

FLOUTING MAXIMS IN “FIVE FEET APART” MOVIE

Cut Nadira Dwiyanti¹

Universitas Putera Batam (UPB), Batam, Indonesia
Pb181210071@upbatam.ac.id

Ambalegin²

Universitas Putera Batam (UPB), Batam, Indonesia
Ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study used a pragmatic study to discover the flouting of maxims in the “Five Feet Apart” movie. This descriptive qualitative research was done with observational method and non-participatory technique. Data collection was obtained from watching the “Five Feet Apart” movie by using pragmatic identity method and pragmatic competence- in equalizing technique. Then, the data were analyzed and classified based on the type of flouting of the maxims according to the theory of Grice (1989). The highest frequency was the flouting maxim of relevance with a total of 8 data. Meanwhile, the lowest frequency was found in flouting maxim of manner and quantity with each having one data. The result of this research was that the researchers found the reason why the characters in Five Feet Apart movie flouted all the maxims. The characters flouted the maxims because they wanted to change the topic, sarcasm, and cover up their feelings. The conversations in Five Feet Apart movie could still be easily understood, even though the characters in this movie flouted all the maxims. Even with the flouting maxims, the plot of this movie became more interesting.

Keywords: cooperative principle, flouting maxims, pragmatics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language cannot be separated from human life because it is a medium used by humans to communicate with each other. Communication is an activity that is always carried out by humans, but people often do not understand what they are talking about, and often make mistakes when communicating with one another. Yule (2006) stated that communication involved word recognition and meaning recognition.

In the other word, when communicating, the speaker must know the meaning of the utterances. One of the related phenomena was seen in the talk show titled The Late-Late Show, starring by Jimmy Fallon on January 30, 2018.

Dakota Johnson: “What is your band’s name?”

Jimmy Fallon : “Gulag.”

Dakota Johnson : **"Why I should believe you?"**

Jimmy Fallon : **"I am tall."**

This quoted conversation existed in the Late-late Show starring by Jimmy Fallon at the minute of 00:01:35. It could be seen that there was an error in Jimmy's answer. Logically, if someone asked by saying the word "Why", the hearer answered it with the word "because". However, Jimmy's answer was not relevant with Dakota's question. Jimmy even said that he had a tall body, which a person's height had nothing to do with belief. Based on the Grice theory, this error is called the flouting maxim relation. This kind of error often occurs due to human difficulties in communicating through speech, because communication is not only about two people talking, but how they can understand about their utterances and the context in their conversation. To avoid miscommunication, people need to know how to understand the meaning and the context of utterances.

The study of the relationship between context and language, and the meaning of utterance is known as pragmatics. Yule (1996) stated that pragmatic was concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a hearer (or a reader). In other word, Pragmatics is the study of the meaning of the speaker's utterance, and how the hearer interprets the speaker's speech to find out the meaning of the utterance. In conversation, there are two kind of meaning which are spoken directly and indirectly.

The meaning that is contained in a speech, but which is not stated directly is called implicature. Horn (2007)

stated that implicature was composed of the speaker's meaning that constituted an aspect of what was by the speaker's utterance without being part of what was said. In the other word, implicature is the hidden meaning in an utterance where the speaker wants the hearer to pay attention and know the hidden meaning in the utterances. Language is not only found in society, but can also be found in literary works, such as: movies, dramas, novels, poetry, etc. In this case, the researcher analyzed a movie. Movie is a literary work in the form of a series of live pictures that serves as a medium for reflecting human life. In addition, movies can also be a medium used to convey messages to people. One of the phenomena of the occurrence of implicature errors from the conversation of a film can be seen below:

Will (S) : "Are you gonna be here for a while?"

Will (S) : "Hello? Ouh, you're deaf."

Stella (H) : **"Shouldn't you be procuring your room for your guests? Your rent by the hour or what?"**

Will (S) : "So, that was you lurking in the hall."

This quoted conversation existed in Five Feet Apart movie at the minute of 00:09:30. There was nothing wrong with the structure of the conversation above. But, by looking more specifically at the construction of the interrogative sentence, the hearer's answer was not related to the question. The hearer should have said a time that told how long she would stay there, or she could have answered the speaker's question with a yes or no. However, the hearer's responded to the conversation

returned to asking something unrelated to speaker's question. It could be seen from the way the speaker asked and how the hearer responded, there was no connection that existed in their communication. Based on Grice (1989), if there was no relationship that existed while communicating, it was called as maxim flouting relevance.

