



SNAP TO READ

## NON-OBSERVANCE OF MAXIMS AND THE IMPLICATURE IN SHANG-CHI MOVIE

Medlin Bulain, Yulius Kurniawan, Endar Rachmawaty Linuwih

Universitas Widya Kartika Surabaya

medlinbulain301@gmail.com, yulius@widyakartika.ac.id,

endarrachmawaty@widyakartika.ac.id

First received: August 21, 2023

Final proof received: November 21, 2023

### Abstract:

*Being fluent in a particular language is beneficial for everyone in many aspects. The conversation is beyond just being fluent in languages. According to Grice (1975), the effectiveness of conversation relies on the cooperative principle, which involves participants making efforts to contribute relevant and informative messages and it is essential. However, the speaker often does not fulfill the maxim in conversation whether it is consciously or unconsciously due to various factors. This study aims to investigate the non-observance of maxim and the implicature in Shang-Chi and The Legend of The Ten Rings movie. According to Grice (1975), there are 4 types of non-observance of maxims: flouting, violating, opting out, and infringing the maxim. Thomas (2013) proposed another type of non-observance of the maxim which is suspending the maxim. Moreover, the non-observance of the maxims is result in implicature. This research is analysed by using the qualitative descriptive design. The data of this research is the utterances of the characters. The result of this research shows that the characters do not observe the maxim by dominantly flouting the maxim with 24 occurrences, then followed by violating the maxim with 12 occurrences, opting out with 5 times occurrences, and the last one is infringing the maxim with 4 times occurrences. The characters use implicature often to get what they want without looking desperate to get it, protect their ego, be polite in expressing their opinion and*

*desire, emphasize a point without appearing impolite or assertive, and skilfully guide others to believe what they said and command other through indirect suggestions.*

**Keywords:** *Non-observance of maxim, Implicature, Pragmatic*

## INTRODUCTION

Being able to be fluent in more than one language is beneficial for everyone in conversation, which allow them to speak to many people and discuss wide topics. However, a conversation is beyond just being fluent in a particular language. Being fluent does not guarantee that the conversation goal could be achieved. Grice (1975) stated that there is a way the participants in a conversation can do to achieve the goal of conversation, which is by being cooperative. He argued that the characteristic of conversation is the presence of cooperative efforts shared by participants to gain effective and contextual communication. By being cooperative, Grice stated that the participant in the conversation must follow the cooperative principle maxim in conversation which require them to “Make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” Grice (1975, p. 45). He also proposed the principle of conversational moves which is to expect the participant in conversation to follow. This principle is then named Cooperative Principle.

Moreover, Grice (1975) then proposed four categories of maxims under cooperative principles which are the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the last is the maxim of manner. When the participant does not fulfill the maxims, it is called the non-observance of the maxim. He then proposed the four ways the speaker failed to fulfill the cooperative principles maxims which are violating the maxim, opting out of the maxim, infringing the maxim,

and flouting the maxim. In line with Grice (1975), Thomas (2013) supported one additional speaker's behavior toward the cooperative principle maxim which is suspending the maxim.

Furthermore, besides being cooperative in conversation, the participants are also required to understand the context. The process of understanding the meaning of utterances is vital. Meaning could not just be understood by only the words of the speakers but also include the context of the utterances (Thomas, 2013, p.22). The occurrence and existence of misunderstandings in a conversation are due to the different abilities of everyone to truly understand utterances (Simaremare et al., 2021). The listener on that account is required to pay attention to the possibility of extra meaning and intention from what is said by the speaker (Yule George, 1996). This phenomenon is called implicature, the listener is expected to infer beyond what the speaker conveyed. In other words, the listener is expected to draw conclusions and try to discover the hidden meaning of speakers' utterances. Rather than drawing meaning from every word in an utterance, communication is more about understanding the speaker's intention based on the specific context (Yule, 2020, p. 149)

The object of this research is the movie and the script of the movie. There are several reasons why *Shang-chi and the Legend of The Ten Rings* movie are used as the subject. The first reason is based on the well-known fact that Asian people tend to not show their intention in conversation directly, rather saying more or less than what is needed. This fact is then supported by He Lin talking about how Chinese people tend to talk around the bush. Lin (2023) stated that being indirect in conversation has become the culture and the language of Chinese people. This comes along with the history of the intelligence of someone in playing with words to say the real intention. People that are smart enough to show their intention without directly saying it will be seen as intelligent and therefore will be respected. In addition,

almost all the characters in this movie are cautious in expressing their opinions and feelings due to unresolved issues in the past. The main character in this movie is a family, more precisely a family from China. This has an impact on how people who live in the Asian household, in this case, China, speak and interact with each other. As explained by Lin (2023) above, younger people in Chinese culture will always try not to show their opinions or express themselves explicitly as a sign of showing respect to their elders. This phenomenon makes this movie the right movie to further analyse how participants in conversations do not show their intentions directly and what they try to imply through their utterances. *Shang-chi and The Legend of The Ten Rings* is the first Asian superhero movie or more accurately the first Chinese superhero. The tendency of speaking indirectly leads to implicature. Therefore, this movie is suitable to become the object of this research.

