



Flouting Maxims Found in “Good Doctor Season 1”

Ni Putu Eka Kumala Niti Utami¹, Ni Wayan Suastini²

English Study Program, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Mahasaraswati University Denpasar,
Jl. Kamboja No. 11A Denpasar – Bali 80233

Correspondence Email : amiikkumala03@gmail.com

Abstract

The study entitled Flouting Maxims Found in “Good Doctor Season 1” which intended to identify and analyse the different kinds of flouting maxims and the reason why the characters flouted the maxims in “Good Doctor Season 1”. The data for this study was collected from the series Good Doctor Season 1. This data consists of instances where characters flouted conversational maxims. The collected data was then analysed to identify different types of flouting maxims and the reasons behind them. In this study, the method that was used observation which analysed in descriptive and qualitative method. This analysis supported by Grice (1975), categorizes the type of flouting maxims. Additionally, Leech (1983) provided theory to justify the rationale behind the characters' employment of the flouting maxims in “Good Doctor Season 1” movie. This study collected 42 pieces of data which flouting maxims; 5 of these were classify as flouting maxims in terms of quality, 8 as flouting maxims in terms of quantity, 22 as flouting maxims in terms of relevance, and 7 as flouting maxims in terms of manner. And this study collected 42 pieces of data on the reason of flouting maxims; 13 pieces of data as competitive, 10 pieces of data as convivial, 9 pieces of data as collaborative, and 10 pieces of data as conflictive. Based on the result of analysis, it can be concluded that this movie uses the most relevance maxims and competitive reasoning from 42 data.

Keywords: *flouting maxim, Good Doctor season 1*

Abstrak

Studi yang berjudul "Flouting Maxims Found in Good Doctor Season 1" bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi dan menganalisis berbagai jenis pelanggaran maksim serta alasan mengapa para karakter melanggar maksim dalam serial "Good Doctor Season 1". Data dalam penelitian ini diperoleh dari serial "Good Doctor Season 1". Dalam penelitian ini, metode yang digunakan adalah observasi, yang dianalisis dengan metode deskriptif dan kualitatif. Analisis ini didukung oleh teori Grice (1975), yang mengategorikan jenis-jenis pelanggaran maksim. Selain itu, Leech (1983) menyediakan teori untuk menjelaskan alasan para karakter menggunakan pelanggaran maksim dalam film "Good Doctor Season 1". Penelitian ini mengumpulkan 42 data terkait pelanggaran maksim; 5 data diklasifikasikan sebagai pelanggaran maksim kualitas, 8 data sebagai pelanggaran maksim kuantitas, 22 data sebagai pelanggaran maksim relevansi, dan 7 data sebagai pelanggaran maksim cara. Selain itu, penelitian ini juga mengumpulkan 42 data mengenai alasan pelanggaran maksim; 13 data bersifat kompetitif, 10 data bersifat ramah, 9 data bersifat kolaboratif, dan 10 data bersifat konfliktif. Berdasarkan hasil analisis, dapat disimpulkan bahwa film ini paling banyak menggunakan pelanggaran maksim relevansi dan alasan kompetitif dari 42 data yang dikumpulkan.

Kata kunci: *melanggar pepatah, Good Doctor musim 1*

Introduction

Language is a system that is used by human to say something through communication. It is used to communicate, to express about their ideas and to inform about something when they have a conversation (Ibrahim, 2018: 81). Communication is a medium to convey meaning from one to another (Ulfah, 2018: 2). One of the main forms of communication is spoken language. There are two or more participants in a conversation, communication should occur when the listeners can discern the speakers' intentions. People need to communicate with one other in order to build good relationships (Williams, 2010: 26). Another aspect of communication is the manner in which individuals convey their ideas, presumptions, messages, goals, and emotions. Misunderstandings can often arise in communication. The study of how language interacts with context is known as pragmatics (Green, 2014: 133). Within pragmatics, there is a focus on conversational analysis, which includes a concept called the cooperative principle that guides effective language use (Candlin, 1976: 111). This principle involves specific guidelines, known as maxims, which help analyze spoken or written language. Learning about flouting these maxims is crucial for effective communication, as it ensures that each statement is relevant to the context, clear, concise, and easy for the listener to understand (Yeboah, 2021: 10).

