information. This then leads to the failing of the maxim quantity and Thor did not answer the question as much as it needed. According to Grice (1975), maxim quantity obligated the speaker to give contribution and information as much as it required. As added by Andy and Ambalegin, (2019) the maxim quantity wanted the speaker to speak properly and answered as much as it needed.

---

### Data 5

The data below happened in the minute 42.33-42.44 with Korg as the speaker and Thor as the hearer.

Korg : “There you go. Another one gone. Yeah, no, I just do the smaller fights, warm up the crowd and whatnot. Wait. You're not gonna face him, are you?”

Thor : “**Yes I am. Fight him, win, and get the hell out of this place.**”

The conversation above happened when Thor was about to beat the other fighter and the other prisoner doubted his intention to fight. The speaker then asked the hearer if he really sure about his will to fight the champion. The hearer's response to the question concluded as the flouting in the maxim of quantity. The speaker gave a yes or no question but the hearer answered with more information that it required. Thus the utterances uttered by the hearer classified as the flouting quantity maxim. As mentioned by Grice (1975) the participants in maxim quantity needed to give contribution and information not less or more than it required. Therefore, to fail or to unfulfill the maxim of quantity means the participants give more and less contribution in the conversation.

### Data 6

Thor : “Yes! I'm getting us out of here. This is a terrible, awful place. You're gonna love Asgard. It's big. It's golden. Shiny!”

Hulk : “**Hulk stay**”

The data above took between the minutes 1.04.51 to 1.05.00 with Thor as the speaker and Hulk as the hearer. The speaker in the conversation told the speaker that he would get them out of the place. But, then the hearer refused it and wanted to stay at the place. The utterance that uttered by the speaker categorized as the maxim quantity because the speaker gave less information than it needed. Although the speaker still get the meaning but according to the Grice (1975) maxims the participants should give information not less or more than it required.

### Data 7

Hulk : “You're Banner's friend.”

Thor : “**I'm not Banner's friend. I prefer you.**”

The data above happened in the minute 1.05.26 – 1.05.29 with Hulk as the hearer and Thor as the speaker. The conversation above showed how the speaker tried to persuade the hearer. Earlier in the conversation the speaker wanted the hearer to join with him but the hearer refused it. Then to make the hearer on his side, the speaker said that he prefer the hearer than the other person in his body. However, at the other scene he also told Banner than he liked him more than Hulk. Moreover, the speaker flouted the maxim of quality as he lied and said something that opposite from the truth.

---

### Data 8

Hulk : "I smashed you."  
Thor : "**Yeah, sure, sure.**"

The data above took from the conversation between Hulk as the speaker and Thor as the hearer. Earlier in the conversation they talked about how the speaker fought the hearer. The speaker said that he smashed the hearer and beat him off. The hearer did not look agree with him but he pretended to agree with the hearer. Thus, the utterances uttered by the speaker considered as the flouting the maxim quality as the hearer unfulfill the maxim of quality.

### Data 9

Thor : "What's going on here?"  
Hemidall : "**Come see for yourself.**"

The conversation above happened between Thor as the speaker and Hemidall as the hearer in the minute 1.07.05 to 1.07.08. The data showed when the speaker asked about what happen to their kingdom and the hearer answer did not directly provide enough information. Instead of answer the speaker's question the hearer asked the speaker to watch the situation by himself. This phenomenon categorized as the flouting maxim of quantity, as the speaker failed to deliver the information needed.

### Data 10

Hemidall : "**I'm providing refuge in a stronghold build by our ancestors. But if the garrison falls our only escape will is Bi-Frost.**"  
Thor : "You're talking about evacuating Asgard?"

The conversation above happened between the minute 1.07.11 to 1.07.19 with Hemidall and Thor as participants. Hamidall utterances were considered as the flouting maxim of manner as he explained not briefly about the strong place to hide for their people. Although Hamidall did not mention it directly Thor understood Hamidall's intention. This then showed how flouting in the conversation can be cooperative as long as the participants stick to the context.

### Data 11

The data below was taken from movie dialogue in the minute 1.09.49 – 1.09.58 with Thor as the speaker and Hulk as the hearer.

Thor : "We're kind of both like fire".  
Hulk : "**But Hulk like real fire. Hulk like raging fire. Thor like smoldering fire.**"

The conversation above happened after the speaker and the hearer argued. The speaker earlier mentioned the reason behind their argument was because they were emotional like a fire. The hearer reaction hearing that agreed. However, he added more information on the conversation and said that he was the real fire more than the speaker. This then can be categorized as the flout of maxim quantity.

---

### Data 12

The conversation below was taken between the minutes 1.10.34 to 1.10.37 with Thor as the speaker and Valyrie as the hearer.

Thor : “We need to talk.”  
Valkyrie : “**No, you want to talk to me.**”

The above dialogue was identified as the flouting maxim of relation uttered by the hearer. The hearer disobeyed the principle by responding to the speaker with an irrelevant statement. The speaker stated that they need to talk, but instead of responding appropriately, she refused. As stated by Setiawan & Haryani (2020) when the speaker failed to be relevant in discussion or refused to be relevant to hide information, then they flouted the relation maxim.

### Data 13

The below dialogue was from the minute 1.11.00 – 1.11.08 with Thor as the speaker and Valkyrie as the hearer.

Thor : “Asgard is in danger and people are dying. We need to get back there. I need your help...wow.”  
Valkyrie : “**Finished. Bye.**”

The above utterances were started when the speaker asked the hearer to listen to him. The listener eventually agreed, but only for a few moments. The speaker did not even finish his statements but she already cut them and finished the conversation. She gave him less information or nearly no information at all and failed to fulfill the maxim of quantity.

