

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM FOUND IN FRIENDS MOVIE

Wida Monalisa Purba^{1*}, Putu Nur Ayomi²

Mahasaraswati Denpasar University

¹ widamona@gmail.com, ² putu.nur.a.@unmas.ac.id

Abstract

This article focuses on finding the types of flouting maxim in the Friends film by all characters, especially in season 1, episodes 1-10. This research aims to find the types of flouting maxim and the reasons behind the characters flouted the maxim based on the context of the situation. This topic is part of pragmatics which studies whether humans as social beings who always interact can be cooperative and able to make the appropriate contribution as expected with the aim of creating quality communication, in accordance with the portion, relevant, and assuredly clear. The data were analyzed using the theory of Grice (1975) in classifying the types of flouting maxims that appear in the film and the analysis will be supported with the context of situation theory by Halliday (1985). This article uses qualitative methods and data collection using the observation method. Then as a result, 49 data flouting the maxim were identified in this movie. The data found represent all types of flouting maxim (Grice). However, the type of flouting maxim that most found is flouting maxim of relation.

Keywords: Flouting Maxim, Cooperative Principle, Pragmatic, Movie

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is an important part of science that explores meaning by departing from its context first and implying that different meanings have different contexts. Levinson (1983: 21) concludes that pragmatics is a study that focuses on the relationship between language and how its use affects crucially and generates valid assumptions or conclusions that are relevant to communication itself. Communication is a form of human interaction to exchange ideas and form groups. Humans need to talk to each other in order to survive both in family, school and at workplace. According to Grice (Hanna, 2017) concludes that everyone convey their own thoughts to each other in communicating. It is impossible to survive without communication in this world, in essence we need it because humans are social creatures who need communication as the basis of daily life. The result of communication is a real conversation between at least 2 people both verbally and non-verbally. Giriyani (2021) concludes that in communication, participants must be able to convey correct and important sentences so that information is easily understood and the other person understands the topic being discussed so that the conversation can run well and does not violate the cooperative principle. According to Lestari (2017) Cooperative principle is a situation where the speaker can be interpreted correctly and on the other hand the listener must be able to parse the information received so that they can contribute to each other.

Conversation has become a necessity for us as a society where we use linguistic forms and effectively when talking to other people (Brennan, 2010). Then as a result, there are many works, information and even emotions that can be channeled, be it happiness, sadness, humor and others. Therefore, a conversation that goes smoothly is known from the results, that is

mutual understanding and agreement. That is the importance of knowing what things support a conversation to take place effectively.

According to Novera (2020) states that there are many human needs, one of which is communicating with each other and humans interacting to fulfill social needs that cannot be separated, both verbal and nonverbal communication. The fact is that until now, there are still many conversations that do not work effectively due to various things, such as the different understanding backgrounds of the participants so that misunderstandings become a problem that often occurs in society. This happens when the process of delivering information is not appropriate and causes an error at the stage of receiving the information. When misunderstandings continue to occur, communication will experience chaos, the role of the cooperative principle is needed to overcome this phenomenon. The cooperative principle is one of the principles of conversation in pragmatics that emphasizes the existence of cooperative efforts that exist between speaker and speech partner.

The intended collaboration related to the utterance. Grice (1975) concludes that maxim is a part of pragmatics which studies whether participants in a conversation can be cooperative or not in order to make appropriate and needed contributions. Based on this theory, there are 4 maxims that are categorized in conversation, which are: Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Relation and Maxim of Manner. Maxim of quality is a type of conversation where the point is the truth, the information is not based on personal opinion and has valid evidence. Maxim of quantity is a type of conversation whose essence is the appropriate amount, the information provided is not too little and not too much. Maxim of relation is a type of conversation in which the information is relevant or related to the topic being discussed. Meanwhile, Maxim of manner is a type of conversation that is unambiguous, sequential, and clear. In connection with the phenomenon of the previous effective conversation, the speaker and the listener are considered have flouted the maxim if they do not meet the conditions of the four maxims. In essence, context is a realistic picture of a certain situation and setting of an event that occurs. Meaning that carrying the context of the situation in this study is needed as a supporting theory to analyze conversations which become data that can be classified according to the types of flouting maxims. Then Halliday (1985) classifies the context of the situation about what topic or content is being discussed, the nature of the relationship between language users in the context, the role they have and what is expected to happen in the conversation itself. This study analyzes two problems as research gap or benchmarks in discussing the data. The first problem is what are the maxims that flouted in the Friends movie?, and the second problem is why the maxims are flouted by the characters in Friends movie?