The flouting maxim is a strategic technique used by speakers to convey additional meaning or avoid answering questions directly (Gustary, 2021: 125). It involves a deliberate violation of communication rules and requires the interlocutor to interpret the message. Brown and Yule (1989: 50) argue that this approach is often used to prevent misunderstandings and improve communication effectiveness. By violating the maxim, speakers indicate that they do not wish to answer questions directly or that there are other, more appropriate ways of conveying their message. Overall, the flouting maxim is a powerful communication tool that skilled speakers can use to convey complex messages in a concise and effective manner.

In order to create an ideal communication, the participants in communication have to be cooperative in the conversation. Grice (1975: 39) introduced the "Cooperative Principle," which suggests that participants in a conversation are expected to contribute appropriately to the interaction, aligning their contributions with the accepted purpose or flow of the exchange. This principle guides how people engage in conversations and suggests ways to enhance communication effectiveness. To achieve successful communication, the Cooperative Principle includes four conversational maxims: the maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. These maxims help ensure conversations proceed smoothly and effectively (Fahmi, 2018: 92). These all of maxims consist of some ways to push the speaker or the listener to say on the right track in the conversation in order to avoid any ambiguity and misunderstanding (Lakoff, 1977: 91). Briefly, the four types of maxims can be defined as follows: The Maxim of Quality must be applied to state a fact in a conversation that is relevant to the situation and the speaking context; The Maxim of Quantity must be strictly followed to provide the appropriate amount of information in a conversation or an answer to a question, without providing more or less information than what is needed in the speaking context; The Maxim of Relevance must be adhered to in order to show the utmost importance of the topic being discussed in the conversation; The Maxim of Manner must be followed strictly to use clear and

understandable language that does not cause any confusion or ambiguity between the speaker and the listener.

Based on the explanation that has been written briefly above flouting maxims can also be observed in literary works, including films. To gain a deeper understanding of the concept and how it is applied, this writing aims to analyze the use of flouting maxims in the series *The Good Doctor*, specifically in Season 1. Despite the existence of the approach in the movie, the reason behind its use related to the speaking context of the movie will also be analysed. This research cannot be separated from the results of previous studies as a comparison material. Previous research becomes the author's reference in conducting research, so that the author can work on the theory used in studying the research conducted. Misiantari, et al. (2022: 16), The several ways that the characters in the *Tall Girl* movie disregarded maxims and the reasons for their behavior were investigated in this study, *An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in the Tall Girl Movie*. The outcome indicates that there are ten instances of maxims being flouted in the *Tall Girl* film. Five instances of data that deviated from the principles of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner were found in this study. Additionally, it discovered one instance of data that deviated from the relevance maxim. Additionally, this study discovered ten reasons for breaking the maxim: 1 was competitive, 2 were convivial, 4 were collaborative, and 3 were conflictive. The new study differs from the previous one in that it uses different approaches and offers different levels of detail regarding classification and conclusion.

In their study titled *An Analysis of Maxim Flouting in Pokémon: Detective Pikachu Movie*, Setiawan and Haryani (2020: 224) examined the types of maxim flouting present in the film. Their findings identified 8 instances of quantity maxim flouting, 13 of quality maxim flouting, 8 of relevance maxim flouting, and 7 of manner maxim flouting. Additionally, they noted 16 instances of competitive motive, 4 of convivial motive, 6 of collaborative motive, and 9 of conflictive motive. The differences between their study and the current one lie in the context, characters, motives, and media format, which shape the specific aims and findings of each research.

In their study titled *An Analysis of Flouting of Maxims Done by Main Characters in La La Land Movie*, Wahyuni et al. (2019: 384) examined the types of maxim flouting and explored the implied meanings behind the main characters' dialogue. The study found that the quantity maxim flouting, along with implicature, was the most frequently used in *La La Land*. While this prior research focused on identifying types of flouting maxims and their implied meanings, the current study analyzes the reasons behind maxim flouting in *The Good Doctor Season 1*.