The cooperative principles are needed to minimize errors while communicating, and also to make communication effective. Grice (1989) stated that the cooperative principles ordered the participants to make conversational contribution as necessary, at the stage at which it takes place, and by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange. It can be concluded that with the cooperative principle, the speaker and the hearer only contribute to the conversation when needed. The conversation should have the purpose or exchange of information required. However, on the Five Feet Apart movie, the actors spoke uncooperatively. It had an unclear, ambiguous, and unrelated meaning to the other actors who played in the movie. Thus, this research found out the types of maxims flouting causing uncooperative principles in Five Feet Apart movie based on Grice's theory.

There were two studies on the same topic which were used as references in this research. Helmie and Lestary (2019) analyzed flouting maxims in conversation speaking of the main character in the movie of Home Alone 2 Lost in New York by John Hughes. They used qualitative method and came to the result that main character in the movie of Home Alone 2 Lost in New York flouted all maxims of cooperative principles. Nevertheless, this research

proved that there was never a guarantee when a maxim flouted the communication would be damaged.

Other researchers came from Natasya, Yuhendra, & Sari (2019). In this study they analyzed the flouting maxim in Finding Dory Movie. This research was conducted using descriptive qualitative method. There were 35 flouting maxims found by researchers in Finding Dory Movie. 17 of the data were maxim of quantity, 16 maxim of relevance, one maxim of quality, and one maxim of manner. The result of this research was the researchers found the reasons why all the characters in Finding Dory movie uttered flouting maxims. The reasons were because the characters expected something, emphasized something, showed panic, explained further, avoid talking, changed the conversation, persuaded, and to get attention.

In this paper, the researchers did the different research especially in the research object. The researchers took the data from "Five Feet Apart" movie and analyzed all the characters' utterances that related to maxims flouting based on Grice's theory.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conversational Implicature

The cooperative principles are needed to make communication runs effectively and minimize the occurrence of misunderstandings between speakers. Grice (as cited in Yule, 1996) stated that a cooperative principle of conversation and elaborated into four sub-principles, called maxims. In other words, cooperative principles had four sub-principles, called maxims. Thomas (as cited in Mohammed & Alduais, 2012) stated that flouting maxim

occurred where a participant in a conversation chose to ignore one or more of the maxims by using a conversational implicature. It means, flouting maxims occurred because the speaker ignored a maxim or more, and the speaker uttered the implied meaning while communicating. Those maxims have the different way to be flouted. Below are the explanations of maxim of quality, maxim of manner, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance.

2.1 Maxim of Quality

Maxim quality occurs when speaker utters something that is true while communicating. Grice (as cited in Yule, 1996) stated that tried to make your contribution one that was true, did not say what you believe to be false, did not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. In other words, maxim quality occurred when someone said something that was true by providing evidence, and that person would not say something that he or she believed was wrong. If, the speaker said something untrue and something without proof, then it was called flouting maxim of quality. To make it easy to understand, there is an example of a dialogue below.

A: "Where does C live?"

B: "Somewhere in the south of France."
(Grice, 1989)

2.2 Maxim of Quantity

Speakers convey things that are informative, do not convey information excessively and is also no less, called maxim of quantity. Grice (as cited in Yule, 1996) stated that made your contribution as informative as was required, and did not make your

contribution more informative than was required. In other words, maxim of quantity occurred when the speaker uttered information according to the needs of the hearer, and the speaker did not convey information excessively while communicating. An example of the maxim of quantity is below.

A: "How many people in your family?"

B: "There are five people."

A: "Do you have brother?"

B: Yes, I do. I have 2 siblings and I am the youngest." (Andy & Ambalegin, 2019)

2.3 Maxim of Relevance

What is said by the speaker must relate to the topic while communicating. Grice (as cited in Yule, 1996) stated that be relevant. It means, the speaker should be uttered something relevant to the topic. Maxim of relevance became a bridge for speakers and hearers to connect with each other while communicating, so that communication became effective and informative. If, the speaker did not utter a relevant answer, it called as flouting maxim of relevance. In addition, flouting maxim of relevance can also occur when there is a hidden meaning that the speaker wants to convey to the hearers. To make it easy to understand, there is an example of a dialogue below.

A: "Smith doesn't seem to have a girlfriend these days."