### Data 14

The conversation below happened at the minute 1.11.40 to 1.11.43 with Valkyrie as the speaker and Thor as the hearer.

Valkyrie : “**I'm not getting dragged into another one of Odin's family squabbles.**”  
Thor : “What's that supposed to mean?”

Earlier in the conversation, the hearer asked the speaker to join his team and fight for their kingdom. The speaker did not agree with him and refused to enter the team. But she did not directly say no to the hearer instead gave an unnecessary and ambiguous statement. It was proven when the hearer failed to understand her statement and asked “what's that supposed to mean?”. This problem then called as the flouting in maxim of manner because the utterances uttered was unclear and ambiguous.

### Data 15

The dialogue below was taken from the minute 1.11.17 – 1.12.23 with Thor as the speaker and Valkyrie as the hearer.

Thor : “I agree. That's why I turned down the throne. But this isn't about the crown. This is about the people. They're dying and they're you're people, too.”  
Valkyrie : “**Forget it. I have mine.**” **Quan**

---

The context of the dialogue happened when the speaker tried to make the hearer join their team and tried to persuade her to fight for her kingdom. The hearer's response was considered as the flouting of maxim because she did not deliver enough information. As stated by Tami & Handayani (2021) to flout the maxim of quantity the speakers tend to give too little or too much information.

#### **Data 16**

The data below was taken in the minute 1.16.33 – 1.16.36 with Banner as the speaker and Thor as the hearer.

Banner : “Thor where are we?”

Thor : “**About that**”

The dialogue above contained the flouting of maxim manner. The speaker asked about where they were and the hearer was hesitated to answer the question. The hearer actually did not know how to explain it to the speaker. So the hearer failed to fulfill the maxim of manner as he replied with ambiguous statement to the speaker.

#### **Data 17**

The conversation above happened in the minute 1.16.52 – 1.16.56 with Thor as the speaker and Banner as the hearer.

Thor : “Yeah. Quite a lot's happened. You and I had a fight recently.”

Banner : “Did I win?”

Thor : “**No, I won. Easily**”

The speaker told the hearer that there are a lot of things happened and they also had a fight recently. The hearer cannot remember the fight because he was turned into the green monster called Hulk. So then, the hearer asked did he win the fight. The speaker said no and told the hearer that he won the fight. It was categorized as flout the maxim of quality. The speaker said something that opposite from the truth and he did not win the fight. Thus he unfulfilled the maxim of quality.

## **4. CONCLUSION**

The analysis above showed the result of this research. The characters in the movie tend to flout their utterances or fail to fulfill the principles. According to the findings, the researchers found 4 types for the characters to flout the maxims. The types found were based on the theory by (Grice, 1975). The result showed 17 data contained the types of the maxim flouting. The first type with the most frequent appearances was the flouting maxim quantity. The flout of maxim quantity had occurred 8 times. The flout of maxim quality with 4 occurrences, 2 times occurrence of flout relation maxims, and the last 3 times for the flouting maxim of manner.

---

## REFERENCES

- Andy, A., & Ambalegin, A. (2019). *Maxims violation on "night at the museum."* 215–224. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v6i2.1421>
- Ayu, I., Wulandari, P., Made, N., Utami, V., & Deni, N. N. (2021). *The types of flouting maxim found in Alice in Wonderland movie.* 1(1). Retrieved from <https://e-journal.unmas.ac.id/index.php/elysian/article/view/1547>
- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics.*
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry dan research design.* SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and conversation.* London, England: Harvard University Press Cambridge.
- Hadi, M. Z. P. (2018). *a Pragmatic analysis of implicatures used in the sport column of the Jakarta Post newspaper.* 4(2), 49–59. Retrieved from <https://journal.universitasbumigora.ac.id/index.php/humanitatis/article/view/442>
- Lasiana, L. L., & Mubarak, Z. H. (2020). An analysis of flouting maxim in Ruby Spark movie. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 8(1), 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v8i1.1348>
- Latifatun Nuzulia, I. F. (2020). Pragmatic analysis of flouting maxim in Donald Trump's interview with Time in the Oval Office 2020. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(3), 333. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v5i3.443>
- Natasya, D., & Sari, N. (2019). Flouting maxim in Finding Dory movie. *Jurnal Kata: Penelitian Tentang Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 3(2), 321–328. <https://doi.org/10.22216/jk.v3i2.4457>
- Prasatyo, B. A., & Kurniyawati, Y. (2021). An analysis of flouting of maxim in Aiman's Talkshow 'Tudingan Konspirasi di Balik Korona.' *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 8(1), 38–45. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.259>
- Rahmawati, N. I. (2018). *An analysis of non-observance of grice's cooperative principle in Dead Poets society movie.* 1–18. Retrieved from <https://repository.unja.ac.id/id/eprint/4400%0A>
- Setiawan, F. A., & Haryani, H. (2020). An analysis of maxim flouting in Pokémon: Detective Pikachu movie. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 3(2), 224. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v3i2.p224-230>
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa.* Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Tami, T., & Handayani, N. D. (2021). Flouting maxim analysis in "Stranger Things 3" television series: pragmatics approach. *Jurnal Riset Teknologi Dan Inovasi Pendidikan (Jartika)*, 4(1), 01–10. Retrieved from <https://journal.rekarta.co.id/index.php/jartika/article/view/126>
- Whayuni, M., Arifin, M. B., & Lubis, I. S. (2019). An analysis of flouting maxims in La La Land movie. *Literary Criticism Journal*, 1(2), 10–15. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v3i3.2212>