Maurarochelle and Ambalegin (2023: 158), in their study titled *An Analysis of Particularized Implicature in To All the Boys I Loved: Always and Forever: Pragmatics Approach*, investigated specific instances of particularized conversational implicature and maxim-flouting in the Netflix film *To All the Boys I Loved: Always and Forever*. Their findings identified 21 instances of specific conversational implicature, along with 8 instances of quality maxim flouting, 4 of quantity maxim flouting, 5 of relevance maxim flouting, and 4 of manner maxim flouting. While the previous study focused on analyzing specific conversational implicatures, the current study examines the reasons for maxim flouting in *The Good Doctor Season 1*.

In their study titled *The Flouting Maxim in Aladdin Movie*, Arundati et al. (2022: 191) analyzed the types of flouting maxims in the characters' dialogue within the movie *Aladdin*. The study identified 12 instances of maxim flouting: 5 instances of quantity maxim flouting, 4 of quality, 2 of relevance, and 1 of manner. While the previous study focused on categorizing types of flouting maxims, the current study examines both the types and the reasons for maxim flouting in *The Good Doctor Season 1*.

In currently, individualities can readily discover film online on spots like Youtube, Netflix, Viu, Disney Hotsar, Idlix, and numerous others in addition to going to the film. In particular, Idlix, a popular streaming app from this company that offers film, series, television shows, reality shows, and more, is well-known in Indonesia. This data of this study is the award-winning South Korean TV program of the same name from 2013 serves as the alleviation for the American medical drama series *The Good Doctor*. The duration per occasion in season 1 is approximately 45 minutes which tells of people were skeptical of Shaun Murphy's talents because his internal capacity halted at age 10, which caused this. In malignancy of the misgivings of his colleagues, Shaun Murphy used his abilities and aptitude to save many lives by performing amazing medical procedures. This study focuses on examining the types of flouting maxims and the reasons behind their use by characters in the *Good Doctor Season 1*.

Method

The conversational exchanges between the characters in the 2017 season 1 of "Good Doctor" will serve as the study's data source. In order to analyze the data, this study employed descriptive qualitative methodologies. Data for this study were gathered by direct observation. Merriam-Webster defines "observation" as "a record or description so obtained" or "an act of recognising and noting a fact or occurrence often involving measurement with instruments." The IDLIX movie will be viewed by the researcher. The initial stage in this study process was obtaining the movie script in order to bolster the data. Second, note-taking the movie script by watching for several times. Third, synchronizing the dialogue in the film with the dialogue in the script. Fourth, pick the discussion that includes maxims that are being flouted. Finally, categorizes dialogue in "Good Doctor Season 1" that involves characters flouting maxims and the reasons behind it.

This study used a technique called the competency equalization approach to equalize the data. The data then proceeded through the data analysis procedure, first with identifying statements within the context of the analysis. Second, the theory was used to analyze several types of particularized flouting maxims proposed by Grice (1975: 39). The study results also highlighted the types of maxims that were flouted in the *Good Doctor Season 1*.

Result and Discussion

Result

In analyzing "The Good Doctor" Season 1, a popular TV series that follows the life of Shaun Murphy, a young doctor with autism and savant syndrome, instances of flouting maxims are quite prevalent. The unique character dynamics and Shaun’s distinct way of interacting with others lead to frequent moments of non-traditional communication. This analysis explores how and why characters, particularly Shaun, flout various maxims and how these moments contribute to the storyline and character development. The analysis revealed that all four types of maxims were flouted, each with varying frequency. The maxim of relevance was flouted most often, as Shaun frequently diverged from conventional conversational relevance due to his unique way of interpreting and responding to situations. The following sections break down the instances of each type of flouted maxim, highlighting how these moments enrich the dialogue and narrative of the series.

Table 1. Flouting Maxims in Good Doctor Season 1 Series

Types of Flouting Maxims	Frequency	Percentage
Maxim of Quantity	8	19%
Maxim of Quality	5	12%
Maxim of Relevance	22	52%
Maxim of Manner	7	17%
Total	42	100%

According to the following table, the Good Doctor Season 1 film featured every kind of flouting maxim. A total of 42 instances of maxim flouting were observed among the characters. The most frequently flouted maxim was relevance, with 22 instances (52%). This was followed by the flouting of the quantity maxim, which appeared 8 times (19%), the manner maxim with 7 instances (17%), and the least common was the quality maxim, with 5 instances (12%). The high frequency of relevance maxim flouting is largely due to the character Shaun Murphy, who has autism and savant syndrome. Although he interacts with others in the hospital, his unusual behaviors often make communication challenging, leading to frequent flouting of the relevance maxim in the show.