B: "He has been paying a lot of visits to New York lately." (Grice, 1989)

2.4 Maxim of Manner

The speaker did not say anything ambiguous while communicating. Grice (as cited in Yule, 1996) stated that a speaker had to avoid obscurity of expressions, ambiguity, be brief, and orderly. In other words, when communicating the speaker had to avoid hesitant expressions, not say things that had two or more meanings, and uttered information in a concise and orderly manner. To make it easy to understand, there is an example of a dialogue below.

A: "What do you think about the Ding tea drink?"

B: "I like the drink."

A: "What about the packaging and the price?"

B: "It's the same as Jom tea."
(Op.Sunggu & Afriana, 2020).

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was a qualitative descriptive research proposed by Abbot and McKinney, (2013). In the process of collecting data, researchers used observational methods and non-participatory techniques proposed by Sudaryanto (2015). It infers that the researchers observed the data through watching Five Feet Apart movie. Then, the researchers did not act as participants or actors in this movie. There were several steps taken by the researchers in collecting data. First, the researchers watched the Five Feet Apart movie. Second, the researchers noted the utterances in the film based on the theory in question. Finally, the researchers identified these utterances based on Grice's cooperative principles theory. In analyzing the data, the researchers used pragmatics identity method proposed by Sudaryanto

(2015) In other words, this method used contextual situations to analyze the data. This research applied this method to identify the context and meaning of the speech delivered by the actors in Five Feet Apart movie. The utterances in this movie were analyzed in a pragmatic study supported by (Grice, 1989) the theory of cooperative principles. Lastly, this research was conducted by describing the data using words and sentences.

Data analysis were done by the researchers through pragmatic identity method by Sudaryanto (2015). The method that the researchers used was competence in equalizing technique to equalize the data. The researchers took some steps to analyze data. First, the researchers discussed the theory that was employed in data collection, namely watching conversational implicature types. Second, the researchers started to quote utterances from the movie. The utterances were then evaluated using the theory from Grice. Finally, the researchers began to link the data based on the theory employed in this research.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Result

There were 15 data found on "Five Feet Apart" movie showed flouting maxims. The results of this research can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Frequency of Flouting Maxim in Five Feet Apart movie

No	Types	Frequency
1	Flouting maxim of relevance	8
2	Flouting maxim of	5

	quality			
3	Flouting	maxim	of	1
	quantity			
4	Flouting	maxim	of	1
	manner			
Total				15

4.2 Discussion

Flouting maxims occurred when the speaker did not obey the cooperative principles during the conversation to make a certain meaning or purpose. There were 15 data analyzed by researchers.

Data 1

Camila (S) : "Hello!"

Camila (S) : "Are you with us?"

Maya (H) : **"Okay, guess what. Taylor and Mason are meeting us at the airport in the morning."** (00:02:13)

Data 1 showed that relevance maxim was being flouted. The hearer broke the cooperative principle because there was no relationship between her response and the question that given by the speaker. It happened because the hearer was focused on her cellphone and not listening to what the speaker was talking about. It caused the hearer to answer the question with another topic.

Data 2

Stella (S) : "Letting your friends borrow your room for sex. Is disgusting, so, no."

Will (H) : "You don't like sex?"

Stella (S) : **"No, I like sex."**

Stella (S) : **"I like sex. Sex is fine."** (00:10:05)

Data 2 showed that quality maxim was being flouted. The Hearer broke the cooperative principle because she hesitated to answer the speaker's questions. This could be seen when the hearer kept repeating her words. "No. I like sex. I like sex. Sex is fine." Responding to an utterance with hesitation or not based on the truth was included in the flouting maxim of quality.

Data 3

Will (S) : "A little name for your psychological profile. I'm Will Newman and you are?"

Stella (H) : **"Deaf."** (00:10:35)

Data 3 showed that the maxim of relevance was flouted. The hearer broke the cooperative principle because there was no relationship between her response and the question given by the speaker. Supposedly, she answered the question by saying her name. But, instead she answered that question with the word (deaf). She responds to questions by answering (deaf) because she wanted to tease the speaker.

Data 4

Poe (S) : "Dang, girl. You look worn. Who is he? Is it anyone I know?"

Stella (H) : **"What'd you get?"** (Poe showed his food)

Stella (S) : "What? Are those truffles? How'd you get truffles? (00:14:09)

Data 4 showed an uncooperative side. The conversation above became uncooperative because the hearer's answer was irrelevant to speaker's question, called flouting maxim of relevance. This happened because the

hearer did not want to talk about the man who the speaker was talking about. It caused the hearer to immediately change the topic of conversation.

