AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING OF MAXIMS DONE BY MAIN CHARACTERS IN *LA LA LAND* MOVIE

Mery Wahyuni, M. Bahri Arifin, Indah Sari Lubis
English Literature Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences
Mulawarman University
Email: merywahyuni55@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Maxims are the rules of cooperative principle which is proposed by Grice in 1975. These maxims are used in conversation in order to make communication run smoothly. However, people often do not observe the maxim to deliver meaning implicitly; it is called as flouting of maxim. Flouting of maxim does not only happen in daily conversation but also occurs in literary work such as movie entitled *La La Land*. Therefore, this research was focused on analyzing the flouting of maxims which was done by main characters in *La La Land* movie. This research aimed at revealing kinds of maxim flouted by the main characters and also identifying the implied meaning behind their utterances. This research was conducted by using content analysis qualitative method since it focused on understanding language phenomena deeply. Data were taken from movie in the form of utterances. Dealing with the purposes of the research above, it was found that main characters flouted all kinds of Gricean maxim. There were 44 data that contained flouting of maxims in the movie. In addition, it was also found the implied meaning behind main characters' utterances depending on the context of conversation. Most of the implied meaning contained of insulting, rebuking, requesting, and praising.

Keywords: flouting, Gricean maxim, implied meaning, *La La Land* movie

ABSTRAK

Maksim merupakan aturan dalam prinsip kerja sama yang diusulkan oleh Grice pada tahun 1975. Maksim digunakan dalam percakapan untuk membuat komunikasi berjalan lancar. Namun, orang sering tidak mematuhi maksim untuk menyampaikan makna secara implisit; hal ini disebut sebagai pelanggaran maksim. Pelanggaran maksim tidak hanya terjadi dalam percakapan sehari-hari tetapi juga terjadi dalam karya sastra, seperti film berjudul La La Land. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini difokuskan pada analisis pelanggaran maksim yang dilakukan oleh karakter utama dalam film La La Land. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menemukan jenis maksim yang dilanggar oleh para karakter utama dan juga mengidentifikasi makna tersirat di balik ucapan mereka. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif analisis isi karena berfokus pada pemahaman mengenai fenomena bahasa secara mendalam. Data pada penelitian ini diambil dari film dalam bentuk ucapan. Berkaitan dengan tujuan penelitian di atas, ditemukan bahwa para karakter utama mencemooh semua jenis maksim Gricean. Ada 44 data yang berisi pelanggaran maksim dalam film. Selain itu, ditemukan juga makna tersirat di balik ucapan karakter utama tergantung pada konteks percakapan. Sebagian besar makna tersirat mengandung ujaran yang berfungsi untuk menghina, memarahi, meminta, dan memuji.

Kata kunci: *pelanggaran, Gricean maksim, makna tersirat, La La Land*

A. INTRODUCTION

In communication, misunderstanding is a common problem. It could happen because of different background knowledge between speaker and listener. Supposedly there should be cooperation in communication between speaker and listener so that no misunderstanding occurs. The existence of such cases, make an English philosopher proposed a theory called Cooperative Principle (CP) or best-known as Gricean maxims. The CP theory consists of four maxims i.e. maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. With these maxims, it is expected that interaction and communication process between speakers will run smoothly and effectively.

However, there are still many people who disobey Gricean maxims in communication. In everyday life, sometimes someone does not deliver a message directly and uses implicit words. Speaker lets the listener to figure out and understand the meaning of the words himself. It is known as flouting of maxims. Flouting of maxims can also occur when someone says something using one of the strategies such as overstatement, understatement, hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter (Cutting, 2002). Flouting of maxim itself does not mean someone breaks communication, but only brings out a proper context because there are certain intentions of the speaker. Speaker's intentions to flout the maxim can be seen through the implied meaning inside his/her utterance.

In this study, the researcher analyzes the utterances produced by main characters in *La La Land* movie, Mia and Sebastian. These characters are very suitable for the study about the flouting of maxims in communication for two reasons. First, they are adult who should have understood and have enough experience about how to make good conversation. Secondly in this movie, Mia and Sebastian have unique characterizations. Their characterizations often make them do flouting of maxim when talking to others. Based on series of explanations above, the researcher is interested in finding out the kinds of flouting of maxim that occur in *La La Land* movie. The researcher is going to prove that main characters, Sebastian and Mia, flout the maxims.