The study of the non-observance of maxims and implicature has gained more attention and interest from many researchers for the past five years. Zhao (2021) in his study, stated that Cooperative Principles are moving constantly from theory to daily dialogue which eventually can be found in movies and dramas. Several studies of the non-observance of the maxims in movies, dramas, and TV shows, even games have been done recently in the past five years. The first study was conducted by Irawan (2019) to discover the type of conversational maxim that is not observed in the *Selma* movie. The second study by Saradifa (2020) aimed to discover the type of non-observant maxim and the speaker's intention in the *Grapevine* drama series. The third study was done by Zhao (2021) focusing only to analyse the violation of the maxims in *Little Sheldon* movie. The fourth study was executed by Muarifuddin & Arman, (2022) to discover types of non-observance of the maxims produced by the character in their conversation in the *Knives Out* movie. The next study was carried out by Dewi et al. (2023) analysed the violation of the maxim and the reason for the violation

in Emily in Paris movie. The last study was done by Tumimomor et al. (2023) to investigate the type of maxims that are violated in the Legend of Dragon Game.

The difference between this present research and the previous studies is the focus of the study which is to discover all five types of non-observance of maxims done by all the characters in the Shang-Chi movie and what the implicature of the non-observance of the maxim. The analysis of implicature which arises from not following the maxim is important because when the speaker chooses to not follow the maxims, they want the listener to understand what they want without directly saying so. Their meaning and intention in conversation are beyond utterances. Therefore, by analyzing the implicature the participant in conversation can get more ideas and insight into the actual intention of utterances based on the context. Based on the background of the study, the research aims to answer the following research questions: What is the non-observance of the maxims in the Shang-Chi and the Legend of the Ten Rings? and What is the implicature of non-observance of the maxims in the Shang-Chi and the Legend of the Ten Rings?

### **Literature View**

#### ***Pragmatics***

Yule, (1996) defined "Pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener". Yule explained that pragmatics is the study of the meaning in conversation regarding the context. The way the intention can be interpreted differently in different circumstances. In the field of pragmatics, there is what is called "invisible intention". It is when the speaker does not say the intentions directly through words or sentences in conversation. These unsaid intentions, however, are still a part of the conversation. Here the listener or the interpreter is required to deal with understanding the speaker's intention beyond what is said. Pragmatic

is the way people, in this case, the speaker and the listener create momentum to understand each other in conversation. In conclusion, there are four definitions of pragmatic defined by Yule; 1) "Pragmatic is the study of speaker meaning" 2) "Pragmatic is the study of contextual meaning 3) "Pragmatic is the study of how more gets communicated than is said 4) "Pragmatic is the study of the expression of relative. Moreover, Yule (2020) also stated that Pragmatics is the study of "invisible meaning" or "speaker meaning". Yule (2020) argued that in communication, people rely not only on comprehending the literal meaning of the words used in utterances but also on understanding the speaker's message based on the specific context.

### ***Grice's Cooperative Principle***

Grice (1975) in his *Logic and Conversation* essay, argued that following a certain principle that functions as the bridge between what is said and what is meant makes the speaker and hearer cooperate well in achieving the goal of conversation, which he defined as the Cooperative Principle. The Cooperative Principle represents the cooperative effort of people to achieve the effectiveness of conversational communication by being cooperative to achieve the level of accepting, recognizing, and understanding in a particular way in conversation.

The idea of the Cooperative Principle was proposed by Grice (1975) as an attempt to make the conversational participants cooperative in communication. This idea was triggered by Grice's realization that in daily life, people often do not say their intention directly, rather they tend to imply it. To be cooperative in a conversation, all the participant is required to make utterances appropriate to the conversation context. By proposing the Cooperative Principle, Grice also brought out the Four Maxims, which people should follow to make the conversation brief yet contain everything that is required. Cooperative Principles Maxims as follows:

***Maxim of Quantity***

Give information not more or less than is required in the particular situation. The maxim of quantity emphasizes the importance of the right amount of contribution in a conversation. “Say enough, but do not say too much” (Birner & Betty, 2001, p.35)

***Maxim of Quality***

Be true and provide evidence in the information in the conversation. Maxim of quality expects parties in a conversation to speak truthfully and honestly or speak what they believe is the truth. In addition, they are also expected to be able to provide evidence that can support the information and topics being discussed.

