



## **Analysis of Flouting Maxims in Dialogue of Doctor Strange Movie**

**Magdalena Ayu<sup>1</sup>, Maydinda Ayu Puspitasari<sup>2</sup>, Shinta Marnesa<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>123</sup>STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung

magdalenayups@gmail.com

**Abstract:** This research analyzes the flouting maxims based on the character' dialogue in the Doctor Strange movie (2016). Flouting the maxims also occurs in literary works such as films. It does not only happen in everyday conversation. Communication is otherwise the transmission of information from one person to another, but the information transmitted must be accessible to the recipient. Communication becomes when the actors create a discussion. The cooperative principle is divided into the four conversational maxims of Grice. There are four more specific maxims that Grice proposed, such as quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These four maxims describe particular principles observed in striving for effective communication by people who follow the cooperative principle. This research revealed what types of maxims were disregarded by the characters in the Doctor Strange (2016) movies.

**Keywords:** flouting maxim, linguistic, qualitative research

### **INTRODUCTION**

As social beings, humans cannot live alone because they need each other to support their lives. Individuals should connect with others to keep up with their endurance. They need to fabricate a decent relationship by doing some correspondence. Correspondence is the exchange of data starting with one individual and then onto the next in any case. However, the data moved should be open to the beneficiary, and the correspondence will be when the entertainers produce some conversation. Khosravizadeh & Sadehvandi (2011) argue that the discussion itself is a complementary action.

Moreover, the character should answer anything the conversationalist says. When the character give great reciprocal activities, it can cause them to see each other's discourse, and the outcome is smooth conversation. Therefore, in the daily discussion, the audience members at long last did not figure out the importance of the speaker. To avoid

misreading correspondence, one should be familiar with the speaker's or alternately speaker's expectations technique. The study of what speakers mean is realistic (Yule, 2006). Communication will end effectively depends not just on catching the importance of the words in an expression yet additionally on catching what the speaker implied with his words (Hastomo, 2016). Hadi (2013) realistically states that the primary purpose of communication is considered an exchange of information.

In addition, Paltridge (2006) says that pragmatics is the study of meaning concerning the environment in which a person speaks or writes. It implies when entertainers give precise data, they can construct excellent correspondence. Practically, there are rules for building great posts. As indicated by Grice's suggestion, there are four rules for creating excellent equality with others connected with genuineness, giving required data, material, and clarity. These rules are alluded to as the "cooperative standard". Cooperative is an assurance for fruitful correspondence and a reason for creating any allegations of conversation. This shows that the cooperative guideline is one of the essential things in the conversation. Because of the above assertion, parties should stick to usual collaborative standards to complete the practical and successful utilization of language in exchange.

In addition, in daily discussions, flouting maxims can also be embedded in film scripts or dialog. In film dialogue, this case is often used by characters in films. Acclimation rejuvenates discourse and keeps individuals thinking about what the speaker implies. It is fitting to utilize this recommendation to identify a movie that contains affronts conversational feelings through the suggestion of flouting maxims. This examination causes us to notice the Doctor Strange movie (2016), which centers around the conversation of the principal character, Stephen Strange's videlicet.

All in all, this film is likewise called the insight of the taradiddle identifier. Some of Dr. Strange's trades with another person (suspect) show that he hated the expressions of the discussion. Based on Grice's suggestion, individuals who disdain word conversation or don't give data as an educational means keep profound implications that need to be communicated. Grice stated, "To indicate is to allude to, suggest or convey some meaning laterally through language" (Thomas, 1995). When the speaker says sideways in his speech, he is letting his listeners search for the missing meaning spoken by the speaker. In this case, the background knowledge of the matter is required maxims to interpret its means. After understanding the proposition of hating conversation, the researcher is interested in taking this field as exploration because we often apply this method in our daily life included in the Doctor Strange movie (2016). When

people hate maxims, they have specific reasons to disclose. This study is also essential to understand the fame of his speech as listeners understand the meaning of the speaker's lips.

Similarly, the researchers were interested in separating this film because there is a lot of discourse in this film that underestimates the maxims of conversation. From this Dialogue, experimentation can distinguish the types of flouting maxims in this film. The research has differences from others. In previous studies, one of them was only anatomic ridiculed by one word, the maxims of the relationship. One of them also analyzes by word hedging and underestimates pearls of wisdom. And the other bone is about humor that uses Grice's propositions. In this exploration, the experiment focuses on the words that the suspects and the main character in "Doctor Strange" movie, what maxims were mocked, and the reason for hating maxims. Based on the explanation that is complete, this exploration is proposed.