In this research, there are two questions: what kinds of maxims are flouted by main characters in *La La Land* movie? and what are the implied meanings behind main characters' utterances? The purposes of the study are to reveal out the maxims flouted by the main characters in La La Land movie, and to identify the implied meanings behind main characters' utterances. Theoretically, the results of this study are expected to be a reference, consideration or input for the development of linguistics research. Especially for researchers who want to analyze the cooperative principles usage in literary work. On the other hand, this research is expected to give deeper understanding in the analysis of flouting of maxims depicted in a movie. Practically, the results of this study are expected to give the information about how to communicate well. So in communication, readers are able to understand the other and able to create a good conversation because they already knows about cooperative principle.

B. RELATED LITERATURE
1. Flouting of Maxim

Cutting (2002, p.37) states that when the speaker seems not to hold on the maxims but expect the hearers to get the meaning implied; it is called flouting of maxims. Another opinion comes from Grundy (2000, p.78) "flouting maxim is a particularly silent way of getting an addressee to draw inference and hence recover an implicature." When flouting of maxim, the speaker requires the listener to know that his/her utterance cannot be understood directly, it makes the listener expects the implied meaning of that word. In short, maxim

flouting is a state in which a person attempts to convey something hidden through his/her speech by exploiting Gricean maxims. Based on Gricean maxims, there are several categories of flouting of maxim that are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner.

a. Flouting of Maxim of Quantity

This happens when someone gives information that is not in accordance with what required by the listener. In other words, speakers do not speak to the point. The speaker may give too much or too little information so, making the other person misunderstood.

b. Flouting of Maxim of Quality

This happens when someone says information that does not correspond to reality or not supported by the clear and tangible evidence. In certain circumstances, the speaker lies while talking or sometimes s/he also uses an irony statement.

c. Flouting of Maxim of Relevance

If the speaker does not provide a relevant contribution means he flouts the rules of the maxim of relevance. This can happen when the speaker inserts or changes the topic in the conversation. More specifically, someone makes an unsuitable conversation and does the wrong causality.

d. Flouting of Maxim of Manner

If someone's contribution is not perspicuous such as be obscure, ambiguous and disorderly, it means s/he flouts the maxim of manner. In addition, a person can flout this maxim when he or she uses a strange word so that the other person does not understand and uses slang word in front of people who do not understand it. In other words, someone who flouts maxim of manner is often trying to exclude a third party.

2. Implied Meaning

People flout the maxims with various strategies because they want to convey indirectly a particular message that called as implied meaning. Implied meaning refers to any meaning that is "conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated" (Grundy, 2000, p.73). Griffiths (2006, p.9) says that the sender's thoughts are private, but utterances are publicly observable. The listener can interpret the speaker's meaning according to his experience as both sender and addressee which is then adjusted to the context of the speech. In line with those opinions, Verschueren (1999, p.50) also said implied meaning is what can be communicated beyond what is literally said, by means of presupposition, entailment (implication), and implicature.

a. Presupposition

Presupposition is the relationship between two propositions which are easily presupposed by any listener. Verschueren (1999, p.33) stated that presupposition is implicit meaning that must be presupposed, understood, taken for granted for an utterance to make sense. Speakers use a particular expression to treat information as presupposed and hence to be accepted as true by listener. However, meaning that is presupposed is not always true even it can be the opposite of what is true, or contrary to facts. Thus, presupposition is not absolute and cancellable. Besides the meaning of some presuppositions do not survive to become the meaning of some complex sentences (Yule, 1996, p.30).

b. Entailment (Implication)

Entailment is something that logically follows from what is asserted in the utterance (Yule, 1996, p.25). In line with that opinion, Verschueren (1999, p.34) says that entailment is "implicit meaning that can be logically inferred from a form of expression." So that entailment is said to be truth-conditional. In the sense, the truth of the first sentence is influenced by the truth of the second sentence (A entails or logically implies B, every situation that makes A true also makes B true). Entailment is simply more powerful than presupposition. It even can be used to cancel existential presupposition.

c. Implicature

Implicature is the term used to describe what might be interpreted, recommended, or intended by the speaker, which is different from what was actually said by the speakers (Brown & Yule, 1996, p.31). Based on Grice (cited in Bottyan, 2006) implicature is an inferred meaning, typically with a different logical form from the original utterance. To conclude, implicature is used to explain the implied meaning of an individual's utterance. This implicature divide into two types, there are generalized conversational implicature (GCI) and particularized conversational implicature (PCI).