Data 5

- Will (S) : "I don't know, man. Sounds like you love her."
Poe (H) : "Of course, I love her."
Will (S) : "So, why haven't you done anything about it?"
Poe (H) : **"Because she's not a he."** (00:25:15)

Data 5 showed that the maxim of manner was flouted. The hearer broke the cooperative principle because the hearer gave an ambiguous answer. It could be seen from the hearers who answered, "Because she's not a he." This caused the speaker misunderstood about what the hearer was said.

Data 6

- Stella (S) : "Are you doing your AffloVest?"
Will (H) : **"Yeah."**
Stella (S) : "Show me."
Will (H) : **"I can't. I'm half naked."**
Stella (S) : You're supposed to be doing your AffloVest right now, and did you take your Creon?" (00:27:56)

Data 6 showed that the maxim of quality was flouted. The hearer flouted the cooperative principle because he lied in response the question. It could be seen from the hearer's answers, "Yeah" and "I can't. I'm half naked." The speaker already knew that the hearer was lying, and that was why she kept asking the speaker.

Data 7

- Stella (S) : "The Divorce Diet doesn't look good on you, Mom."
Mom (H) : **"What are you talking about?"**
Stella (S) : "You're too thin. Dad needs a bath. You guys are stealing my look." (00:29:36)

Data 7 showed that the maxim of quality was flouted. The hearer flouted the cooperative principle because she lied in response the question. The hearer deliberately pretended not to understand what the speaker was saying because she did not want the speaker to worry about her parents' divorce.

Data 8

- Will (S) : "So, your plan is to die really smart. So that you can join the debate team of the dead or something?"
Will (S) : "What about traveling the world?"
Stella (H) : **"Learn to play piano. Done"** (00:32:40)

Data 8 showed that relevance maxim was being flouted. The hearer broke the cooperative principle because there was no relationship between the response and the question. It happened because the hearer felt uncomfortable with the question asked by the speaker, and caused her to immediately change the topic. It made the conversation became irrelevant.

Data 9

- Will (S) : "You wanna hear my list?"
Stella (H) : "No."
Will (S) : **"Painting class with Bob Ross. He's dead. Yeah,**

never mind. Uh... Sex in the Vatican.” (00:32:58)

Data 9 showed that quantity maxim was flouted. The speaker broke the cooperative principle because the speaker gave too much information about himself to the hearer, even though the hearer did not want to hear about the information.

Data 10

Will (S) : "Did you do that?"

Stella (H) : "Uh, no, my older sister, Abby."

Will (S) : "Wow. She's really good. I'd love to see more of her stuff. Do you have any?"

Will (S) : **"We don't have to, uh, share our stories, okay? We can just do our treatments together."** (00:36:31)

Data 10 showed that the maxim of relevance was flouted. The hearer broke the cooperative principle because there was no relationship between the answer and the question. The hearer should respond to the speaker's utterance with (Yes or no). But instead, she replied, "We don't have to, uh, share our stories, okay? We can just do our treatments together." It happened because the hearer felt uncomfortable with speaker's utterance. It made the conversation became irrelevant.

Data 11

Will (S) : "Abby's dead, isn't she?"

Stella (H) : **"You're as delicate as a Jackhammer."** (00:38:22)

Data 11 showed that the maxim of relevance was flouted. The hearer broke the cooperative principle because there was no relationship

between the answer and the question. The hearer should respond to the speaker's utterance with (Yes or no). But instead, she replied, "You're as delicate as a Jackhammer." The hearer said, "You're as delicate as a Jackhammer." To equip the speaker who spoke harshly without thinking about the feelings of the hearer.

Data 12

Stella (S) : "Dr. Hamid's worried about sepsis, so she's replacing it in the morning. I'm going under general."

Will (H) : "Shit. Are your lungs up for that?"

Stella (S) : **"Do your nebulizer at 8:00, and your AffloVest, okay?"** (00:42:36)

Data 12 showed that relevance maxim was being flouted. The conversation above showed an uncooperative side. The conversation became uncooperative because there was no relationship between the answer and the question. On the other hand, the hearer obeyed the maxim of quality where he was not sure if her lungs would be okay. That's why she chose to change the topic and make the conversation irrelevant.

Data 13

(In surgery room)

Stella (S) : "What are you doing here?"