The data source used in this analysis is movie. Movie is one part of literary works which is shown through moving recording and has experienced drastic development. Hornby (2006) concludes that a movie is a work that conveys stories and art through a collection of images that move with sound. This article used the movie as a data source because this research is based on the context of the situation, therefore through the movie it will be easier to understand the context that occurs when the character flouted the maxim. The movie that will be used in this analysis is Friends season 1, episodes 1-10 and this movie was chosen because Friends has become a popular teaching-learning tool and has been successfully used by many people. However, it is hoped that the data found will become an example of learning.

METHOD

In obtaining the data, this research uses the observation method as a method for collecting data. The data is taken from the expressions of the characters in the Friends movie. This movie is an

American sitcom directed by Jennifer David Crane and Marta Kauffman and was very popular in 1994-2004. The steps taken in collecting data are downloading the Friends movie and its script, after that watching the movie and reading the script several times to get a deep understanding of the storyline, then taking notes for the important data which is considered a flouting maxim, after that classifying the type of maxim from the data and the last is concluding the data. On this occasion, the method used to analyze the data that has been collected is using descriptive qualitative method. Vanserstoeop and Johnstony (2009; 258) states that qualitative research emphasizes processes and observations in an analysis so that this method is descriptive of the process. This analysis assesses the type of flouting maxim and the reasons for the occurrence of the flouting maxim based on the context of the situation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The findings of this study indicate that there are 63 data of flouting maxims by the characters in the Friends movie. This study explain the data based on the findings described in the descriptive way. The result table attached clearly as follow:

Table 1. Types of Flouting Maxim found in Friends Movie

Types of Flouting Maxim	Frequency	Percentage
Flouting Maxim of Quantity	10	20.4%
Flouting maxim of Quality	14	28.6%
Flouting Maxim of Relation	18	36.8%
Flouting Maxim of Manner	7	14.2%
Total	49	100%

As shown in the table, this study found 49 data which are the flouting maxim performed by the characters in the Friends movie, especially season 1, episodes 1-10. After classifying based on the nature of each type of maxim, it was found that there were 10 data which constituted the flouting maxim of quantity with a percentage of 20.4%, 14 data which constituted the flouting maxim of quality with a percentage of 28.6%, 18 data which constituted the flouting maxim of relation with a percentage of 36.8%, and 7 data which constituted the flouting maxim of manner with a percentage of 13.20%. From all the data, the flouting maxim of relation is the most dominant that appears in the 10 episodes analyzed. In data analysis, there are 8 data analyzed on this occasion such as 2 data for flouting maxim of quantity, 2 data for flouting maxim of quality, 2 data for flouting maxim of relation, and the last 2 data for flouting maxim of manner.

Discussion

Data 1

Rachel : *You're twins?*

Phoebe : *Yeah. We don't speak. She's like this high-powered, driven career type.*

(Friends season 1 EPS 2 00:12:06)

The conversation between Phoebe and Rachel took place in Central Perk. At that time they gathered there as usual and had a chit-chat and suddenly Ross stood up and kissed his sister, Monica's forehead. They looked confused because Ross seemed to want to go home but in fact he just went to the bathroom. They were just silent seeing Ross's farewell behavior like that just went to the bathroom without saying anything. Then Phoebe said it would be worse if she had a twin sister whose behavior would exceed Monica's brother. Rachel was cleaning the table when she heard Phoebe arguing that it was worse for twins and thought Phoebe has twins and Phoebe did not like her. Rachel was curious and immediately asked "You're twins?" then Phoebe replied "*Yeah. We don't speak. She's like this high-powered, driven career type.*"

In this case, Phoebe answered more than necessary because Rachel's only question was whether she was a twin and Phoebe should have answered Yeah. But Phoebe told them they did not talk and she's driven career types where this information wasn't needed at the time. Despite Phoebe's intentions that she just wanted to let them know that she did not like her twin but she was considered to have flouted the maxim of quantity. Phoebe has failed to fulfill the rules or conditions of the maxim of quantity which the participants are expected to be able to contribute according to the portion, no less and no more than required.