In communication, people sometimes intentionally disregard conversational norms to convey underlying motives or to emphasize certain intentions. These reasons for flouting maxims—competitive, convivial, conflictive, and collaborative—shed light on the purpose behind indirect or non-literal language. By examining these motives, we can gain insights into the characters' relationships, conflicts, and interactions within the narrative. In "The Good Doctor" Season 1, a detailed analysis of character dialogues reveals that each of these four motives for flouting maxims appears with varying frequency. The competitive motive, in particular, emerges as the most common reason for characters’ indirect communication. This is likely due to the

tension between personal and social goals, often highlighted in a high-stakes medical environment where personal beliefs can conflict with professional duties. Characters frequently encounter situations where their goals clash, leading them to flout conversational norms to assert or defend their views. The sections below analyze each motive in the context of the “Good Doctor Season 1 Series”.

Table 2. The Reasons of Using Flouting Maxim in Good Doctor Season 1 Series

The Reason of Using Flouting Maxims	Frequency	Percentage
Competitive	13	31%
Convivial	10	24%
Collaborative	9	21%
Conflictive	10	24%
Total	42	100%

As shown in the following table, the Good Doctor Season 1, featured every type of motive for flouting maxims. In total, 42 instances of different motives were identified among the characters. The most prevalent motive was competitive, appearing 13 times (31%). Followed by convivial and conflictive motive which appeared about the same 10 times (24%), and the lowest data is collaborative motive which appeared 9 times (21%). The reason why competitive reason is the most dominant from the other reasons because in this movie there are many arguments that conflict with social and personal goals. Conversations that conflict between social and personal goals are included in competitive reasons. So, there are a lot of competitive reasons in this movie.

Discussion

In the Good Doctor Season 1, characters were observed flouting maxims for various reasons, with a total of 42 instances recorded. These maxims fall under different categories. Flouting maxims of quantity (8), quality (5), relevance (22), and manner (7). And also, the reason of using flouting maxims falls under different categories. Competitive motive (13), convivial motive (10), collaborative motive (9), and conflictive motive (10). In reference to the overall amount of data found, 8 pieces of data were discussed.

FLOUTING MAXIM OF MANNER

Data 1

Dr Kalu : Screw sleep, Murphy. You are coming with us.
 Dr Shaun : Where are you going?

Dr Kalu : **Out, we’re gonna drink.**
Dr Shaun : I’m not thirsty.

In the conversation between Dr. Kalu and Dr. Shaun, after a tiring shift following a major bus accident, Dr. Kalu and Dr. Claire decide to invite Dr. Shaun out for a drink. The term "drink" here refers specifically to alcoholic beverages, but Dr. Shaun, unaware of this social convention, interprets it literally as just a regular beverage like water, juice, or even a milkshake. This misunderstanding happens in the doctors' locker room, highlighting the friendly but work-focused nature of their relationship. Dr. Shaun's misinterpretation could have been avoided if he had asked clarifying questions about what kind of drink they were referring to, but he did not. This creates a subtle ambiguity, categorized as a flouting of Grice's maxims (1975) regarding manners. Specifically, this maxim includes the expectation for clarity, brevity, and transparency in communication. By not clarifying, Dr. Shaun's interpretation remains ambiguous to the others, leading to potential miscommunication.

The reason Dr. Shaun flouted the maxim of manner can be attributed to what Leech (1983: 104) terms as a convivial reason. He genuinely believed "drink" referred to a non-alcoholic beverage. This ambiguity aligns with his honest interpretation and understanding, without intending to cause confusion or discomfort. This kind of flouting, where an illocutionary goal (achieving clarity about the meaning of "drink") aligns with a social goal (accepting a friendly invitation), benefits both Shaun and his colleagues, contributing to a shared and positive social experience without causing any disadvantage to either party. Thus, the flouting maxim in this case promotes social harmony and mutual enjoyment.

Data 2

Dr shaun : **Her pulse is too weak to perfuse her organs**
Woman : What? What does that....

