

Flouting Maxim in smile Movie : A Pragmatic Study

Rima Desrifianti¹, Ervina CM Simatupang^{2*}

¹⁻² Universitas Widyatama, Bandung, Indonesia

*ervina.simatupang@widyatama.ac.id

Abstract

The objective of this research is to identify the types of flouting maxim and the factors of flouting maxim in Smile Movie. In this study, a qualitative approach that was descriptive was employed. The dialogue in the film Smile serves as the research's data source. Grice's theory (1975) served as the theoretical foundation for this study. Thirty instances of infractions of Grice's maxims of cooperation principles were found as a consequence of this investigation. The maxim of number comprises 9 data (30%), the maxim of quality includes 9 data (30%), and the maxim of relevance includes 11 data (36.6%) out of the total 30 data. and the manner 1 data maxim (3.4%). The characters also carry out the following factors: 14 data (46.6%) that are competitive, 1 data (3.4%) that are convivial, 7 data (23.4%) that are collaborative, and 8 data (26.6%) that are conflictive. It is evident that, at 36.6%, relevance is the most frequently violated aspect by the characters, and competitiveness is the most frequently utilized component at 46.6%.

Keywords: *pragmatic, maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, maxim of manner*

Introduction

Language is a system used by humans to say something through communication. It is used to communicate, express their ideas and announce something when there is a conversation. According to Paul Grice in Grundy (2000) argues that "the speaker's cooperative intention is for the speaker to provide as much information as intended". They must drive a ruler to understand implicit meaning of the statements made. According to Nuzulia (2020) communication whether it be spoken or written, is an important part of our lives and is used to convey ideas to others and communicate. Speaking, debating, conversing, or making an utterance that requires a straightforward answer from the hearer and a speaker is known as spoken language. Additionally, when the duties of communication are fulfilled, language can be successfully understood by both the audience and the speaker. Then, in order to have successful communication, there had to be a widely acknowledged guideline, which could be examined in terms of language characteristics as a pragmatic maxim that was broken.

Participants should incorporate maxims into their speech in order to implement the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle would be broken in a circumstance known as the flouting of the maxim, which occurs when speakers break the maxim's principles and listeners attempt to understand the underlying meaning that is not made clear in speech (Cutting: 2002). According to Griffith (2006) flouting maxim "is a pithy piece of widely-applicable advice," which suggests that in order for speakers to achieve effective communication, they must follow the maxim. Ibrahim, et al. (2018) explains this principle

describes how effective conversational communication is achieved in common social situations and is broken down into four mottos of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. However, sometimes people break the maxim by giving more or less information, irrelevant, misleading, obscure, that is called breaking the flouting of maxim. And classifies the factor into four parts namely competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive.

The movie is based on the script, but it mainly reflects our daily activities. This is why the researcher became interested in using film as a means to enhance the researcher's understanding of maxim disrespect. Cinema also influenced the masses during childhood and adolescence. Film, also known as film or motion picture, is a series of still or moving images (Chandra, 2014).

The author of this study wants to examine at the Smile movie's category of disobeying a dictum. In this study, these questions ought to be addressed:

1. What types of the maxim are flouted in the Smile movie?
2. What are the factors that characters in Smile movie do?

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of many subfields of linguistics. According to Mey (2001) pragmatics considers people's use of dialect as determined by societal contexts. Appropriately, the contemplation of grounding is also tied to societal contexts resulting from meaning making in articulation. Kroeger (2018) noted pragmatic interpretation is the study of the meaning used in sentences and words. Simatupang (2021) concludes that pragmatics clarifies how dialect clients are able to overcome clear uncertainty since meaning depends on the way, put and time of an expression. It implies that pragmatics offer assistance members of discourse acts to maintain a strategic distance from equivocalness since the meaning of expressions depends on how the articulations are talked. Thomas (2013) defines that meaning in usage or content in context was the prevalent definition of pragmatics in the past.