Data 2

Monica : *Hello ?*

Chandler : *Hey, it's me.*

Monica : *It's Chandler! Are you OK?*

Chandler : *Yeah, I'm fine. I'm trapped in an ATM vestibule with Jill Goodacre.*

(*Friends* season 1 EPS 7 00:04:40)

The conversation between Monica and Chandler above happened on the phone. At that time there was a sudden power outage while Monica and her gang were at her apartment and Chandler was at the Vestibule ATM. At first, Monica and the others did not know Chandler's whereabouts until late at night and had not met them, while Chandler was trapped in the ATM machine room with Jill Goodacre because a power outage caused the door of the room was close automatically. After a while he realized that the woman was a Viktoria' Secret model and he was stuck there. Chandler was ecstatic and seemed to stare at Jill Goodacre but he did not dare to say hello. Jill felt uncomfortable knowing Chandler looking strange in the corner of the room and tried to start a conversation by offering her phone if he wanted to contact someone. Then Chandler thought to tell his friends that he was with a famous model and called Monica's apartment. After greeting each other Monica asked if he was okay out there in pitch black all over the city. Chandler replied "*Yeah, I'm fine. I'm trapped in an ATM vestibule with Jill Goodacre.*"

In this case, Chandler was considered to have flouted the maxim of quantity. He should have simply replied that he was fine at the time and since Monica had not asked where he was and who he was with at the moment. Therefore, Chandler has clearly flouted the maxim of quantity. Regardless of Chandler's reasons for recounting the unexpected experience, he should have asked Monica first if she wanted to hear about his meeting with the famous model or not. If Monica replies that she wants to hear what Chandler has to say then he can say "*I'm trapped in an ATM vestibule with Jill Goodacre*" and if she does not want to then he does not need to tell her. Even though Monica is a close friend, Chandler is still considered to have failed to fulfill the terms or conditions of the maxim of quantity in which he is expected to provide information according to portion, not less and not more than required.

Data 3

Rachel : *They wanna know if I'm okay. Okay.. they wanna know if I'm okay, okay, let's see. Well, let's see, the FICA guys took all my money, everyone I know is either getting*

married, or getting promoted, or getting pregnant, and I'm getting coffee! And it's not even for me! So if that sounds like I'm okay, okay, then you can tell them I'm okay, okay?

Monica : ***Uh- Rachel has left the building, can you call back?***

(Friends season 1 EPS 4 00:09:54)

The conversation between Rachel and Monica above took place at Monica's apartment. At that time Monica had just come home, Monica was blending something and then gave it to Rachel, and Phoebe who was relaxing on the sofa. They had a chit-chat about their activities for the day and suddenly the phone rang. Monica rushed to pick up the phone and someone on the phone asked Rachel. Monica informed that it was for her and it was from the visa. Rachel refused to take the call and asked Rachel to ask what they wanted. Turns out it was about unusual activity on his credit card. Rachel was annoyed that she had not use her credit card in months and Monica replied that it was precisely because she had never used it, which was very unusual since she was used to being extravagant. Then Rachel got angry and told Monica that she was not okay but they could assume she was fine. Then Monica did not want to make things worse and went back to talking to the person on the phone and told that Rachel had left the building. In this case, Monica had said something that was not true because she lied to the person that Rachel had gone but in fact Rachel was still there. Monica chose to lie so as not to make Rachel's mood worse. She was considered to have failed to be cooperative in the conversation and failed to meet the maxim of quantity requirements where participants are expected to be able to make contributions that have valid evidence, according to the truth, and the information can be justified. Regardless of the reason, providing information that cannot be verified was a violation. If she had said that Rachel did not want to talk to anyone at the time, Monica would not be considered the maxim of quality because of the fact that Rachel did not want to answer the person on the phone. Therefore, it is important to understand the surrounding situation before contributing in order to create a quality form of conversation.

Data 4

Joey : *Monica, I'm telling you, this guy is perfect for you.*

Monica : *Forget it. Not after your cousin who could belch the alphabet.*

Joey : ***Come on. This guy's great. His name's Bob. He's Angela's... brother. He's smart, he's sophisticated, and he has a real job. Me, I go on three auditions a month and call myself an actor, but Bob is...***

(Friends season 1 EPS 5 00:06:17)

The conversation between Joey and Monica above took place at Monica's apartment. At that time, Joey continued to persuade Monica to went with him to dinner with Angela. Angela was his ex-girlfriend and Joey wanted to get back with her but Angela refused since she already has a boyfriend at that time. Earlier at the café, Joey kept begging Angela but she insisted she did not want to and rushed off. Joey who feels left out also invited Angela to have a double date, Angela with Bob, and Joey with Monica. Joey felt defeated and said that he also has a girlfriend, She was Monica. Then, Angela agreed to the invitation. Joey had to go with Monica but she did not want to then Joey said that he would introduce Angela's brother to her, he was Bob. It was clearly a lie and Joey wanted her to like Bob so he could be with Angela again.