In a conversation between Dr. Shaun and a woman in a car, Dr. Shaun is visibly panicked as he rushes to help an unconscious young child who is foaming at the mouth. The child, whose parents often argue in front of him, needs urgent medical attention and must be taken to the hospital immediately. According to Grice's maxims, the maxim of manner suggests that speakers should aim for clarity, avoiding ambiguity and overly complex language. Dr. Shaun's use of medical jargon ("pulse is too weak to perfuse her organs") makes his response unclear to a non-medical listener, flouting this maxim. The woman's reaction, "What? What does that....," shows her confusion, indicating that Dr. Shaun's statement was too complex for her to understand easily.

The reason why Dr Shaun flouted the maxim of manner belongs to conflictive reason. Leech's politeness principle provides insight into why Dr. Shaun flouted the maxim of manner. Leech explains that politeness can involve conveying messages that align with a convivial reason, where the speaker may unintentionally use language that suits their expertise rather than the listener's understanding. Dr. Shaun likely did not intend to confuse the woman but instead responded from his medical perspective, prioritizing accuracy over accessibility. Dr. Shaun's use of complex language could

stem from his genuine concern and intent to inform, not to alienate or upset the woman. However, a simpler explanation would have demonstrated empathy, respecting the woman's likely anxiety and limited medical knowledge, which would align better with Leech's principle of tact and empathy.

FLOUTING MAXIM OF RELEVANCE

Data 3

A woman : Sorry, you seen claire?
Dr. Jared : **Would you turn off the light?**

Based on a conversation between a woman and Dr. Jared, the woman asks if Dr. Jared has seen Claire, but he responds by asking her to turn off the light. This answer is unrelated to the question and appears to ignore her request for information. By doing so, Dr. Jared is flouting the maxim of relation, as his response does not directly address her question. In the conversation between the woman and Dr. Jared, the woman asks, "Sorry, you seen Claire?" Instead of answering her question directly, Dr. Jared responds with an unrelated request: "Would you turn off the light?" This response does not provide the information the woman is seeking, as it does not indicate whether he has seen Claire. This creates a disconnect in the exchange, leaving the woman's question unanswered and potentially signaling an indirect message about Dr. Jared's current mood or state. Grice's maxim of relation suggests that conversational contributions should be relevant to the preceding question or topic. By responding with a seemingly unrelated request, Dr. Jared is flouting the maxim of relation, as he does not address the woman's question at all. Instead of a straightforward response, his reply shifts the focus of the conversation from her question to his own immediate need or comfort level.

The reason why Dr. Jared flouted the maxim of relevance belongs to conflictive reason. Leech's politeness principle provides insight into why Dr. Jared may have flouted the maxim of relation. Leech proposes that conversational choices can be influenced by interpersonal and social factors, which can lead a speaker to prioritize personal needs or social concerns over a direct response. In this case, Dr. Jared's reason for flouting the maxim could align with what Leech describes as a conflictive reason. A conflictive reason may indicate that Dr. Jared is experiencing some frustration, irritation, or preoccupation. This would explain why he does not address the woman's question directly and instead redirects the conversation to a request about the lighting. By doing so, he expresses a need for comfort or rest, possibly suggesting he is unwilling or unable to respond to her question about Claire. This lack of engagement prioritizes his own concerns over providing an answer to the woman's question. Additionally, the request to turn off the light might signal a desire for quiet or solitude, further underscoring his focus on his own needs.

Data 4

Glassman : How you doing?
Claire : **The computer is not working**

In the conversation between Glassman and Claire, they are beginning their workday, but a technical issue disrupts their routine: Claire’s computer is broken. Glassman approaches and casually asks, “How you doing?” This question, while often used to inquire about someone’s general well-being or mood, is likely intended as a friendly start to the workday. However, Claire responds, “The computer is not working,” which deflects his inquiry about her personal state and instead directs attention to the malfunctioning equipment. This interaction can be analyzed through Grice’s concept of flouting maxims.