***Maxim of Relation***

Be relevant in a conversation. Sticking to the storyline and being on the topic being discussed or previously discussed is the main thing in the maxim of relevance. It is about how the parties in the conversation can communicate well on the same path in the conversation to prevent misunderstandings.

***Maxim of Manner***

Be brief and orderly and avoid ambiguity. as the name of the proverb suggests. The manner maxim focuses on how the parties in a conversation behave. Therefore, the parties in the conversation are expected to be more straightforward in conveying their intentions without the need to go around the bush.

***The Non-observance of the Maxim***

The non-observance of the maxim is the situation when the participants in conversation do not fulfill the maxim of conversation proposed by Grice. (Anisa, 2020) argued that non-observance of the maxim means the participants in conversation do not follow the cooperative rules. There are five ways the speaker does not observe or fulfill the maxim. Grice (1975) proposed four ways speakers do not

fulfill the maxim and Thomas (2013) add one additional way of way speakers do not observe the maxim of conversation.

### ***Violating the Maxim***

The speaker violates the maxim when they fail to observe or follow the maxim with the assumption that the listener would not be aware that the maxim has been violated in the conversation. Grice (1975) stated that when the speaker violates the maxim, they are liable to mislead. Moreover, the speaker violating the maxim often aims to make the listener believe or understand the utterance as it is or just understand the surface meaning.

### ***Flouting the Maxim***

Flouting the maxim is the same as violating the maxim, the speaker fails to observe the maxim. The difference between violating and flouting the maxims is that when flouting the maxim, a speaker blatantly disobeys the maxim. This disobedience does not have negative intentions, but the speaker just wants the listener to understand and find more meaning in the utterance.

### ***Suspending the Maxim***

Suspending the maxim occurs when there is no expectation of the speaker and hearer that the maxim should be observed. Thomas (2013) also argued that suspension of the maxim can depend on cultural influences, and it may also be context-specific to particular situations or events. Irawan (2019) stated that maxim suspension happened because the topic or words that are being communicated is considered taboo, therefore the speaker will not give information clearly about that. The use of euphemism is a case of avoiding taboos, such as the use of “kupu-kupu malam” to indicate “prostitute”. Moreover, (Saradifa, 2020) also stated that suspending the maxim often happens at the funeral to respect the participant in the said situation.



### ***Opting out of the Maxim***

The opt-out maxim is when the speaker refuses to be cooperative in a conversation. Moreover, the way the speaker tries not to be involved in a conversation is also the way the speaker opts out of the maxim.

### ***Infringing the Maxim***

Infringing the maxim occurs when there is no intention to create an implicature which is often due to the imperfect linguistic performance and the condition of the speaker in the specific situation.

### ***Implicature***

Thomas (2013) explained that implicature is to imply something. To imply something means to give a hint of the intention indirectly through language. Implicature is the intention of the speaker which is not part of the utterances but is somehow conveyed through the conversation (Rachmah Zakia et al., 2022). It is created intentionally and unintentionally by the speaker which will then be understood by the listener.

Furthermore, Rachmah et al. (2022) also argued that implicature is the intention of the speaker that is conveyed despite not following the cooperative principle of conversation, which is also called the non-observance of conversational maxims. Implicature occurred because there is no cooperation between or among the speakers. The listener's understanding of implicature may fail, this is because implicature depends on the context in which the conversation takes place, which is called conversational implicature. They are pragmatically rather than semantically determined which means the meaning depends on the context of the utterances (Recanati Francois, 1989)

## METHOD

### Research Design

This study aims to find the type of non-observance of the maxims and the implicature of the non-observance of the maxim. Therefore, this research utilized qualitative design. As stated by (Mishra & Alok 2017) “Qualitative research involves looking in-depth at non-numerical data” and descriptive research is research where the researcher has no control over the data and only reports the result of the analysis without making any other changes or development. Descriptive research is also used because in this research the researcher analyses and draws conclusions as the result of the data analysis. Consequently, this research design is suitable for this research, given the objectives of the research.