First, GCI is an implicature that calculated without special knowledge of any particular context (Yule, 1996, p.40). Listener identifies the implicature through general process. Other generalized conversational implicature commonly are communicated on the basis of a scale of values, consequently known as scalar implicature (Yule, 1996, p.41). In contrast to generalized implicature, PCI is an implicature that requires special background knowledge in order to make the necessary inferences.

It can be concluded that the listener will know the implied meaning behind someone's utterance after make inference from the assumptions obtained via presupposition, entailment, or implicature. However, not only that, the listener also has to consider the implied meaning by understanding what the speaker's purpose behind his speech. Speaker's purpose is often vague, especially in the case of indirect communication. Therefore, in analyzing the implied meaning, someone can take the advantage of insights from speech act theory (Kloosterhuis, 2015). Illocutionary act can be used to observe the intention of the speaker when he is talking; because in every utterance there is always illocutionary force. This is in line with Yule's opinion (1996, p.48) that someone might utter something to make a statement, an offer, an explanation, or for some other communicative purpose. There are five types of general function performed by speech acts: declaration, representative, expressive, directive, and commissive (p.53). In each type, there are various kinds of actions that can be carried out by the speaker such as promising, threatening, suggesting, commanding, asserting, thanking, declaring, insulting, praising, and so on. Based on the types above, researcher classified the implied meaning in this study into several kinds related to the speaker intention and context of conversation, among others: insulting, rebuking, praising, and requesting.

C. RESEARCH METHOD

The research design in this study was qualitative content analysis. According to Hsieh & Shannon (2005, p.1278) qualitative content analysis is "a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of the text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns." The researcher used this method in order to analyze the language used by the main character through the systematic process. In this research, data source was *La La Land* movie either script or scene. Meanwhile data were words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, which were taken from dialogues, and conversations

of the main characters namely Mia and Sebastian. Only their utterances that contained flouting of maxims include as data in this research.

There are some processes in analyzing the data in this research based on Kothari (2004), as follows:

1) Editing

At this stage, the researcher also discarded unnecessary data. Researcher edited the data by separating the utterances from the main characters, Sebastian and Mia, in *La La Land* movie, which were included in the category of flouting of maxim or not.

2) Coding

After editing, the next activity is coding. Coding is done by giving a sign (symbol) to the data that has been obtained. Researcher created own codes that were used in this research as follows:

Table 1 Kind of Flouting of Maxims

Kind of Flouting of Maxims	Code
Quantity	QN
Quality	QL
Relevance	RV
Manner	MN

In addition to the codes above, researcher also used page of script and time of the scene as coding.

Table 2 Other Coding of Data

Name	Code
Page	PG
Scene	SN

3) Classification

In this study, the classification was adjusted to Grice's theory of maxims. In addition, at this stage, researcher also classified the implied meaning behind the utterances of the main characters based on speech act theory.

4) Tabulation

At this stage, the researcher made a data table containing the data that had been classified. The following is the example of the data table that the researcher used in this research.

Table 3 Example of Data Table

Dialog/Conversation	Analysis	Kind of Flouting	Implied Meaning
A: ………….. B: ………….. (SN 00:01:30-00:01:35, PG.2)	B used hyperbole strategy	QL01	….

5) Interpretation

This is the final activity of research. At this stage, the researcher described the data in the form of description and related it to the theory of Grice. After that, the researcher drew conclusions based on interpretation and supported by theories so that the results could be trusted.

D. FINDING AND DISCUSSION
1. Maxim Flouted by Main Characters and Its Implied Meaning

MANAGER	: Mia, where do you think you're going?
MIA	: Oh, it's five after.
MANAGER	: You better be here early tomorrow.
MIA	: Okay.