According to Cutting (2002), there were four collaborative principles for conversational maxims. They are maxims of volume, maxims of quality, maxims of relationship, and maxims of manner. The first is maxims of volume. It implies that speakers ought to be basically as educational as neither fundamental, that they should neither give too little nor too significant data. A few speakers are partial to mentioning that they know how important data the audience needs or can be messed with. Individuals who give too little data risk their audience members not being reasonable in determining what they are referring to because they are not adequately unequivocal. The impact of these sayings is to show that the assertion is the most grounded or educational it can create in a circumstance. The other is adages of value. It implies that speakers ought to be accurate and says what they accept compared to the real world. It is expected that they will not utter a word that they get off-base or for which they have lower validation. A few speakers wish to cause summaries to notice how they are just expressing out loud whatever they accept to be valid and warrant adequate validation. The third is proverbs of connection. It implies that speakers are accepted to say were pertinent to what was, for starters, said. Furthermore, the latter is sayings of way. It means that the Manner of talking implies that speakers should be firm and precise, keeping away from ambiguity and nebulosity.

According to Thomas (1995), casualness occurs when "the speaker blatantly disregards maxims at the position of what is said, with the conscious intention of creating implicates". In ignoring it, the speakers do not give the correct information as the by-words bear, but the hearer can still get the meaning because of the implication. Casualness can do in four sub-principles of the maxims. The maxims of volume are disregarded. The

casualness of the maxims of quality, the casualness of the maxims of relationship, and the casualness of the maxims of mores. The first is disregarding the volume principle. It means that the speakers in a discussion do not fulfill the volume principle of the collaborative principle. This includes whether the speakers are not as instructional or further instructional than needed. Speakers come less or more instructional when they defy volume. For illustration, A asked to B "How do we get there?" B answered A's question, "Well, we will get there in Dave's auto." In this case, B stresses the word in a way that signals A that it is not included, which tells A by its recrimination that B's friend Dave has arranged a lift for her and that A will not be traveling to their designated destination. It is egregious that the information given over is not clear to understand. B does not indeed give the listener enough information.

The second is the quality of flouting maxims. It implies the speaker is essentially saying a product that doesn't reflect what the individual is permitting. The speaker misses the proverbs of value, a saying that requires the speaker to make a genuine gift, for example, not to get out whatever is viewed as misleading and not to get out whatever the speaker doesn't have adequate validation for. For illustration, A asked to B "Teheran's in Turkey, is not it, schoolteacher?" B answered A's question, "And London's is presumably in Armenia ."In this illustration, B shows what A preliminarily said is wrong without saying "no." Still, B says commodity differently to indicate that Tehran is not in Turkey by saying that London is located in Armenia. Since we know London is in England, A's statement is false. For this reason, B disregarded the quality maxims.

The third is dismissing the relationship rule. It implies that the speakers of a conversation are not material to the correspondence. For the most part, speakers are not associated with assuming that they dismiss the most extraordinary pertinence. In any case, being irrelevant does not imply that speakers would rather not be pertinent. Infrequently speakers are outside because they need to conceal items or say ware along the side to other people. For illustration, John asked Mika, "Do insectivores eat hamburgers?" And also, Mika give a question John, "Do cravens have lips?" In this discussion, Mika is inapplicable to the listener with rhetorical questions. When speakers use it, they do not anticipate the listener to get an answer (Gvozdanović, 1997). Then, Mika uses it as a statement, and John expects her to give a yes or no answer. Instead of saying "no," she is inapplicable by saying commodity different, though laterally telling John that insectivores do not eat hamburgers as part of the implicate. Because of this, Mika disregards the maxims of the relationship.

The last is ignoring the way standard. It implied when their

expressions came undefined or dark. You can not say product minimalistic ally or conveniently. For example, A asked B, "Where are you going?" B responded to A inquiry, "I was permitting of going out and getting a portion of that odd white stuff for somebody".