### Instrument

Table 1 Data Table

No.	Data	Time	Context	Type of non-observance of the maxim					Type of maxim				
				VM	FM	SM	OM	IM	MQ	MY	MR	MM	
1	Xu Wenwu: Where's the entrance to Ta Lo? Ying Li: You're not welcome in our village.	02:07:06	After almost getting killed and passing through the magical forest, Xu Wenwu continued to search for Ta Lo village. Ying Li is the only person Xu Wenwu met after trying to find the entrance to Ta Lo. However, before meeting Xu Wenwu in person, Ying Li has already known every bad thing that Xu Wenwu did and what he is looking for.		✓				✓				

Type of non-observance of maxim.	Type of maxim
VN = Violate the maxim	MQ = Maxim Quantity
FM = Flout the maxim	MY = Maxim Quality
SM = Suspend the maxim	MR = Maxim relevance
OM = Opt-out of the maxim	MM = Maxim manner
IM = Infringe the maxim	

### Data Analysis

The theory of analyzing qualitative data is used in analyzing data. In analyzing data Miles et al. (2014) proposed three activities in analyzing the qualitative data: First, data condensation, followed by data display, and verifying or drawing the conclusion. After collecting the data, the next step in analyzing the data is data condensation. Data condensation is the process of selecting and simplifying the data from its raw forms, in this case, the movie transcript. In this data condensation, the writer used the coding process, which means selecting and simplifying the data into the selecting code. The result of data condensation was then analysed by using the theory of Grice (1975) and Thomas (2013) about the non-observance of maxim and implicature which then will be displayed in the table and extended text or the explanations. The implicature is analysed by using Grice's theory of conversational implicature based on the context of the conversation. Finally, after the first two steps, the final activity is to conclude the analysis result.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Non-observance of the Maxims

#### *Flouting the Maxims*

In this movie, the character's behavior toward the cooperative principles maxims is highly inclined to flout the maxim. This can be seen from the number of utterances classified as flouting the maxims, which is twenty-four times out of forty-six data. The table below

displays the result of non-observance of the maxims by flouting it. The Maxim of quantity is the most maxim that is flouted, followed by the maxim of relevance, the maxim of manner, and the maxim of quality.

Table 2 Flouting the Maxims

Type of non-observance	Type of maxim	Frequency	Data Reference
Flouting	Quantity	12	1, 7, 8, 19, 27, 28, 29, 34. 35, 36, 42, 44
	Quality	1	3
	Relevance	9	4, 6, 9, 13, 18, 21, 25, 26, 43
	Manner	2	30, 41
Total		24	

*Mrs. Chen: Ruihua, you're supposed to be helping your dad stock the shop.*

*Ruihua: Mom, I can't work on an empty stomach, my legs get crampy. Maybe Shaun help him instead of just showing up every day to eat our food. (Datum 7)*

This conversation happens in the morning when Ruihua and his family are having breakfast. In the morning, Ruihua is supposed to help his father at the shop at the time, however, he seems to not hurry but enjoy his breakfast. Therefore, his mother told him about that. The response of Ruihua is considered to flout the maxim of quantity. The first sentence of his answer “Mom, I can’t work on an empty stomach, my legs get crampy” is in fact enough to answer his mother. However, he keeps talking and gives more information that is needed in that situation. This finding is in line with Rachmah Zakia et al. (2022) that stated that the speaker gives more information to form a negative value, one of which is to be sarcastic to another participant. The next sentence of Ruihua’s “Maybe Shaun can help him instead

of just showing up every day to eat our food” can be categorized as being sarcastic because he gave an offensive opinion toward Shaun.

*Katy: Been looking everywhere for ya. You okay?*

*Shang-Chi: I'm not who you think I am. (Datum 41)*

The conversation between Katy and Shang-Chi in datum 41 above happened the night before the war between Shang-Chi and his father. After preparing mentally and physically with his mother's family to prevent his father from destroying his mother's village, Shang-Chi takes his time and sits by himself. Katy who saw that come and sit with him.

The maxim of manners requires the speaker to be brief but at the same time be clear and avoid ambiguity. The conversation above shows the way Shang-chi's flouting the maxim of manner. Here Katy's asking about Shang-Chi's well-being because she saw Shang-Chi sitting by himself and looked like he was drowning in his thought. However, Shang-Chi's answer here is ambiguous. He is talking more about who he is rather than telling Katy his condition in an ambiguous manner. It can be seen by the next response of Katy in the conversation. She responded as if she thought they were talking about the same topic, however, Shang-chi said that is not what he is talking about. Therefore, Shang-chi is being ambiguous and not clear in the conversation and flouting the maxim of manner.

The result of Pertiwi (2023) study shows that when the speaker flouted the maxim of manner, they were demanding something. This study, however, found that Shang-Chi flouted the maxim of manner to somehow start a difficult conversation about himself. Shang-Chi is rarely talking about his true self or his identity to anyone else. That is why being open to someone and completely trusting them to show his true color was somehow challenging to him. Therefore, he flouted

the maxim of manner to get Katy into the conversation and allow him to talk about the truth.