The reason why Claire flouted the maxim of relevance belongs to collaborative reason. Leech’s politeness principle offers insight into why Claire might flout the maxim of relation. Her response can be understood as convivial according to Leech’s framework, which emphasizes communication that seeks mutual cooperation or alignment of interests. There were several reasons why Claire was flouting maxim at the time, the first reason is by focusing on the broken computer, Claire may be signaling a practical need for assistance. Rather than discussing her feelings or well-being, she quickly directs Glassman’s attention to the technical issue at hand. The second reason is her way of requesting support without explicitly asking for help. Instead of saying directly, “Can you help me with the computer?” she redirects the conversation to make Glassman aware of her situation, which subtly invites his cooperation or assistance. And the last reason is Claire’s response may also indicate that she prioritizes work-related concerns over personal ones in this context, which can be seen as a convivial strategy. Rather than shifting the conversation to herself, she brings up a work-related obstacle that Glassman could potentially help resolve.

FLOUTING MAXIM OF QUANTITY

Data 5

Dr Melendez : You get that consent on 104?
Dr Claire : **Well, I made him a deal. He’s got a meeting with Dr Max from psychiatry at 6:00. We’ll get the consent by 8:00. You can operate first thing in the morning.**

Based on the conversation above, that is the conversation between Dr Melendez and Dr Claire. Dr. Melendez asked Dr Claire whether she had obtained consent for her patient's surgery. In fact, Dr Claire did not, but she gave more statements than necessary. This conversation happened in the emergency room. The relationship between them is just coworkers. Based on the data, that is the conversation between Dr Melendez and Dr Claire. When Dr Claire arrived at the emergency room, Dr Melendez suddenly asked her a question with “you get that consent on 104?”. Then Dr Claire responded, “Well, I made him a deal. He is got a meeting with Dr Max from the psychiatrist at 6:00. We’ll get the consent by 8:00. You can operate first thing in

the morning”. Dr Claire’s answer to Dr Melendez’s question belongs to flouting maxim of quantity. In her statement, Dr Claire gave Dr Melendez more information than required by using many words to answer his question. Actually, Dr Claire could answer the question by just saying “not yet” or “we will get the consent at 8:00”. But she gave more information in her utterances and made Dr Melendez a bit angry because she had not gotten the consent. This analysis is supported by Grice (1975: 39), flouting maxim of quantity happens when a speaker gives more information than required and talks too much with the goal of making the listener understand better.

Dr. Claire's disregard for the quantity maxim can be attributed to collaborative reasoning. The reason Dr Claire gave more information in her utterances was because she was afraid of Dr. Melendez if he found out that Dr. Claire had not asked the patient for consent. So, she chose to give more information than required.

Data 6

Stranger : Where to?

Dr. shaun : **San Jose st. Bonaventure hospital. I’m a surgical resident. Today is my first full day**

Based on the conversation above, which is a conversation between Dr. Shaun and a stranger. It was Shaun's first day working at the hospital. he was very excited to work because it was his first day as a surgical resident. on the way to the hospital, he met a stranger. The stranger asks Dr. Shaun a simple, direct question: “Where to?” Dr. Shaun replies, “San Jose St. Bonaventure Hospital. I’m a surgical resident. Today is my first full day.” His response, while answering the question, includes additional, unrelated information about his job title and the significance of the day for him. This answer can be analyzed as flouting the maxim of quantity according to Grice’s theory.

The reason why Dr Shaun flouted the maxim of quantity belongs to collaborative reason. The reason Dr Shaun gave more information in his utterances was because he was excited because it is his first time become a surgical resident. So, he chose to give more information than required.

FLOUTING MAXIM OF QUALITY

Data 7

Claire : What’s in the basement?

Kalu : **Pediatric patient lost a blanket**

Based on the conversation above, which is a conversation between Claire and Kalu. Kalu is looking for a patient who will be operated on. While the patient disappeared from the patient's room, then kalu went around looking for the patient to the basement. While walking around he accidentally met Claire. And then Claire asks Kalu, “What’s in the basement?” and Kalu replies, “Pediatric patient lost a blanket.” Kalu’s response doesn’t directly answer Claire’s question about the basement’s contents; instead, he responds with an explanation that seems unrelated or vague about

the basement itself. This can be analyzed as flouting the maxim of quality according to Grice’s theory.