Furthermore, A answered B's, "Alright, do not remain long-entertain is anywhere near prepared ."In this conversation, B becomes undefined by saying, "amusing white stuff ."Frozen yogurt and "somebody" signifies his child. B dismisses the adages of the way since B says nothing clear. The justification for why B ignores this caring proverb since B does not maintain that his child should comprehend the significance he is causing the child needs to eat her amusement before eating the frozen yogurt

## **METHOD**

### ***Research Design***

This exploration is conducted using the descriptive-qualitative system. Johnston (2009) explains that qualitative exploration generates narrative or textual descriptions of the marvels under study. Meanwhile, Hancock (2006) and Ibrahim et al. (2018) describe qualitative exploration as an exploration that has enterprises about developing explanations for social marvels.

### ***Data and Source of Data***

The information of this exploration came as expressions containing negligence for the conversation in Doctor Strange Movie. As an information source, the researchers gathered the data from the discussion of the Doctor Strange film

### ***Research Instrument***

In this study, the researchers are the main instrument for assaying the data. They made compliances in the film Dr. Strange (2016). In-depth observances of several utterances by several characters in the movie are used to gather the main focus of the violation of conversational by-words. Below are the tools demanded to use. First is the internet. Use the internet to support experimenters to get flicks and scripts and browse affiliated studies. The alternate is the Speaker. This is used to help the experimenter to match the data linked as violating the by-words and the last to support the experimenter in writing the report files.

### ***Data Collection Technique***

Data collection is how data and information related to this exploration are attained. Creswell (2012) explains four ways to collect the data, videlicet compliances, interviews, documents, and audiovisual accouterments. In this exploration, the researchers use submission to induce the data. Observation is an exertion that uses the five senses, including sight, smell, and hail, to gain the information demanded to answer exploration problems. The results of the

compliances are in the form of specific conditioning, events, objects, countries, or atmospheres, and one's emotional sensations. Observations are made to gain an actual event or events to answer exploration questions.

### ***Analysis***

According to Miles, Huberman & Saldaña (1994), data analysis has three main factors: data reduction, data representation, and logic in data analysis. In this case, the analysis process described below data reduction is about reducing the data without any significant loss of information. Then the researchers named the data that contained sayings infringement and prohibited the information that did not have the adage infringement standards. Information portrayal involves getting sorted out, packing, and gathering data. Therefore the researchers coordinated the report for examination as a story for the sorts of by-words that were disregarded and the incitements of the characters that were abused against the specific sayings. In deducing, the researchers would decide grounded on the information shown and in the wake of examining the report talked about.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Types of Flouting of Maxims in Dialogue of Doctor Strange (2016) Movie**

This part showed Maxim's data was disregarded in the movie dialogue. They are volume maxims, quality maxims, and relationship maxims. Flouting is 'quiet' because it is egregious at the utterance that the speaker has designedly prevaricated, supplied inadequate information, or been nebulous, inapplicable, or hard to understand (H. Tupan & Natalia, 2008).

### ***Flouting Maxims of Quantity***

(In minutes 1:06:24)

Stephen Strange: Christine!

Christine Palmer : Oh my god. What's happened?

Stephen Strange : Get me in an operating theater now. Just you. Now!  
I haven't any time.

The conversation happened at the hospital. Stephen came to the hospital from another universe using the magic power generated by the Sling ring. The discussion above contained floating maxims of quantity and maxims of relation done by Stephen. Christine asked Stephen about 'what had happened to him. It means Stephen had to answer the question correctly according to the question by explaining what had just happened to him. However, she responded with more information than required. Grundy asserted that the maxim of quantity as one of the cooperative principles is concerned with giving the news as necessary and not giving the data more than required (2000). Thus, Stephen flouted the maxim of quantity.

### ***Flouting Maxims of Quality***

The strategy of using violating towards maxim of quality is by giving a taradiddle statement where the speaker did not know about the verity. According to (Cutting, 2002), people who violate the maxim of quality indicate not being sincere and give wrong information.

(In minutes 12:52)

Stephen Strange : What did they do?

Christine Palmer : They rushed you in a chopper. But it took a little while to find you.

The conversation situation above is in the hospital, where many needles have pierced Stephen's hands right above the surface of his hands. Not long after, he realized and was surprised to see his hand, which was already filled with the needle. Christine was right beside him. Christine's face looked sad. Then Stephen asked Christine, "What did they do?" he said. Christine also replied that they were looking for Stephen by helicopter, but it took a long time to find Stephen.