In this case, Joey did not think about the risks that would occur if Monica finds out that Bob was Angela's boyfriend. He kept lying to Angela as well as to Monica. Therefore, Joey was considered flouted the maxim of quality for providing information whose truth cannot be proven and only want to fulfill personal interests. He has failed to fulfill the maxim of quality

to be cooperative and contribute according to the truth or in accordance with the facts. Apart from Joey's love for Angela, he has damaged the identity or quality of good communication and if done continuously would make other people would not want to believe what Joey said.

Data 5

Rachel : *Why are- why are you so tanned?*

Barry : *Oh, I, uh- I went to Aruba.*

(*Friends* season 1 EPS 2 00:17:45)

The conversation between Rachel and Barry above took place in Barry's office. Barry was the man she was supposed to marry a few weeks ago but she ran away from the wedding. Rachel came there to return the wedding ring but when she got there Barry's reaction was unexpected. Rachel thought Barry would get mad on her or take her away but Barry welcomed her as if nothing had happened. This made Rachel felt awkward and she asked why his skin was so tanned and Barry replied "*Oh, I, uh- I went to Aruba*". Aruba was where they should be honeymooning but Barry went with someone else.

In this case, Barry gave an implicature answer and assumed Rachel would know the reason his skin was so tanned because he was enjoying his vacation in Aruba. Rachel knowed the meaning of the implicature sentence but going to Aruba would not cause his skin to tan completely, the reason of his skin to tan was to bask for a long time in the hot sun. Therefore, Barry was considered flouted the maxim of relation because it does not provide an answer that is relevant to Rachel's question. If he answered that his skin became tanned due to exposure to the sun while on vacation, then he would not be considered to be flouted the maxim of relation. Barry was considered to have failed to make relevant contributions without any hidden meaning from the answers given so that it will minimize the phenomenon of misunderstanding in communication.

Data 6

Monica : *Hey. Where's Joey?*

Chandler : *Joey ate my last stick of gum, so I killed him. Do you think that was wrong?*

Rachel : *I think he's across the hall.*

(*Friends* season 1 EPS 3 00:18:29)

The conversation between Monica, Chandler, and Rachel above took place at Monica's apartment. At that moment everyone except Monica and Joey were watching *Lambchop* in the living room. Joey was taking a shower at the time and Monica came into her apartment and asked them where Joey was. Chandler seemed annoyed with Joey because Joey ate his last stick of gum and said that was why he killed him. Chandler also asked if he was at fault for that but they all knew he did not really kill Joey so Rachel immediately told him that Joey was across the hall. After knowing his whereabouts, Monica immediately met and dragged Joey to his apartment still in a bathrobe.

In this case, Chandler answered Monica in the wrong way as Monica asked. Monica asked where Joey was at that time and nothing else but Chandler discussed things that were not related to the question and therefore he was deemed to have flouted the maxim of relation. The answer Monica needed was whether he know where Joey was or not. If Chandler answered correctly, then he would not fail to fulfill the maxim of relation, which was the participants are expected able to be cooperative and contribute to the conversation by providing information that is relevant or related to the other person's topic. Regardless of Chandler's reasoning, that is he joked that he had killed Joey, but that answer was considered to have violated the provisions of the maxim. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the answers submitted since it can be

hoax news and other people may believe that because they do not know the background of the relationship and the problems that occur.

Data 7

Phoebe : *Yes, yes! Like the man in the shoe!*

Ross : *What shoe?*

Phoebe : *From the nursery rhyme. 'There was a crooked man, Who had a crooked smile, Who lived in a shoe, For a... while...*

(*Friends* season 1 EPS 3 00:09:58)

The conversation between Phoebe and Ross above took place at Monica's apartment. At that time Monica invited her boyfriend to visit and get acquainted with all of them. After a while Alan finally back home and they all gathered in the living room. Monica expected them to criticize her boyfriend and let them say whatever they wanted. They all seemed to have a lot to say but they held it in for fear of Monica's wrath if they badmouthed her boyfriend in front of her face. They chose to compliment Alan and it surprised Monica since they said that Alan's smile was great and that was crooked. Phoebe immediately agreed and added that smile like the man in the shoe. Ross, who did not understand what she meant, asked "what shoe?" then Phoebe said "*From the nursery rhyme. 'There was a crooked man, Who had a crooked smile, Who lived in a shoe, For a... while...'*" then his friends could not help but stare at her singing the lyrics.