Cooperative Principle

The success of a conversation sometimes depends on the speaker's interactive approach. Ibrahim, et al. (2018) explains a component of the broader notion that participants in a conversation will collaborate with one another is the notion of an expected amount of information shared. The concept of the expected amount of information provided in a conversation is only one aspect of the larger idea that the participants in the conversation will cooperate with each other. According to Cutting (2002) when speakers urge their listener to grasp or seek out the intended meaning, whether on purpose or not, they are flouting a maxim. Grice (1975) explains that to achieve the principle of cooperation in communication, he distinguished four rules that the speaker and the listener must follow. There are four types of maxims; maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner.

Maxim of Quantity

How much information is shared in a discussion is determined by the maxim quantity. According to Sari, et al. (2020), If another asks a question, the hearer has to respond with information, be brief, and avoid giving away too much. It must be the clarification or

response that the original questioner required. While providing additional information might occasionally be helpful, cooperative principles only require the information that is absolutely necessary. For example:

A: "Hi, what is the capital city of Indonesia?"
B: "It is Jakarta."

In this example, between A and B showed that this is an example of a quantity maxim because B provided the required details regarding Indonesia's capital city, Jakarta.

Maxim of Quality

The truth is the primary emphasis of the quality maxim. Griffith (2006) defined mismatch as an articulation that aims to communicate but has a meaning that is opposite from what is actually meant. Grundy (2000) explains optimal quality as being truthful when necessary. It implies that the speakers must present information as true or as incorrect as they believe it to be. For example:

A: "When is the field study?"
B: "This Thursday."

In this example, the answer given by B is in accordance with the rules in the maxim of quality. B answers with the truth that he believes to be true. Therefore, B has observed the maxim of quality.

Maxim of Relevance

In accordance to the relevance maxim, presenters must make their points pertinent. According to Cutting (2002), when a speaker leaves out a maxim, they anticipate that the listener will be able to infer what the speaker did not say and draw a relationship between their remark and the earlier ones. This makes it harder for the speaker to express the notion clearly and forces the listener to decipher the speaker's concealed meaning. For example:

A: "Is there a lecturer in the room?"
B: "I'm a lecture."

In this example, A asks for it is evident that to B gives pertinent information to ensure that the communication between them operates on the basis of cooperation. As a result, B has adhered to the relevant maxim.

Maxim of Manner

Speakers do not provide concise answers or provide clear information, however, they present data that is confusing and can be obscure, cluttered, and ambiguous. Cruse (2006) explains something can be identified as an ambiguity if it expresses more than one possible meaning. As explained by Ibrahim, et al. (2018), that the speaker usually avoids ambiguity and obscurity of communication by being perceptive, succinct, and organized. It implies that in a communication, the speaker needs to be precise and avoid ambiguity. For example:

A: "There is a math course today, right?"
B: "I'm afraid you're wrong. The math course is tomorrow."

In this example, Speaker A asks B if today is the day for the math course. B responds succinctly but thoroughly, letting us know that the math class will take place tomorrow. B has conformed with the rule of manners in his response.

Factor of Flouting Maxim

The speaker intentioned gives an adage to anticipate the audience to discover the covered up meaning of the expression and leads the audience to more than one suggestion. The adage ignore happens to a few individuals, a few of whose thought processes depend on the circumstance. Leech (1983) classifies the functions of illocutionary speech acts as four parts namely:

Competitive

According to Leech (1983), competitive occurs when linguistic goals compete with social goals such as ordering, demanding, demanding, and begging. A linguistic goal is a self-centered goal, it focuses on its own goal and not another, and a social goal is one that benefits others. For example: Do you know this address?

Convivial

Ibrahim, et al. (2018) explains convivial occurs when linguistic goals coincide with social goals such that offering, inviting, greeting, thanking and congratulating. This dynamic is related to Searle's expressions of thanks, congratulations, forgiveness, praise and condolences (cited in Trosborg, 1995). For example: Congratulations on the degree, hopefully it will be useful.

Collaborative

Leech (1983) explains collaborative occurs when the linguistic target is indifferent to the social goal. This includes endorsements, reports, notices and instructions. Here, the speaker and the listener are not disadvantaged by the utterance, whether the speaker gives a little or a lot of information, for the purpose of this reason is to provide understanding. Furthermore, this motive is related to Searle's assertions, such as claims, hints, brags, complaints, demands, and reports. For example: Dispose of trash in its place!.