***Violating the Maxims***

Table 3 Violating the Maxims

Type of non-observance	Type of maxim	Frequency	Data Reference
Violating	Quantity	2	33, 39
	Quality	5	11, 20, 22, 23, 45
	Relevance	4	17, 24, 38, 40
	Manner	1	15
Total		12	

*Waipo: When are you two going to get married?*

*Shang-Chi: Waipo, we're just friends. (Datum 11)*

The result of quality maxim violation conducted by Maulin & Sembodo (2022) display the way the speaker violates the maxim of quality by not telling the actual information needed in the conversation. In line with the study, this research also found out that the character in the movie violates the maxim of quality by not giving the actual information to the listener.

The contextual situation in datum 11 above is Shang-chi was at Katy's house to go to work together. As they were about to leave, Shang-chi went to Waipo to say goodbye. Shang-chi is considered to violate the maxim of quality because he aims to mislead Waipo by saying something that seems like the truth. From the movie or the context, there is something more between Shang-chi and Katy. However, Shang-chi's life was unstable, and he lived in disguise and hiding from his father. That is why he tries to convince Waipo and himself about his and Katy's status.

*Shang-Chi:* I knew that I couldn't go back to him, so I just...  
ran. I know this is a lot to dump on you.

*Katy:* I'm sorry about your mom. (Datum 17)

The contextual situation in the conversation above is that after an accident on the bus and where Katy saw Shang-chi's true side, which Shang-chi had been trying to cover up, Katy finally decided to help Shang-chi and followed Shang-chi to meet his sister. The conversation above took place while they were on the plane. Here Shang-chi tells Katy about his past and who he really is and how he ended up living under an anonymous name.

In the conversation above Katy is considered to violate the maxim of relevance. The maxim of relevance requires the participant in conversation to be relevant to the topic being discussed. Although Shang-Chi also tells Katy about his mother and how he lost her, Katy's response here is considered irrelevant to what Shang-Chi said before. Here, Shang-Chi shows his apologies for not being true to Katy in their entire friendship. However, Katy instead answers with "I'm sorry about your mom". Therefore, she unconsciously violates the maxim of relevance.

### ***Opting Out the Maxims***

The next way the character does not fulfill the maxim of conversation is to opt out of the maxim. The table below displays the number of occurrences of the way the characters in the movie opt out of the maxim. With a total of five times occurrences, the most maxim that is opting out is the maxim relevance, followed by the maxim of quantity, quality, and manner with the same amount of one occurrence.

Table 4 Opting Out the Maxims

Type of non-observance	Type of maxim	Frequency	Data Reference
Opting out	Quantity	1	2
	Quality	1	12
	Relevance	1	10
	Manner	2	5, 16
Total		5	

*Mrs Chen: Waigong didn't move here from Hunan so you could park cars for a living.*

*Katy: Well, on that note, I think we're gonna miss our bus. (Datum 10)*

Katy's answer shows the way she tries to not be in the conversation, or she does not want the conversation to continue. The topic of conversation was Katy's job. Katy's mother does not like her to work as a valet driver. However, Katy has always been like anything about cars. In her opinion parking a car is not an easy and fun job as her mother thinks. Therefore, that is why she is opting out of the conversation.

By using the phrase "Well, on that note" she emphasizes that she is no longer interested in continuing the conversation. She is considered opting out of the maxim of relevance because her answer is not in line with the topic that has been discussed before. Moreover, the disagreement about her job has been declined by some people including her close friends. This eventually led her to opt out of the kind of topic in conversation because the result of the discussion has always remained the same.

The way the character or the speaker opts out of the conversation is different. In the conversation above Katy is still trying to be polite to her mother by stating the reason why she opts out of the conversation. The study carried out by Machfudi Imam Moch et al. (2022) found



the speaker opting out of the conversation by making it obvious that they do not want to be cooperative in conversation. In this study, they found a more straightforward answer by stating "Please, don't ask me. Just take the money" and simply "no" utterance.

*Katy: You know, before she was a lawyer, your girl was pretty wild.*

*John: Oh! What happened?*

*Soo: I grew up. (Datum 5)*

The above conversation takes place when Katy and Shang-Chi meet up with their friend Soo and her husband John at a cafe. Here they are talking about their past, how they met and their friendship since high school.

