

FLOUTING MAXIMS OF POLITENESS IN THE INSIDE OUT FILM (2015); PRAGMATICS STUDY

Nastha Cecillia Firdaus, Ervina CM Simatupang

English Department, Widyatama University, Bandung, Indonesia.

nastha.cecillia@widyatama.ac.id, ervina.simatupang@widyatama.ac.id

Artikel Info

Received : 19 Des 2023
Review : 10 Feb 2024
Accepted : 26 April 2024
Published : 30 April 2024

Abstrak

This research explores pragmatics, focusing on conversational flouting in the film "Inside Out" (2015). Pragmatics involves understanding how meaning is conveyed and interpreted in communication. The aims of the research are to find out the types of flouting maxims in the film "Inside Out" and the Functions behind the Flouting of maxims that occur in the film Inside Out. The descriptive qualitative approach is used to analyzed the data. The flouting maxims were found in some of the conversations from the Inside Out movie along with the function. The results of this research shows that Flouting the maxim of quality and manner is the most common type that has been observed in the characters, each constituting 30% of the data. Different functions were also identified, and the research indicates that characters in the movie predominantly exhibit maxim flouting driven by a single motive—specifically, the competitive function, which constitutes 40% of all the instances observed. Whereas convivial, collaborative, and conflictive functions are not as frequent as competitive functions.

Keyword: Flouting Maxim, Quantity, Quality, Relation, Manner, Function.

INTRODUCTION

Language is a crucial component of daily life since it allows us to communicate with others. There are many different ways to communicate via language, including body language, gestures, and written and spoken words. Also, language serves the purpose of communicating our thoughts and desires to others. Language has a role in every facet of our interactions with other people. Language serves as a means of communication as one of its roles. But, in

conversation we frequently do not communicate fully and clearly, making it challenging for the listener(s) to understand what we are saying. Deep pragmatic analysis may be done on the phenomena in discussion.

A conversation occurs when two or more individuals communicate about a certain subject. There are some guidelines to go by during communications, known as conversational maxims. Conversational maxims are a means to clarify the connection between what is said and what the listener understands (Grundy,2000) Someone must

talk during a conversation, and another person must listen. Contributions or communications must be made by individuals that the listener or hearer can understand. In order to develop cooperative communication between speaker and hearer, there are guidelines known as the cooperative principle that must be followed. The Cooperation Principle explains how individuals relate to one another. Individuals employ the cooperative principle to collaborate with one another by speaking in a way that is clear to understand and then interpreting that speech as adhering to the cooperative principle.

Sometimes people break the cooperative principle in their conversation. If the speaker does not fully or break the principle (maxims), the speaker is said to “flout” the maxims. When the speaker flouts the maxim, the conversation between the speaker and the hearer can be unsuccessful since they will misunderstand each other. Speakers who disregard this adage lead their listeners to only comprehend the speaker's words' superficial meaning.

B.METHOD

In this research, the researcher will employ a descriptive qualitative approach to thoroughly analyze the data. This approach has been chosen specifically for its suitability in examining and characterizing instances where the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner are contravened within the script of the movie *Inside Out*. Qualitative research, utilizing techniques such as focus groups and interviews, delves into the realms of attitudes, behaviors, and

personal experiences. Its primary aim is to elicit comprehensive responses from participants, as noted by Dowson (2002: 14). Furthermore, as Basnet highlights, qualitative research is firmly rooted in the concept of quality and is particularly concerned with evaluating information gathered from the general public with a focus on its quality. This methodological choice will enable a nuanced exploration of how these maxims are flouted within the context of the *Inside Out* movie script, shedding light on the intricacies of communication and dialogue within the film.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Data 1

Context: Riley and their mother take a walk to get pizza, reminiscing about cherished family moments. Joy arises as they share stories of silly adventures, heartfelt celebrations, and joyous gatherings. However, the mood shifts when a memory turns blue, suggesting a touch of sadness in the midst of their reflections.

DISGUST: Good going Sadness. Now when Riley thinks of that moment with Dad, she's gonna feel sad. Bravo.

SADNESS: I'm sorry Joy -- I don't really know -- I thought maybe, if you -- if I -- if -- I mean --

(*Inside Out* Film Script; Minute 12.40)

Data 1 showed that Sadness flouted the maxim of quantity in this context by providing insufficient information about why she took the action she did to Riley's memories. Instead of offering a clear and detailed explanation, Sadness's response is vague and lacks sufficient information. She expresses uncertainty and hesitates in her explanation,

saying, "I'm sorry Joy -- I don't really know -- I thought maybe if you -- if I -- if -- I mean --." This lack of clarity and specificity hinders the effectiveness of the conversation, as the principle of quantity in pragmatics encourages individuals to share an appropriate amount of information for the communication to flow smoothly.