Conflictive

According to Leech (1983) mentioned that this dynamic is also related to Searle's expression, which includes expressions of emotions, negative reactions, etc. of the speaker to the listener such as reproach, accusation, blame, etc. Ibrahim, et al. (2018) classifies when the language purpose of an agitation offense clashes with the social goal, it becomes conflictive. Finally, he issues threats, accusations, curses, and reprimands. For example: He must be the one who took your stuff.

Method

The research uses Smile (2022) by Parker Finn as its data source. Qualitative research is a methodology used by researchers. According to Marlisa (2020), qualitative research focuses on creating theories to explain social phenomena. According to Cropley (2021), narrative which can draw from a variety of media, including books, audio recordings, and video recordings is the method used to gather data for qualitative research. Because the researcher examined the data in the form of speech in the Smile movie script, they chose to employ a content analysis approach. In collecting data, there are several steps that researchers take. First, choosing the topic to be analyzed, namely the Smile movie. second,

the researcher first downloads the Smile movie. Third, researchers searched for transcripts of the Smile movie conversation from the internet, Fourth, researchers watched the Smile movie to match the script from the internet with the speech from the Smile movie. Fifth, researchers collected data from the script that contained maxims. Sixth, the researcher analyzed the data that had been collected from the Smile movie script.

Results and Discussion

This section displayed the statistics about maxims that were disregarded in the screenplay. These include the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, manner and the factors of the characters flouting maxim. In this case, a thorough explanation of the data was provided.

Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Data 1

Laura : "It looks like people, but it's not a person"
Dr. Potter : "I'm not sure I understand"
Laura : "It looks like people. It looks like different people.
Sometimes it pretends to be someone that I know. Sometimes it's a random stranger.
Sometimes it looks like my grandfather died in front of me when I was seven. But it's all the same thing. It's like it wears people's faces like masks."

(Smile 2022, 08:39)

In this context, Dr. Potter asked Laura. Dr. Potter is still confused about the condition of his patient. But when Laura first explained what she saw, Dr. Potter replied that he still didn't understand what Laura meant so Laura explained with emotion so she answered very long.

The flouting maxim occurred is quantity where Dr. Potter asks Laura about what she actually saw. Initially, Laura answered Dr. Potter's question by giving enough information. However, after Dr. Potter replied that he did not understand what Laura said, Laura's answer did not match the quantity. She gave so much information, she explained "It looks like people. It looks like different people". Thus, Laura scorns the maxim of Quantity.

The factor stated in the data Laura is competitive since when Dr. Potter says "I'm not sure I understand", she explains everything that happened to her until she begs and demands Potter to understand what she's going through, believe what she's seen so far and hope that there is someone who can help her overcome her problems.

Data 2

Holly : "What's wrong with you?"
Rose : "This can't be happening, **No, no, no, no, I promise you this wasn't me.** It wasn't, it wasn't me, I swear. You have to, you guys have to believe me, please. Somebody please fucking believe to me. Fuck, are you seeing this fucking woman? You see her? You have to see her, please. I mean, I mean, somebody please."

(Smile 2022, 45:36)

In this context, Rose was at the birthday celebration of her sister's son Jackson, when Jackson wanted to open a gift from his aunt he was very excited but when the gift was opened Jackson was surprised and his expression changed so his mother asked what gift his aunt had given him, when Jackson took the gift out of the box everyone was surprised what

gift his aunt had given him, until Holly asked "What's wrong with you?". Rose is flouting the maxim of quantity because she explains too much of the question given by her sister. But Rose did that so that everyone wouldn't be afraid of her.

The factor stated in the data Rose is collaborative, when Jackson opened the gift from her and it turned out to be a dead cat, everyone was afraid of Rose, Rose explained "No, no, no, no, I promise you this wasn't me". Everything that it was not her who did it and suddenly Rose saw the female figure of her former patient who died in front of her. She begged everyone to see the woman who had done this but they were confused about what Rose meant.

Flouting Maxim of Quality

Data 3

Dr. Rose : "Typical is not really the same here"
Police : **"Right, but she was a head case, yeah?"**
Dr. Rose : "I'm sorry, a head case?"