<div align="right">(SN 00:07:05-00:07:09, PG.3)</div>

The conversation happened at Mia's workplace. Mia's alarm sounded at 4 o'clock. She hurried to leave her work because she had an audition. The manager rebuked and asked her about where she was going. Then, Mia answered the question quickly.

The conversation above contained flouting of maxim of relevance done by Mia. The manager asked about 'where' Mia would go; it meant Mia had to answer by mentioning a place name. However, she did not give an answer that was in accordance with the Manager's question. She actually mentioned the time to answer that question. Based on the cooperation principle, Mia failed to observe maxim of relevance. In addition, Mia also failed to observe maxim of quality because she had lied to her manager about the time. She said that it was 5 o'clock, while the real time was 4 o'clock. So, here Mia did two flouting of maxim at once namely relevance and quality.

From her words, Mia implied there was one habit that she did every day and it also was known by the manager. The habit was to leave the coffee shop at 5 o'clock. So when Mia said "it's five after" it may mean "it's time for me to go". Perhaps in that exchange, she wanted to say that she was going to home because it was the time. However, in fact it was not time to Mia go to home. She did flouting of maxims because she had to go to the audition. She did not want to be late for the audition therefore she lied so that the manager would not check the clock and allowed her to leave.

SEB	: What are you doing? Please don't do that. Please don't sit on that.
LAURA	: Are you kidding?
SEB	: Please don't sit on that. Don't sit on that. Don't sit on that. Hoagy Carmichael sat on that!
LAURA	: Oh, my God!
SEB	: "The Baked Potato" just threw it away.

<div align="right">(SN 00:18:40-00:18:48, PG.10)</div>

Conversation above happened in Sebastian's apartment, between him and his sister, Laura. From the entrance, he saw Laura sat on a decrepit stool. It made him become panic. Then, he asked Laura to move from that stool. In that talk exchange, Sebastian flouted maxim of quantity by saying the words "Hoagy Carmichael sat on that!" and "The Baked Potato just threw it away". He asked Laura to stand up from her seat while he was giving information about the chair. Here, Sebastian failed to observe maxim of quantity because he provided more information than was required by Laura. It also meant that he used a strategy

overstatement. He could simply say something about the chair, such as "it is broken", to make Laura moved from her seat. By flouting of maxim of quantity, Sebastian certainly wanted to convey something indirectly to Laura.

In order to make Sebastian follows the maxim of quantity, listener had to make assumption that Sebastian's utterances were not overstatement. The way to make him follow the CP was discover the implied meaning behind his words. Based on the conversation above, Sebastian connected the chair with Hoagy Carmichael and The Baked Potato. He said "Hoagy Carmichael sat on that!", which entailed that the chair had been around since someone named Hoagy Carmichael existed. He then added information by saying "The Baked Potato just threw it away". The assumption behind that utterance was the chair could not be used anymore so something called The Baked Potato threw it away. So the implied meaning behind Sebastian's words was the chair that Laura was sitting on was old and could not be used anymore. So, he flouted maxim of quantity to say that information to Laura. Here, he also implied the reason for picking up the chair; because that stool had historical and antique value. He kept it not to be used as a chair but only to add to his collection.

> SEB   : Maybe you just liked me when I was on my ass 'cause it made you feel better
>   about yourself.
> MIA   : Are you kidding?
> SEB   : No. I don't know.
>   (SN 01:23:14-01:23:46, PG.60)

The conversation above happened when Mia and Sebastian were still arguing about Sebastian's job. Sebastian expressed his anger to Mia because he felt too humiliated by Mia. Mia seemed unhappy with Sebastian's success at this time.

In that dialogue, Sebastian used an ambiguous word such as "I was on my ass." That word was not enough to be interpreted literally because it was slang words. That word had negative meanings that referred to "an after effect of a substance that leave someone in an altered, but sublime, state" ("On My Ass"). So those words may mean "Maybe you are happy if I fail". In addition, Sebastian also gave unclear and excessive answer when Mia asked him, namely "No" and "I don't know". Once again, Sebastian gave Mia an ambiguous answer. Thus, here he did flouting of the maxim of manner.