When Katy told them about how crazy they used to be in high school, Soo's husband John was shocked because he did not know that his wife had done the things that Katy told him about. Therefore, John showed his surprise and asked, "Oh! What happened?" but Soo only answered by saying "I grew up". here Soo considered opting out of the maxim of manner. Soo is opting out because here it can be seen that Soo does not want to even be reluctant to tell her husband what happened back then. Moreover, the maxim that is opting out by Soo is the maxim of relevance because here Soo gives an ambiguous answer.

### ***Infringing the Maxims***

The last type of non-observance of the maxim is infringing the maxim. The following table presents the occurrences of infringing the maxim. The maxim that is infringed are the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner.

Table 5 Infringing the Maxims

Type of non-observance	Type of maxim	Frequency	Data Reference
Infringe	Quantity	3	14, 31,32
	Quality	-	
	Relevance	-	
	Manner	1	37
Total		4	

*Shang-Chi: The back is about to go. On my signal, make a hard right.*

*Katy: What signal? (Datum 14)*

The above conversation took place during the attack on the bus. Shang-chi tries to defeat the villain and Katy tries to drive the bus to save the other passengers on the bus and avoid collisions or accidents with other drivers. Shang-chi is infringing on the maxim of manner because he is not clear with his command.

The infringing of the maxim's manner happens because of the unsuitable situation at the time since Shang-chi just has a fraction of a second to speak to Katy because it was so chaotic. Another conversation where the speaker is not in a stable condition leads to the infringing of the maxim as follows.

*Katy: Who are you?*

*Trevor: Trevor? Slattery? The actor from Liverpool? Wait. Are you the governor's kids? I've been preparing a monologue for your homecoming dinner. Oh. Where's she going?*

*(Datum 32)*

Trevor has been captured there for a long time and has been in an unstable state. Moreover, he also has an imperfect linguistic performance that can be seen from the way he speaks. Trevor seems to easily distract and tends to change topics mid-conversation. This can be because of his job as an actor or performer as he said which led him to always talk. Therefore, he is

infringing on the maxim of quantity because he gives more than what Katy needed by talking about more than one topic at once but also does not give Katy a clear answer about who he is.

### **The Implicature of Non-observance of the Maxims**

Thomas (2013) stated that when the speaker infringes the maxim, they do not have any intention or desire to create any conversational implicature. Therefore, the implicature of the data that are included in maxim infringement 14, 31, 32, and 37 are not analyzed.

### ***The Implicature of Flouting the Maxims***

*Katy:                      What the hell's going on?*  
*Shang-Chi:             You really wanna talk about this now?*  
*(Datum 13)*

Context: While on their way to work, Shang-chi was suddenly approached by some people, who are from his father's army. They talked for a few seconds but then the situation became increasingly chaotic and uncontrollable, then they started fighting.

In datum 13, Shang-Chi does not directly answer Katy's question which makes him not relevant to the conversation. However, by saying "You really wanna talk about this now?" He implied that the situation they are in is not possible for him to answer her. Or in short, Katy's question is not inappropriate to the situation. Moreover, rather than questions about the situation, Katy should help him manage the situation. if Katy really wants to talk about it now, he implies that the timing is also emotionally and physically inappropriate, which is why he trying to question Katy's decision to engage in a conversation at that moment.

*Shang-Chi:             Look, I don't know what the hell is going on, but if we don't find a way to get to Ta Lo before him, he's gonna destroy everything that's left of our family.*  
*Xu Xialing:            This family was destroyed a long time ago.*  
*(Datum 30)*

Context: After Shang-Chi refuses to listen to his father and help him to do his plan, Shang-Chi, Xu Xialing, and Katy end up locked in the basement, however, after learning of his father's plan, Shang-Chi tried to stop him.

Xu Xialing in the conversation above is being ambiguous and not clear, there are two different implicatures from the conversation in datum 31 above. We see that Shang-Chi is trying to protect his family or to be precise his mother's family. He knew when his father got there, he would destroy anything that stood in his way. That is why Shang-Chi says "he's gonna destroy everything that's left of our family" to imply he will do anything to prevent his father from going to Ta Lo and protect his mother's family and home. However, from the response or the utterances we can see there is another opinion or perspective, Xu Xialing tries to imply something else. The family she means in her utterances consisted of just she, Shang-Chi, and his father which is why she says, "This family was destroyed a long time ago". This happened when their mother dies, and his father just focuses on revenge and her brother focuses on running away and leaving her alone. The dynamic of the family is no longer there for such a long time ago. Therefore, for her, there is nothing left to destroy.