The maxim that is flouted in the conversation above is the maxim of quality. Because in the Dialogue, Christine lies to Stephen. He did not tell the truth about what happened to Stephen. It can be seen from the Dialogue above when Stephen asks what they did to him. Christine simply replied, "They took you by helicopter". "But it took some time to find you". Then Stephen asked Christine again, "What did they do?" . With a sad feeling, Christine also told the truth that 11 steel tongs were attached to the bones. Some ligaments are damaged. Both of Stephen's hands suffered severe nerve damage. And he was in surgery for 11 hours. And the reason why the Dialogue includes maxims of quality is what we can see in the previous section. There are no scenes or conversations about those who took Stephen in a helicopter and took a long time to find him.

### ***Flouting Maxims of Relation***

The maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation irrelevant to the topic at hand (Thomas, 1995). So the speaker flouts the maxim of relation when she/she does not give a response to the issue that is being discussed.

(In minutes 19:23)

Jonathan Pangborn : Who are you?

Stephen Strange : Paralyzed from the mid-chest down. Partial paralysis in both hands.

The conversation above occurred when Stephen Strange met Jonathan Pangborn at the futsal venue. Strange came to see Pangborn because Strange got information from a fellow doctor who had treated an almost impossible patient, namely Pangborn. But a few years later, Pangborn miraculously recovered,

which made Strange wonder how an accident as severe as that could be cured. Strange goes to Pangborn because he wants information so that Strange can heal his damaged hand.

When he met Pangborn, Strange immediately said his name and mentioned the severe injury that Pangborn had suffered several years ago. This violates the maxims relation because Pangborn, who was confused by Strange's presence, asked, "Who are you?" instead of answering the question correctly, Strange responded with the sentence "Paralyzed from the mid-chest down. Partial paralysis in both hands." which is the severe injury suffered by Pangborn. Strange violates the relation maxims by giving an answer that has nothing to do with Pangborn's question.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the results, the researchers concluded that in the film *Dr. Strange 2016*, the character in all forms of words and words of applicability was most rejected. Characters tend to reject words as a nuisance because they want to draw the listener to find the meaning of what the speaker said. There for provocation four provocations, but in this study, the character is only led by three provocations reject by-words; contend, cooperate and contradict each other. That cooperation is the most dominant provocation because *Dr. Strange's 2016* film script does not have optimal conflict, and competition follows. Characters frequently reveal and express commodities. They want to say this because the thing is to give understanding to the end of court proceedings.

## **REFERENCES**

- Creswell, J. W. (2012) *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. 4th edn. Boston.
- Cutting, J. (2002) *Pragmatics and Discourse, From Language To Communication*. doi: 10.4324/9781410603685-11.
- Gvozdanović, J. (1997) *Language Change and Functional Explanations*, De Gruyter Mouton. Edited by J. Gvozdanovic. DE GRUYTER MOUTON. doi: 10.1515/9783110813753.
- H. Tupan, A. and Natalia, H. (2008) 'the Multiple Violations of Conversational Maxims in Lying Done By the Characters in Some Episodes of Desperate Housewives', *K@Ta*, 10(1), pp. 63–78. doi: 10.9744/kata.10.1.63-78.
- Hadi, A. (2013) 'A Critical Appraisal of Grice's Cooperative Principle', *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 03(01), pp. 69–72. doi: 10.4236/ojml.2013.31008.
- Hancock, B. (2006) 'An Introduction to Qualitative Research Authors', *Qualitative Research*, 4th, p. 504. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2007.70541.



- Hastomo, T. (2016, January). The Effectiveness of Edmodo to teach writing viewed from students' motivation. In *Proceeding of International Conference on Teacher Training and Education* (Vol. 1, No. 1).
- Ibrahim, Z., Arifin, M. B. and Setyowati, R. (2018) 'the Flouting of Maxim in the Se7En Movie Script', *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 2(1), pp. 81-94.
- Johnston, N. (2009) 'Evolving Function', *The Prison Journal*, 89(1), p. 34. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0032885508329761>.
- Khosravizadeh, P. and Sadehvandi, N. (2011) 'Some Instances of Violation and Flouting of the Maxim of Quantity by the Main Characters ( Barry & Tim ) in Dinner for Schmucks', *2011 International Conference on Lnguage Literature and Linguistics*, 26(December 2011), pp. 122-127.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. and Saldaña, J. (1994) 'Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook', Sage Publications, p. 341.
- Paltridge, B. (2006) 'Discourse Analysis Paltridge 2006', p. 117.
- Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning In Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*.
- Yule, G. (2006) 'Pragmatics By George Yule.Pdf', p. 171.