According to Leech’s politeness principle, Kalu’s response may stem from a conflictive reason. The conflictive principle involves responses that may deliberately withhold or obscure information, potentially to avoid conflict, express disagreement, or even create distance between the speaker and listener. There were several reasons why Kalu was flouting maxim at the time, the first reason is Kalu may intentionally choose not to answer Claire’s question fully, possibly to avoid delving into specifics that he either doesn’t want to share or feels are unnecessary for her to know. By focusing on a lost blanket rather than what’s in the basement, Kalu subtly deflects the conversation, possibly to keep Claire at a distance from the true context. The second reason is Kalu is downplaying the situation, whether out of impatience or a desire not to involve Claire further. This use of minimal information serves as a way to shut down the conversation, avoiding any perceived obligation to provide further details. And the last reason is Kalu’s flouting is that he may not want Claire to probe further into the situation in the basement. By giving a vague and somewhat dismissive answer, Kalu may be indirectly discouraging her from inquiring further.

Data 8

Lea : You call in sick?
Shaun : **I’m ready to go**

Based on the conversation above, which is a conversation with Lea and Shaun. Shaun was angry with Glassman and decided to take a few days off from work. Shaun did not explain the situation to Lea. Lea asks Shaun, “You call in sick?” and Shaun responds, “I’m ready to go.” Shaun’s response does not directly answer Lea’s question about whether he called in sick, as he does not confirm or deny it. Instead, his reply shifts the focus to his readiness to leave, which suggests a potential flouting of the maxim of quality. According to Grice’s maxim of quality, speakers are expected to provide truthful and direct information, without ambiguity. In this case, Lea’s question is straightforward, asking if Shaun called in sick. However, Shaun does not answer directly and instead states he is “ready to go.” This lack of a clear answer could imply that Shaun is avoiding a direct “yes” or “no,” potentially withholding the truth or giving a response that leaves Lea uncertain about whether he indeed called in sick. By flouting the maxim of quality, Shaun creates ambiguity, which suggests that he may not be providing a straightforward answer about his actions.

Shaun’s disregard for the quality maxim can be attributed to conflictive reasoning. The conflictive principle suggests that sometimes speakers may use indirect responses or ambiguity to avoid conflict, create distance, or conceal information. There were several reasons why Shaun was flouting maxim at the time, the first reason is by not directly answering Lea’s question, Shaun could be trying to avoid explaining himself or justifying his actions. If he did indeed call in sick but now plans to leave, providing a direct answer might invite questioning or disapproval from Lea. The second reason is Shaun may be attempting to conceal whether or not he actually called in sick. By deflecting with “I’m ready to go,” he implies readiness and determination, shifting Lea’s attention away from the question. This strategy aligns with a conflictive

approach, as it minimizes Lea's opportunity to probe further or express concern about his actions.

Conclusion

In this study reached the conclusion that the "Good Doctor Season 1" television series created statements that flouted a maxim. The data that has been collected are 42 data, but only 8 data are discussed. There are four types of flouting maxims according to Grice's (1975). But from a total of 42 statements made by the character in the "Good Doctor Season 1" series, this study found four of the categories of flouting maxims in this study. These are the flouting maxims of relevance (22), manner (7), quantity (8), and quality (5). According to the findings, the characters mostly use the types flouting maxims of relevance. Flouting maxim of relevance usually happens when someone does not want to answer the question and directly change the topic. However, by studying and investigating flouting maxims, this research can provide further knowledge and awareness of how to prevent misunderstandings in order to achieve effective communication.

And also, in this study there are four types of reasons of using flouting maxims according to Leech's (1983: 104). The data that has been collected is 42 data, in this study found four types of the reason of using flouting maxims. These are competitive (13), convivial (10), collaborative (9), and conflictive (10). The results show that the movie's characters primarily employ competitive reasoning. In this type of reason, there is a competition between the illocutionary goal the social goal. In the context of the statement about characters in a movie using competitive reason, it suggests that the characters are engaging in communication where there is a competition between what they intend to achieve with their speech acts (illocutionary goals) and how they want to affect the social dynamics or relationships within the dialogue or scene (social goals). This competition could lead to conflicts, misunderstandings, or interesting plot developments within the movie.