Based on the context of the conversation above, Sebastian degraded himself in front of Mia. However, the meaning behind that word was inversely proportional to what Sebastian was said. It used to hurt Mia. He said indirectly to Mia that she was a selfish person by saying "Maybe you just like me when I was on my ass' ..." It also implied when Sebastian answered Mia's question by saying "No". He showed that he was really angry with Mia. However, after that he added another sentence "I don't know". Here, Sebastian seemed to fix the atmosphere so that Mia was not sad. He realized he had hurt Mia with his words so he wanted to apologize by saying "I don't know". He did not want to say sorry directly because he was also angry at Mia so he delivered it by doing the flouting of maxim of manner.

2. Discussion

Based on data finding, the researcher found that the main characters, Sebastian and Mia, flouted all kinds of Gricean maxims. There were forty-four utterances that contain flouting of maxims, which consist of eleven flouting of maxim of quantity, ten flouting of maxim of quality, three flouting of maxim of relevance and nine flouting of maxim of manner. As for the eleven other data were found contain of two kinds of flouting of the maxims. Sebastian was the main character who most frequently flouted the Gricean maxim. He tended to flout

those maxims because of his characterization in the movie. He was described as a Jazz lover, cool, stubborn, independent and sometimes humorous person. In contrast to Sebastian, Mia only flouted maxim a little in the conversation. This was because she likes to speak frankly. She did flouting of maxim mostly in urgent situations such as lying to audition, avoiding certain people, and conveying her unrestrained feelings.

In this study, those three means were used to find the implied meaning behind main characters' utterances. First, presupposition was used to find meaning based on assumptions. However, this presupposition did not survive in several complex sentences and it also could be canceled (Yule, 1996, p.30). So, presupposition was not enough or less appropriate to find the implied meaning behind flouting of maxim. Next, entailment was used to look for implied meaning logically. Similar to presupposition, entailment was not enough to find implied meaning. In contrast, implicature could be used to discover implied meanings behind flouting of maxims. Due to within implicature the meaning can be inversely proportional to what is said (Brown & Yule, 1996, p.31); it was closely related to someone's purposes did flouting, which was conveying meaning indirectly.

Based on finding, there were several implied meanings which formed classification behind flouting of maxims in *La La Land* movie like insult, rebuke, request, and praise. Insult was delivered indirectly to avoid an argument. The rebuke through flouting was to maintain good relations with the interlocutors. Praise and request were delivered indirectly to maintain speaker's image.

E. CONCLUSION

First, in *La La Land* movie, Sebastian and Mia as the main characters flout four kinds of Gricean maxim. Whereas maxim of quantity is the most frequently flouted because main characters usually explain in detail about Jazz music, and maxim of manner is the least frequently flouted by the main characters because they occasionally provide ambiguous and unclear responses to their interlocutor. Second, the implied meanings behind main characters' utterances depend on the context of conversation that could be covered via implicature, entailment, and presupposition. From those three means, implicature has the most important role to find implied meaning because it can reach a deeper level of meaning. As for the implied meanings that are found as to insult, rebuke, request, praise, and so on.

REFERENCES

Bottyan, G. (2006). *The Operationality of Grice's Test for Implicature.* Retrieved from http://www.nytud.hu/cescl/proceedings/Gergely_Bottyan_CESCL.pdf

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1996). *Discourse Analysis*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.

Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Arnold Publishers.

Hsieh, H. F. & Shannon, S. E. (2005). *Qualitative Health Research: Three approaches to qualitative content analysis.* SAGE Journals. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1049732305276687

Kloosterhuis, H. (2015). *Insult in Context: Incorporating Speech Act Theory in Doctrinal Legal Analysis of Interpretative Discussions.* Eramus Law Review 3rd. Rotterdam: Eramus University. Retrieved from https://www.elevenjournals.com/tidjschrift/ELR/2015/3/ELR-D-15-003_005

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods & Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.

Rokhmansyah, A., Ainin, N., & Purwanti. (2019). Pelanggaran Maksim pada Tuturan Remaja Perempuan Yatim: Kajian Psikopragmatik. *JP-BSI (Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia)*, *4*(1), 47-52. http://dx.doi.org/10.26737/jp-bsi.v4i1.887

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold Publishers.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.