The Implicature of Violating the Maxims

*Shang-Chi: I'm not here to fight anybody. Okay? I'm looking for my sister, Xu Xialing.*

*Jon Jon: Never heard of her. We just lost a fighter at the last minute, so you get the next slot.*

*(Datum 20)*

Context: Shang-Chi wanted to meet with his sister to tell her about and warn her about their father. So, he went to his sister's place. Until there it turns out that his sister's place is an underworld fight. There he met Jon Jon who worked at that place. Jon Jon tells Shang-Chi that he gets the opponent and is ready to fight. Before that, Shang-Chi mistakenly signed a contract that he thought was some sort of term and condition to get into the building.

Jon Jon's response here has a significant implicature. Despite Shang-Chi's expectation that Jon Jon might provide information about Xu Xialing, Jon Jon claims he has "never heard of her." Here, he is stating a lie. Moreover, He is also mentioned losing a fighter unexpectedly and talking more about the fight rather than Shang-Chi's focus at the time, which is looking for his sister. Jon Jon does that to shift Shang-Chi's focus. Moreover, by mentioning "next slot," Jon Jon creates an implication that Shang-Chi will be participating in the fight rather than addressing his sister's whereabouts. Moreover, Jon Jon also tricked Shang-Chi into wanting to fight by saying "I'll help you find whoever you're looking for" in their next conversation.

*Katy: No, no. Hell no, dude. This is bullshit! I have been by your side for half your life. I get there are things you never wanted to talk about, and I never wanted to push. But a guy with a freaking machete for an arm just chopped our bus in half, Shaun! Who the hell are you?*

*Shang-Chi: My sister sent me this a few months ago. I think it's the address of where she's staying. Those guys back there were sent by my dad.*

*(Datum 15)*

Context: On their way to work, Shang-Chi was attacked by some people because he would not give them the pendant his mother gave him when he was a kid. It turns out, those people are the men of Xu Wenwu, Shang-Chi's father. When attacked, Shang-Chi fought back, Katy who saw Shang-Chi's skill in fighting was surprised, because the Shang-Chi she knew so far was just an ordinary man. After escaping and surviving the attack, Katy followed Shang-Chi and tried to get an explanation for her confusion and shock.

In the conversation above, Shang-Chi does not clearly answer Katy's question of who he is. Rather he is talking about his sister and his father man. However, Shang-Chi's response gives some implicature. The first thing on his mind after the attack is his sister. He also knew that if his father already found him, that is mean his sister is also in danger. At the time, he does not care about others but to protect his

sister, he even does not bother to explain himself to Katy. Moreover, Shang-Chi also uses the phrase "I think" when referring to the address which shows that Shang-Chi might not be completely certain about the authenticity or significance of the address. This implicates and shows how he and his sister's relationship, they have no contact or any knowledge of each other.

Shang-Chi is also not in the best state to even explain everything to Katy. He says "Those guys back there were sent by my dad" which carries a sense of urgency and danger. This implies that the arrival of these individuals sent by his father has prompted Shang-Chi to act and he knows that he must tell his sister because they are both now in danger.

#### ***The Implicature of Opting Out of the Maxims***

*Mrs Chen: Waigong didn't move here from Hunan so you could park a car for a living.*

*Katy: Well, on that note, I think we're gonna miss our bus.*  
(Datum 10)

Context: Katy and Shang-Chi work at the same place. Shang-Chi comes to Katy's house to go to work together. Katy's Family and Shang-Chi are having breakfast before they go to work. When they were about to start breakfast Mrs. Chen suddenly talked about their job.

In the conversation above, Katy utilizes the phrase "Well, on that note" politely exit the ongoing conversation. She is also clearly talking about the new topic. From the context, we also can see that Katy was about to eat her food but because the topic was brought up by her mother, she decided to not eat and just left and went to work. It is supported by Katy talking about "I think we're gonna miss our bus." to support her action in not finishing her breakfast and her unwillingness to listen more about her mom bickering toward her job.

*John: How have you never told me this story?*

*Katy: You know, before she was a lawyer, your girl was pretty*

*wild.*

*John: Oh! What happened?*

*Soo: I grew up.*

*(Datum 5)*

Context: Shang-Chi and Katy are meeting up with their friend Soo and her husband John. Here, they are talking about their time in senior high school, how they met, and all the crazy things they did back then. One of the stories shared by Shang-Chi and Katy at that time had never been heard by John before, so he attempted to seek clarification or further explanation from Soo.

Soo's response holds several implicatures. By stating "I grew up," Soo explains that she is no longer the same person she was during her senior high school days when she acted without much thought. She now identifies as a career-oriented woman, focused on her job and important aspects of her life. Additionally, Soo is the second person who does not approve of Shang-Chi and Katy's job as valet parkers. She indirectly suggests that Shang-Chi and Katy could also aspire for more, as seen from her later words in the conversation where she mentions that they are graduates of a prestigious university and should live up to their potential rather than settling for parking cars.