Reference

- Anjani, Z. N., Jepri, & Hafisah, S. 2020. The Relation of Maxim Flouting Used to Illocutionary Function of Politeness in 12 Years a Slave Movie. *Prologue: Journal on Language and Literature, Vol.6, No.1*. https://prologue.sastra.uniba-bpn.ac.id/index.php/jurnal_prologue/article/view/50
- Arundati, N. L. M. U., Suastini, N. W., & Putri, I. G. A. V. W. 2022. The Flouting Maxim in Aladdin Movie. *Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics, Volume 03, No. 02, 191-199*. <https://traverse.asia/index.php/traverse/article/view/152/65>
- Baker, L. M. 2006. Observation: A Complex Research Method. <https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/CSS506/Technique%20Readings/Baker%202006%20Observation%20a%20complex%20research%20method.pdf>
- Candlin, Christopher N. "Communicative language teaching and the debt to pragmatics." *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics 1976* (1976): 237-256. Retrieved from https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/555469/GURT_1976.pdf?sequence=1#page=247

- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: a resource book for students*. New York: Routledge English Language Introductions.
- Fahmi, Rizal. "An analysis of Grice's maxims violation in daily conversation." *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching* 4.2 (2018): 91-97. Retrieved from <https://e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/article/view/325>
- Green, Georgia M. *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. Routledge, 2014. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203776476/understanding-pragmatics-gunter-senft>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Arts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Good Doctor Season 1 Movie. <https://tv.idlixplus.net/tvseries/the-good-doctor-2017/>
- Gustary, Devian Try, and Suciati Anggraini. "The analysis of flouting maxim in “up!” movie." *Jurnal Lingua Idea* 12.2 (2021): 124-135. Retrieved from <https://jos.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/jli/article/view/4118>
- Haryani, H., & Setiawan, F. A. 2020. An Analysis of Maxim Flouting in Pokémon: Detective Pikachu Movie. *Professional Journal of English Education, Vol.3, No.2*, 224-230. <https://e-journal.unmas.ac.id/index.php/elysian/article/view/3598>
- Ibrahim, Zulfah, M. Bahri Arifin, and Ririn Setyowati. "The flouting of maxim in the se7en movie script." *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya* 2.1 (2018): 81-94. Retrieved from <https://ocs.unmul.ac.id/index.php/JBSSB/article/view/1016>
- Lakoff, Robin. "What you can do with words: Politeness, pragmatics and performatives." *Proceedings of the Texas conference on performatives, presuppositions and implicatures*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED140617.pdf#page=94>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Cambridge university press.
- Maurarochelle, V. S., & Ambalegin. 2023. An Analysis of Particularized Ipicature in to All the Boys I Loved Always and Forever: Pragmatics Approach. *e-Journal of Linguistics, Volume 17, No.2*, 158-166 <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eol/article/view/100905/49768>
- Misiantari, N. K., Putri, I. G. A. V. W., & Ardiantari, I. A. P. G. 2022. An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in the Tall Girl Movie. *Elysian Journal: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies, Volume 2, No.3*. <https://e-journal.unmas.ac.id/index.php/elysian/article/view/3598/3715>
- Movie Script. Good Doctor Season 1 movie. https://subslikescript.com/series/The_Good_Doctor-6470478
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Observation. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved Aug 27, 2023, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/observation>
- Ulfah, Rena Al Asyifa Nur, and Resti Afrilia. "an analysis of flouting maxim in “The BFG” movie." *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)* 1.5 (2018): 687-695. Retrieved from <https://journal.ikipsiliwangi.ac.id/index.php/project/article/view/1498>
- Williams, Redford, and Virginia Williams. *Lifeskills: 8 simple ways to build stronger relationships, communicate more clearly, and improve your health*. Harmony, 2010. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=iAqb69QYbcwC&oi=fnd&pg=PT9&d>

[q=People+need+to+communicate+with+one+other+in+order+to+build+good+relationships.&ots=ANnEhsNIOk&sig=PikyHzjHwY00iUJtLFFAj1fWVQk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=People%20need%20to%20communicate%20with%20one%20other%20in%20order%20to%20build%20good%20relationships.&f=false](https://www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jeltal/article/view/1657)

Yeboah, Joyce. "The principles underlying what is communicated and not said: a cursory discussion of Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims." *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* 3.5 (2021): 10-17. Retrieved from <https://www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jeltal/article/view/1657>