Will (H) : **"I thought this was the bathroom, honestly."** (00:43:51)

Data 13 showed that quality maxim was being flouted. The maxim of quality was flouted because the hearer answered the speaker's question by lying. It was clear that they were in the

surgery room, but the hearer replied, "I thought this was the bathroom, to be honest." It made the conversation became uncooperative.

Data 14

Will (S) : "Hey! Everything alright?"
(Stella checked her phone.)

Stella (H) : **"Yeah, I'm good."**
(01:30:11)

Data 14 showed that the maxim of quality was flouted. The maxim of quality was flouted because the hearer was lying. The hearer answered that she was fine. But, in fact she was not good. It could be seen from the hearers who were constantly looking at her cell phone. It made the speaker suspicious and made the conversation became uncooperative.

Data 15

Will (S) : "Hey, they have new lungs for you. Let's go to the hospital. Come on!"

Stella (H) : **"I haven't seen the lights yet."** (01:32:56)

The conversation above showed an uncooperative side. The conversation above became uncooperative because the hearer answer was irrelevant to speaker's statement, called flouting maxim of relevance. The speaker told the hearer to go to the hospital, but the hearer answered "I haven't seen the lights yet." Apart from being irrelevant, the hearer's answer had a hidden meaning. "I haven't seen the lights yet." This indicates that the hearer did not want to take those new lungs.

5. CONCLUSION

This study identified the type of flouting maxim using Grice's (1985) theory. The researchers found that all

of Grice's maxims had been flouted by the actors. There were 12 flouting maxims of relevance, 6 flouting maxims of quality, one maxim of quantity, and one maxim of manner. Even though the characters in this movie flouted all the maxim, the audiences could still enjoy the movie. The audiences could also easily understand the utterances in Five Feet Apart movie. Even with the flouting of maxims, the movie's plot became much more interesting. By looking at the findings and conclusions of the study, it was very important to know the flouting of maxims. This was useful so that the speaker and listener could avoid misunderstandings when conveying some information. By knowing the use of cooperative principles, speakers and listeners could minimize the flouting maxims, and made the utterances could be understood. On the other hand, with this study, the listeners were also expected to be able to identify the hidden meaning that the speaker was trying to convey.

REFERENCES

- Akmal, S. (2020). Conversational implicature analysis in "Kingdom of Heaven" movie Script by William Monahan. *Buletin Al-Turas*, 26(2), 335–350.
- Andy, & Ambalegin. (2019). Maxim violations on "Night at Museum" movie. *Jurnal Basis*, 6(2), 215–224.
- Dayani, R., & Amjad, F. A. (2016). Shift of power in David Mamet's Oleanna: A study within Grice's cooperative principles. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 72, 76–82.
- Diningrum, A., & Musyahda, L. (2016). Conversational implicature in

- "Sarah Sechan" talk show of Go Green episodes. *Anglicist*, 5(1), 18–23.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Logic and conversation*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Helmie and Lestary, J. and 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*, 7(1).
- Natasya, D., Yuhendra, & Sari, N. (2019). Flouting maxim in Finding Dory movie. *Jurnal Kata: Penelitian Tentang Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 3(2), 321–328. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.kopertis10.or.id/index.php/kata>
- Nurjannah, J., Daud, B., & Fata, I. A. (2020). A pragmatic analysis of maxim flouting committed by the characters in Avengers: Infinity War Movie. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 5(1), 26–38.
- Op.Sunggu, E., & Afriana, A. (2020). flouting maxim in Wonde Woman movie. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEE) Journal*, 4(1), 1–12.
- Rosmaidar, & Mirani. (2013). Conversational implicature of the main character's utterances in Armageddon movie. *Jurnal Ilmiah BINA BAHASA*, 6(1), 21–34.
- Saniatang, Sili, S., & Setyowati, R. (2020). An analysis of conversational implicature on "Jumanji: Welcome to The Jungle" film. *Ilmu Budaya*, 4(3), 506–514.
- Sapalakkai. (2018). cooperative principle used by chris gardner in "The Pursuit of Happyness" movie. *K@ta Kita*, 6(1), 105–112.
- Simanjuntak, D. S. R. (2017). analisis implikatur wacana percakapan dalam novel "Masih Ada Hari Esok Karya Daniel Steel." *Jurnal Basis*, 4(2), 1–10.
- Ulfah, R. A. A. N., & Afrilia, R. (2018). an analysis of flouting maxim in "The B.F.G" movie. *Jurnal PROJECT*, 1(5), 687–695.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics* (Widdowson, Ed.). Hongkong: Oxford University Press.