In this case, Phoebe compared Alan's smile to that of a man in a shoe who has a crooked smile. At first he was excited to sing it until there was a dubious pause since she realized that they did not agree with it. Phoebe gave an ambiguous parable by equating Alan's smile with the man in the fantasy lyrics so that her friends look confused and resigned. Even though the lyrics have the words crooked man and crooked smile, it does not mean that Alan looks like that and is evidenced by the absence of a reaction that agrees with the parable. Therefore, Phoebe was considered to have flouted the maxim of manner because she has failed to meet the requirements to be cooperative and make contributions that are clear, unambiguous, and sequential. Phoebe should said something simple but known by other people so that the conversation goes well and if we do this repeatedly it will make the interlocutor annoyed and would not talk anymore.

Data 8

Paolo : *Bed?*

Ross : *No, no, that's not where I was going. Er, if you get in the... way, of us becoming a thing, then I would be, well, very sad.*

(*Friends* season 1 EPS 7 00:19:50)

The conversation between Paolo and Ross above took place in Monica's apartment. At that time Ross was jealous because Rachel loved Paolo. Paolo was Monica's apartment neighbor and they met while Rachel was looking for the cat's owner in the balcony. Paolo was an Italian who did not understand English then he has a hard time interacting with them except for Rachel who seemed to understand whatever Paolo was saying in Italian. Ross has liked Rachel for a long time felt annoyed with Paolo's presence there and after Paolo was alone he wanted to say that Rachel and himself were lovers but he did not understand and misinterprets it with something related to bed. Ross replied "*No, no, that's not where I was going. Er, if you get in the... way, of us becoming a thing, then I would be, well, very sad.*" Ross was confused to state his purpose because his sentence was not clear and ambiguous. Even if he spoke clearly it would make Paolo not understand and Ross said it in an ambiguous manner.

In this case, Ross had a hard time getting his point across because he was afraid that other people in the room, especially Rachel would hear him. He tried to explain it haltingly so that in the end Paolo did not understand his warning and started dating Rachel. Therefore, Ross was

considered to be flouted the maxim of manner since he provided information was not clear and ambiguous manner and that means he failed to be cooperative and contribute to the maxim of manner. If he asked Paolo out for a bit to talk then he would feel more free to say that he had liked Rachel for a long time and could warn him not to be her boyfriend so he would not flouted the flouting maxim of manner.

CONCLUSION

This research focused on analyzing the types of flouting maxim based on the context of the situation performed by the character in Friends movie. After conducting research by collecting and classifying the types of flouting maxims found, it was concluded that there are 49 data that were considered to be flouted four types of maxims that concluded by Grice. Among the 49 data, it was found that there are 18 data which constituted the flouting maxim of relation with a percentage of 36.8% as the most dominant type of flouting maxim that appeared in that episode, followed by 14 data which constituted the flouting maxim. of quality with a percentage of 28.6%, after that there are 10 data which constituted the flouting maxim of quantity with a percentage of 20.4% and finally there are 7 data which constituted the flouting maxim of manner with a percentage of 13.20%. The flouting maxim that appears the least in episodes 1-10. Based on the flouting maxim of relation as the most dominant type of flouting maxim, it is concluded that the character flouted the maxim of relation in order to make the movie meets the genre, namely comedy by giving irrelevant answers the co-star will give a confused, funny, annoyed or angry expressions managed to entertain the audience according to the genre.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Gratitude to God who is most merciful for the grace and generosity provided a very valuable opportunity for the researcher to be able to gain knowledge and complete this research and gratitude to my family and everyone who has participated in helping, supporting, and guiding the author through each process of this research.

REFERENCES

- Galati, A., & Brennan, S. E. (2010). Attenuating information in spoken communication: For the speaker, or for the addressee?. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 62(1), 35-51.
- Giriyani, P., & Efransyah, E. (2020). Flouting maxims on the dialogue of characters in Up! animated movie. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 3(4), 512-517.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Brill.
- Halliday, M. A., Hasan, R., & Hasan, R. (1985). Language, text and context.
- Hanna, E., Sembiring, B., & Ghozali, I. (2017). An analysis of flouting maxim in The Jungle Book movie script. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching*, 1(2), 33-39.
- Hornby, A. S. (2016). Equivalence: In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. *Oxford University Press*.
- Lestari, W. (2017). *The Analysis of Cooperative Principle In 1 Mile To You Movie And Its Application In Teaching Speaking at Senior High School* (Doctoral dissertation, PBI-FKIP).
- Levinson, S. C., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge university press.

- Novera, M. K., Winaya, I. M., & Udayana, I. N. (2021). MAXIM FLOUTING IN “BROOKLYN NINE-NINE”. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 4(4), 685-691
- Vanderstoep, S. W., & Johnston, D. D. (2009) *The Meaning of Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. USA: Jogn Willey & Sons Inc.