In data 1, the interaction is convivial as Sadness's actions strengthen the relationship by acknowledging and handling the speakers' feelings with genuine remorse and vulnerability. Disgust sarcastically remarks, "Good going Sadness. Now when Riley thinks of that moment with Dad, she's gonna feel sad. Bravo." In response, Sadness sincerely expresses, "I'm sorry Joy -- I don't really know -- I thought maybe, if you -- if I -- if -- I mean --," showing a genuine attempt to navigate emotional nuances. This acknowledgment and acceptance of sadness contribute to a deeper connection between the characters.

Flouting Maxim of Quality

Data 2

Context: Riley goes downstairs to find her parents engaged in a quiet conversation in the living room. As she listens, she discovers that they are discussing the moving van and the challenges associated with settling into their new house.

DAD: Alright. Goodbye. (hangs up; to Mom) Well, guess what? The moving van won't be here until Thursday.

MOM: You're kidding.

(Inside Out Film Script; minute 09.59)

Data 2 showed that Mom had flouted the maxim of Quality because Mom says "You're kidding." it means something does not represent what she thinks by using sarcasm to respond to the father's conversation. Her mom's sarcastic response didn't seem to align with what she truly thought or felt. It was clear that her mom was also grappling with the stress of the move, but instead of expressing it openly, she chose sarcasm as a shield. Mom's initial sarcastic remark might have been a momentary lapse in communication rather than a true reflection of her thoughts.

The information presented in Data 2 fulfills a collaborative function, emphasizing that both the act itself and the relationship between the speaker and listener are not at risk of deterioration. In this instance, the speaker aimed for a response acknowledging the shared challenges they were facing. Mom, in expressing the depth of her feelings and seeking Dad's approval, deviated from clear communication norms and employed sarcasm. The conversation unfolds with Dad stating, "Well, guess what? The moving van won't be here until Thursday," to which Mom responds, "You're kidding," revealing her emotional stance and seeking validation from Dad.

Flouting Maxim of Relation

Data 3

Context: The group of characters gathered in Riley's new house, and as they did so, their faces hardened and they began to groan in unison. Each of their expressions showed irritation as they adjusted to the strange circumstances. Their new home lacked the charm of their former home since the walls seemed too plain, the furniture was too mismatched, and the decor was uninspired. Sensing the general dissatisfaction, Joy made

the decision that it was time to switch the topic of conversation.

J

OY: Hey, it's nothing our butterfly curtains couldn't fix. I read somewhere that an empty room is an opportunity.

ANGER: Where did you read that?

JOY: It doesn't matter. I read it and it's great. We'll put the bed there. And the desk over there –

(Inside Out Film Script; Minute 09.41)

Data 3 showed Joy had flouted the maxim of Relation since she changed the topic and Joy dodged to answer Anger's question by saying "It doesn't matter. I read it and it's great. We'll put the bed there. And the desk over there –" and then continued the topic being discussed. By disregarding the maxim of Relation, Joy introduced a disruptive element into the conversation. Instead of addressing Anger's question and maintaining the flow of the discussion, Joy sidestepped the query and proceeded to continue with the previous topic. This behavior can create confusion and frustration for the listener, as it hinders their ability to follow the conversation and understand the speaker's intended message.

The motive of data 3 is the Competitive function because Joy refuses to answer Anger's question. The Competitive function often arises when individuals engage in conversation with a goal of asserting dominance, gaining an advantage, or displaying superiority over others. When Anger questions where Joy read her information, she deflects by stating, "It doesn't matter. I read it and it's great. We'll put the bed there. And the desk over there." This response reflects Joy's effort to maintain control and assert

her perspective without engaging in a cooperative exchange. Such behavior introduces tension and hampers effective communication by deviating from the usual expectations of mutual understanding and respect in a conversation.

Flouting Maxim of Manner

Data 4

Context: Riley's curiosity overcame her as she silently crept down the stairs in an effort to see the much-discussed moving vehicle. She couldn't help but hear her parents talking as they walked down the steps from the adjoining living room. She automatically stopped, curious to learn more about the impending move.

MOM: Did you even read the contract?

DAD: Honey, you act like this is my fault

(Inside Out Film Script; minute 10.15)

Data 4 provides a flouting maxim of manner since Riley's Dad responded "Honey, you act like this is my fault –" ambiguously to her mom's inquiry about the contract. Instead of providing a clear "yes" or "no," his vague response caused confusion and frustration to Riley's Mom. The deviation from clear and concise communication hindered the flow of the conversation, contrary to the cooperative principle in pragmatics, which emphasizes clarity, precision, and avoiding unnecessary ambiguity.

In Data 4, Dad's disagreement with Mom serves a competitive function by introducing opposition and deviating from the social objective of maintaining a harmonious relationship. The exchange, initiated by Mom's inquiry about the contract, reflects a lack of cooperation and common ground. Mom questions, "Did you even read the contract?" to which Dad responds defensively, "Honey, you act like this is my fault –". This

competitive behavior has the potential to harm the connection between the speaker and the hearer. The interaction highlights the importance of understanding the impact of competitive behaviors in communication, emphasizing the consequences of prioritizing personal desires over cooperative and considerate social interactions within the framework of pragmatics.