(Smile 2022, 14:19)

In this context, Dr. Potter conversation with the police talked about the actual chronology of what happened with Laura's death. The flouting maxim here is quality where the opinion "Right, but she was a head case, yeah?" of police who thought Laura was crazy was not true, because he did not know what Laura saw and felt. Even Laura herself didn't know what she saw and felt, and she even killed herself without realizing it. Dr. Potter also explained that Laura had paranoid delusions where Laura said some kind of evil presence was haunting her. So, police was scoffing at the quality because he was saying something that wasn't true.

The factor stated in the data the police is conflictive, because where police accused that Dr. Potter's patient was crazy. How could he accuse Laura of being crazy just by concluding Laura committed suicide without knowing what Laura was actually experiencing. So Dr. Potter asked in a sarcastic tone because he knew his patient had a very serious disorder and even Dr. Potter was still panicked by the incident, Laura committed suicide in front of Dr. Potter, tearing her mouth with a piece of glass and she smiled before doing it.

Data 4

Talley : "Do you want from me, huh?"
Rose : "What is it?"
Talley : **"I don't know, I don't know."**

(Smile 2022, 1:17:01)

In this context, Rose came to the prison to meet Talley, who wanted to know about her case. Rose asked what really happened why the suicides were serialized but Talley was the only person still alive from the case she was looking into. But Talley replied "I don't know, I don't know." when in fact he knew all about this serial suicide, so Talley was flouting maxim quality where Talley begged not to provide accurate information.

The factor stated in the data Rose is competitive when asks Talley "What is it?" about the chain of events, where her patient seems to be going crazy after seeing someone commit suicide in front of her. When she researched the case, Talley was the only survivor of this serialized case, so Rose asked him.

Flouting Maxim of Relevance

Data 5

Holly: "Mmm, you are coming Saturday, right?"

Rose: "**Oh, sorry, what's Saturday?**"

Holly: "I'm sorry, this isn't a joke"

(Smile 2022, 20:08)

In this context, it happened when they were having dinner with their respective partners in a restaurant, Holly suddenly asked Rose "Mmm, you are coming Saturday, right?" because her nephew Jackson, would celebrate his birthday, but because Rose was thinking about the case that happened to her patient where the patient committed suicide in front of her by smiling so she did not focus on the conversation so she asked back "Oh, sorry, Saturday?" so here Rose violated the maxim of relevance.

The factor stated in the data Holly convivial, during dinner Holly asks her sister back with "Oh, sorry, what's Saturday?" Holly invites and ensures that her sister does not forget to come to her son's birthday party. But when Rose asked her back Holly got a little emotional and responded is this a Joke? because she had reminded Rose several times to come to her son's birthday celebration.

Data 6

Joel : "How you been?"

Rose : "Why you're here?"

Joel : "You know, like I said, I was on a call nearby, and I just, you know, I thought I would come check on you."

(Smile 2022, 23:17)

In this context, Rose was talking to the administration suddenly Joel was behind her. The flouting maxim here is the relevance maxim where Rose asks back to Joel's question "Why you're here?", in the relevant maxim it is required that the listener or speaker focus on the topic and should not answer questions with questions, Rose does not give an answer to the question Joel asked, she should answer Joel's question first. Therefore this conversation is flouting maxim relevance.

The factor stated in the data is competitive where Rose reprimands Joel for being at the hospital during duty hours. Actually, Joel asked Rose about this because he was worried about his ex's condition. He had memorized Rose's attitude in dealing with her patients but Laura's suicide made Rose very anxious and she became unfocused in any way. Joel knew that he was very worried about Rose, he didn't want his ex to experience stress because of the incident of his patient killing herself.

Flouting Maxim of Manner

Data 7

Rose : "No, no, no, what you're saying ton me? Sorry, sorry, I'm really sorry. Okay. Something is threatening me. Some kind of evil spirit or energy. I don't really know what it is, but, but I think that it killed my patient because she described experiencing the same thing before she died. And now it's somehow attached itself to me, and I'm just really scared that something bad is going to happen. I really need you to say something!"

Trevor : "Do you want me to say it?"