## CONCLUSION

There is a total of 45 data of the non-observance of maxims in Shang-Chi and The Legend of The Teen Rings movie. Flouting the maxim is the most dominant type of the non-observance of the maxim with 24 times occurrences. The maxim that flouted the most is the maxim of quantity. The result shows that the characters sometimes give too much information or give less information than what is needed in the conversation to convey their real intention. Violating the maxim occurs 12 times and the maxim that is violated the most is the maxim of quality by often stated a lie. Opting out occurs 5 times occurrences

and the last type of non-observance of the maxim is infringing the maxim of quantity and manner with a total of 4 times occurrences.

Moreover, the implicature of the non-observance of the maxim shows that there is more meaning behind the characters' utterances in the conversation. The implicature varied based on the context of the conversation. They use implicature often to get what they want without looking desperate to get it, protect their ego, be polite in expressing their opinion and desire, emphasize a point without appearing impolite or assertive, and skilfully guide others to believe what they said and command other through indirect suggestions.

Furthermore, the writer expects the next researcher will consider analyzing more on the way the culture influences the way the characters do not fulfill the maxim and the implicature. Moreover, other fields or branches of linguistics other than pragmatics can be used for more depth analysis.



## REFERENCES

- Anisa Sofiatun Dwi. (2020). *The Pragmatics Analysis of Non-Observance English Education Department Teacher Training and Education Faculty State Institute for Islamic Studies (Iain) Salatiga*.
- Birner, & Betty J. (n.d.). *Pragmatics*.
- Dewi, N. M. P., Candra, K. D. P., & Ayomi, P. N. (2023). Maxim Violation Done by Emily in Emily in Paris Movie. *Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 112–121.
- Grice H. P. (1975). *Grice-Logic*. 41–58.
- Irawan, D. (2019). *A Pragmatic Analysis on The Non-Observance of Maxims Performed by The Characters in Selma Movie*. <http://repository.iainbengkulu.ac.id/id/eprint/3786>
- Machfudi Imam Moch, Aviaty Rifa, & Mustofa Ihyak. (2022). An Analysis of Cooperative Principles in Mark Twain's *The Adventures Of Huckleberry Finn*. *NOBEL: Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, 13(2), 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.15642/NOBEL.2022.13.2>
- Maulin, G., & Sembodo, T. J. P. (2022). Violations of Gricean Maxims in the TV Series *You*. *Lexicon*, 8(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v8i1.65905>
- Miles B. Matthew, Huberman Michael A., & Saldana Johnny. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook (Third edition)*. SAGE Publication.
- Mishra, S. B., & Alok Shashi. (2017). *HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319207471>
- Muarifuddin, M., & Arman, A. (2022). An Analysis of Non-Observance the Maxim in "Knives Out" Movie script. *ELITE: Journal of English Language and Literature*, 7(1), 10–20. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33772/elite.v5i1.1470>
- Nurisa Simaremare, Y., Cendana Nainggolan, W., & Herman. (2021). *Pragmatics Analysis on Conversational Implicature Used in Mulan (2020) Movie*. 15.

- Pertiwi, W. E. (2023). Non-Observance Maxims in Banyumasan Humor Speech. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(3), 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v2i3.124>
- Rachmah Zakia, Widya, & Putri Jovita EVI. (2022). The Non-observance of Maxims that Trigger Implicature in Cruella Movie (2021). *E-Journal of Linguistics*, 16(2), 264–272. <https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2022.v16.i02.p12>
- Recanati Francois. (1989). *The Pragmatics of What is Said*. *Mind & Language*, 4.
- Saradifa, A. S. (2020). Non-Observance of Grice’s Maxims Found In “The Grapevine: Gossip at Work, What Should You Do As A Leader?” Drama Series Script Produced By The Calvin Company. *JELLE: Journal of English Literature, Linguistics, and Education*, 1(1).
- Thomas Jenny. (2013). *Meaning in Interaction*.
- Tumimomor, K., Tuna, J. R., & Kamagi, S. (2023). AN ANALYSIS OF MAXIM VIOLATION IN THE LEGEND OF DRAGOON GAME. *JoTELL: Journal of Teaching English, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(5), 613–637.
- Yule George. (1996). *Pragmatics*.
- Yule George. (2020). *The Study of Language (Seventh)*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108582889>
- Zhao, S. (2021). An Analysis of the Conversational Implicature of “Little Sheldon” from the Perspective of Violation of the Cooperative Principle. *OALib*, 08(01), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107115>