Data 5

Context: Joy excitedly suggests to Sadness to read about the Long-term book to keep Sadness from screwing up Riley's first day of school. So, joy makes it seem that sadness has a very important job to do and makes Sadness a circle so she stays out of trouble.

JOY: Well, have you read this one? This seems interesting: "Long-Term Memory Retrieval, Volume 47?"

SADNESS: No.

JOY: Ohhh! A real page-turner!

SADNESS: (opens manual; reads) "Long-Term Memory Data Selection via channel sub-grouping?"

JOY: See? Fun already! You lucky dog, you're reading these cool things and I gotta go work. Life is so unfair.

(Inside Out Film Script; Minute 15.08)

In Data 5, the maxim of manner is flouted as Joy's statement lacks clarity, introducing obscurity of expression in her utterance. Joy exclaims, "See? Fun already! You lucky dog, you're reading these cool things and I gotta go work. Life is so unfair." The statement, while possibly intended to convey enthusiasm, falls short in terms of clear communication. Joy's ambiguous

expression leaves room for interpretation, hindering effective communication and understanding. The absence of further explanation or clarification contributes to the obscurity of her message, emphasizing the significance of adhering to the maxim of manner for clear and precise communication. In this instance, the competitive function emerges as the social interaction not only deviates from but also competes with the intended social purpose, risking a weakening of the connection between the speaker and the hearer. The act of flouting the maxim of manner disrupts the smooth flow of communication, challenging the listener to decipher the speaker's true intentions. Illustrated by Joy's unclear statement - "See? Fun already! You lucky dog, you're reading these cool things and I gotta go work. Life is so unfair." - the lack of clarity introduces ambiguity, hindering effective communication and emphasizing the importance of adhering to the maxim of manner for clear and precise expression.

D. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this research delves into the intricacies of human communication dynamics as portrayed in the film "Inside Out," employing a descriptive qualitative approach to explore the intentional flouting of cooperative principles by characters. The study holds significance for the field of pragmatics, offering practical applications for educators and researchers. Despite acknowledged limitations, the systematic data analysis categorizes instances of maxim flouting into 20% for quantity, 20% for relation, 30% for quality, and 30% for manner, revealing that flouting of manner and quality is more prevalent than that of quantity and relation. In "Inside Out," characters

frequently flout the maxim of quality and manner because of the intricate nature of their emotions. The story centers on the emotions inside Riley's mind, each representing a unique emotional aspect. Due to the complexity of human emotions, characters often find it challenging to express their feelings clearly. This complexity results in instances where their words are vague or ambiguous, flouting the maxim of manner and quality. Regarding functions, 40% of instances exhibit competitive functions, while collaborative, conflictive, and convivial functions each constitute 20%. Notably, the competitive function is more common compared to the other functions. This research provides valuable insights into language use and communication, paving the way for future studies in this domain. Characters in "Inside Out" frequently have competitive motives as they deal with conflicts and challenges within Riley's emotional surfaces. The inherent struggle between different emotional facets often prioritizes personal desires and perspectives, resulting in frequent competitive interactions. Conflicts become essential in this comprehensive picture of the human mind, adding to the prominence of competitive motives in the characters' reactions and interactions.

REFERENCES

- Bayu Garna Pradika, K. A. (2018). An Analysis of Flouting Maxims in "Coco" Movie. *Professional Journal Of English Education*, 657-663.
- Havika Hariyani, F. A. (2020). An Analysis of Maxim Flouting in *Pokemon: Detective Pikachu* Movie. *Professional Journal Of English Education*, 224-230.
- Jauhar Helmie, N. G. (2019). An Analysis Of Flouting Maxims In Conversation Speaking Of The Main Character In The Movie Of *Home Alone 2 "Lost In New York"* By John Hughes. *Jurnal Joepallt*.
- Jiwalno, N. M. (2020). Flouting Maxims Performed By The Characters In *Jackie* Movie: A Pragmatics Analysis. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, 173-187.
- Melinda Kurniati, S. H. (2018). The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims in the Movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*. *Lexicon*, 65-76.
- Nabillah Holifatunnisa, D. (2023). An analysis of flouting maxim in the *Adam Project* movie. *Lililacs Journal*, 37-45.
- Ni Putu Ira Suartini, K. D. (2023). Flouting Maxim in *He's All That* Movie. *Elysian Journal*, 42-51.
- Puteri, Y. S. (2018, April 4). The Flouting Of Cooperative Principle Maxim In *Inside Out* Movie.
- Rena Al Asyifa Nur Ulfah, R. A. (2018). An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in

"The B.F.G" Movie. Professional
Journal of English Education,
687-695.

Rofa Marlisa, D. N. (2020). The Analysis
of Flouting Maxim in Good
Morning America (GMA)
Talkshow. English: Journal of

Language, Education, and
Humanities, 134-142.

Simatupang, E., et al. 2021. Presupposition
in Kevin Hart's Stand up Show Titled
"Let Me Explain" in 2013: A Pragmatic
Study. Specialucis Ugdymas. Vol.1
(43).