(Smile 2022, 48:21)

In this context, Rose wanted to explain to her fiancé Trevor about what had been going on with her, but Trevor didn't understand what Rose was thinking. Rose flouts the maxim of manner. She told what she was going through and she was in danger to her fiancé, she was experiencing a curse like state from her patient like an unnatural disorder and it's hard to explain it. But Trevor caught what Rose meant by a ghost, Trevor's response from Rose's long explanation so that her fiancé understood but only said "Do you want me to say it?". Rose was not angry but she remained patient and tried to explain and ask her fiancé to believe and help from the problems she was experiencing, but Trevor didn't want to discuss the problem and she left the car first.

The factor stated in the data Rose is competitive, Rose begged her fiancé Trevor to believe what she said because what she is experiencing now is not easy to live with every day she experiences terror from energy that cannot be explained like a ghost but that's not what Rose is experiencing is the same incident exactly from the patient he treated and died in front of him by killing himself by using a broken glass and tearing his mouth with the glass in that state. After that, Rose experienced things that she thought didn't make sense, she even seemed depressed with everything, she even hoped that her fiancé, the person she loved, believed in her. But Trevor ignored her and didn't believe in Rose.

Conclusion

Based on the research and analysis presented earlier, the dialogues in *Smile* flouted the four principles of cooperation. Based on the data collected, the researcher concludes that due to the disputes in the movie, the characters flouted the maxims of the cooperation principle. The gripping horror narrative in *Smile* makes the characters fear for their lives and mentally unstable. The characters unintentionally flouted many maxims as the movie progresses. As a result, they speak more often without understanding what they are talking about. This is shown by some of the maxims that are flouted. The maxim of number comprises 9 data (30%), the maxim of quality includes 9 data (30%), and the maxim of relevance includes 11 data (36.6%) out of the total 30 data. and the manner 1 data maxim (3.4%). The characters also carry out the following factors: 14 data (46.6%) that are competitive, 1 data (3.4%) that are convivial, 7 data (23.4%) that are collaborative, and 8 data (26.6%) that are conflictive. with the maxim of relevance having the highest number of flouted in this movie, which is 11 out of 30 data points and the factor that is widely used is competitive, which is 14 out of 30 data. As mentioned earlier, the dialog in this film is trying to be as formal and easy to understand as possible because the film is trying to convey a terrible and difficult situation to understand.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Chandra Yuliasman. (2014). *AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM USED IN MONSTER UNIVERSITY MOVIE*.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Cropley, A. J. (2021). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Method: A practice-oriented introduction for students of psychology and education*. University of Hamburg.

- Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantic and Pragmatic*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatic and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. Longman.
- Farikha, I., & Nuzulia, L. (2020). Pragmatic Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Donald Trump's Interview with TIME in the Oval Office 2020. *5(3)*, 333–347.
- Fitri, E., & Qodriani, L. U. (2016). A Study on Flouting Maxims in Divergent Novel. *14(1)*, 32–40.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Oxford University Press.
- Griffith, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantic and Pragmatic*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics* (Second Edition). Oxford Press.
- Hancock, B. (1998). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Trent Focus Group.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An introducing to sociolinguistic*. Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Ibrahim, Z., Arifin, M. B., & Setyowati, R. (2018). The flouting of maxim in the Se7en movie script. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni dan Budaya*, *2(1)*, 81-94.
- Kroeger, R. P. (2018). *Analyzing Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic and Pragmatics (Texbooks in Language Science 5)*. Language Science Press.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles in Pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Marlisa, R. (2020). The analysis of flouting maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) talkshow. *7(2)*, 132–142. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630>
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics. An Introduction (2nd Ed)*. Routledge.
- Nuzulia, I. F. L. (2020). Pragmatic analysis of flouting maxim in Donald Trump's interview with TIME in the Oval Office 2020. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, *5(3)*, 333-347.
- Sari, Y. W., & Afriana, A. (2020). The cooperative principle analysis in *About Time* movie. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, *4(1)*, 66-76.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning. Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Simatupang, E. C. M. (2021). *Pragmatic Analysis of Deixis in The Novel Fangirl by Rainbow Rowell*. Widyatama University. *English Journal Literacy Utama*.
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics (Vol. 1)*. Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, J. (2013). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.