

Flouting Maxims by The Main Character in *Money Monster* Film

Richie Alvino

English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Creative Industries, Petra Christian University, Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya 60236, INDONESIA
e-mails: 12richiealvino@gmail.com; A11190042@john.petra.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the flouting maxims contained in the *Money Monster* film. This study uses the qualitative method, and the unit of analysis is the utterances in the *Money Monster* film script. The writer is using Cutting and Fordyce's (2020) theory of flouting maxims. Flouting maxims can be divided into four categories: flouting the maxim of quantity, flouting the maxim of quality, flouting the maxim of relation, and flouting the maxim of manner. The results of this study indicate that there are all four types of flouting maxims found in the film. The total data is 11 of the flouting maxims; all of the flouting maxims are flouted by the main character in the film. Flouting maxims of quantity are flouted one-time, flouting maxims of quality are flouted two times, flouting maxims of relation are flouted five times, and flouting maxims of manner are flouted three times. The least flouted is the flouting maxim of quantity; it is only flouted once. The flouting maxim that appears the most is the flouting maxim of relation, which is flouted four times in the conversation.

Keywords: conversation; film; flouting maxim; scripts

INTRODUCTION

The writer observed the character in the *Money Monster* film, Lee Gates, in this study. The writer chose this movie because it is interesting to analyze, as this *Money Monster* film shows the audience how mankind can steal a company's stock in just one night without anyone knowing it. On the other hand, *Money Monster* serves as a reminder for market participants, particularly stock investors. Financial instruments, such as stocks, are no longer a game to bet on. Given the potential consequences, many parties, and even a significant amount, suffer. This is what makes stock investing so dangerous. This move takes about one hour, thirty-eight minutes, and thirty-nine seconds (01:38:39). This study used cooperative principles in Cutting and Fordyce (2020). These four maxims were used by the writer to analyze the film. There are four types of flouting maxims: flouting quantity, flouting quality, flouting relation, and flouting manner.

METHODOLOGY

In this research, the writer analyzed the data by collecting all the utterances that the main character flouted based on the script. The writer copied and pasted the script and matched it with the utterances of the main character in the film. After the writer matched the script and the Lee Gates utterances, the writer classified the utterances based on the flouting maxims. Then, the writer classified all the utterances based on the scripts and the main character's utterances by listening to and reading them, and then the writer used maxims to analyze them. The writer used one table to classify the utterances.

Table of analysis

No	Utterances	Qtty	Qlty	Rltn	Mnr	Notes

Note:

Qtty: Quantity

Qlty: Quality

Rltn: Relation

Mnr: Manner

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

After finishing analyzing all the data, the writer found out that there were some utterances that flouted the flouting maxims in the conversation among the Money Monster characters, including Lee Gates. As a result, the writer used four types of maxims to determine which flouting maxims appeared the most and least. Below, the writer will also explain why the characters of the movie flouted the flouting maxims.

Flouting Maxim of Quantity

When the speaker does not provide the information that is required and gives either too little or too much information, they are flouting the maxim of quantity (Cutting and Fordyce, 2020, p. 26). Some presenters make an effort to show off their degree of knowledge or their consideration of the audience's needs. Or, to put it simply, that the speaker provided an overstated response when he should have provided the correct information.

Scene 25 (00:03:08) - (00:08:09)

Crew: So, about dinner... Did you...

Gates: Okay, you wore me down.

Crew: I'm sorry?

Gates: I'll go to dinner with you. We'll go to Scalinatella's, let's say 9:30?

Crew: I still have a boyfriend, Lee. Just like I did yesterday.

Gates: Yeah, he's still a bartender in Hoboken, like he was yesterday.

In this scene, the focus is on Gates and the crew; they were both on stage getting ready for the broadcast news when one of the crew members approached and inquired about the dinner with Edgar Rosenthal's office, which was the seventh occasion the business owner had turned down

Gates' request for dinner. Consequently, in this scene, Gates inquires about having dinner with Edgar Rosenthal's office, which was previously discussed in scene 25 (00.04.00), but in this conversation (00.06.00), in the same scene, Gates also unexpectedly invites his crew to dinner for two, which is flouting maxim of quantity to the context of the prior conversation where the crew inquired about the dinner.

According to Cutting & Fordyce (2020), if the speaker inflated his response when he should have given the necessary information, it is flouting the maxim of quantity, which is what Gates' responses are related to (p. 26). Here, Gates provided inaccurate information. Gates should respond according to what she already asked rather than suggesting that his team go out to dinner.

Flouting Maxim of Quality

According to Cutting and Fordyce (2020), "flouting the maxim of quality" is when a speaker says something that is not direct and does not reflect what they believe. It can also be said that the speaker is lying about what they said when what they said does not reflect reality or when they said something that is untrue (p. 27).

Scene 35 (00:14:27) - (00:16:24)

Gates: Something's wrong. Oh, my God.

Patty: Breathe, Lee

Gates: I can't catch my breath.

Patty: Just Stay calm. Don't panic. You can breathe.

Gates: I'm having a heart attack

Kyle: Do I look stupid to you? you are not having a heart attack.

Patty: Just breathe.

Gates: I can't breathe

In the context of this scene, they are both in the broadcasting room when Kyle enters with two boxes, one for Gates and one for Walt. At the time, Kyle tells Gates to choose one of those boxes, which, when Gates opens the box, contains a vest bomb, and then Kyle asks Gates to wear the vest bomb. The bomb could be detonated with the detonator that was in Kyle's hand, so when Kyle lifted his finger from the detonator, the bomb would explode. When Gates was already using the vest bomb, Kyle told him to sit down on the chair, and when Gates sat down, he said he had a heart attack.

In this conversation, Gates is flouting the maxim of quality because he said he is having a heart attack and cannot breathe in the scene, but the fact that he is just so panicking means he cannot catch his breath because, Cutting and Fordyce (2020) says when the speaker says anything false or untrue, they are lying (p. 27). The writer said he was lying because when a person is having a heart attack and does not get first aid, that person will die on the spot because he cannot breathe.

Scene 50 (00:19:29) - (00:20:08)

Kyle: You went on TV. you said it was safe. Four weeks ago. you stood right there. This is what you did. "Let's get into this." "Oh, ibis! safer than a savings account!"

Gates: I didn't say that!

Kyle: Don't fucking lie, Lee! That's what you said.

Gates: I did recommend it, but I never said it was safer than a savings account.

Kyle: You want to bet? Come on, let's bet. You said it was safer than my savings account.

Gates: I would never say it.

Kyle: Come on, let's bet.

The context of this scene is that Kyle was one of the people who bought shares of Ibis Clear Capital, where he lost \$60,000. In the conversation, Gates flouted the maxim of quality because Gates is lying. He said that it was safer to use Ibis Clear Capital than other kinds of savings accounts, but he didn't want to confess that he said that, so he lied about it by saying "I never said it was safer than a savings account". After that Kyle asked the crew and the director to play back the shooting footage on that date, March 6.

Since flouting the maxim of amount happens when a speaker states anything that is not true, what they are doing is breaking the maxim of quantity. When someone makes a statement that is demonstrably inaccurate or false, they are lying. In this scene, Gates considered lying since there is evidence that Gates stated that Ibis is safer than any other savings account. Gates considered lying because there was evidence.

Flouting Maxim of Relation

According to Cutting and Fordyce (2020), when speakers disregard the relation maxim, they usually expect the listeners to be able to envision what the utterance did not say and draw the connection between their utterance and the preceding ones. Flouting the maxim of relation typically happens when speakers talk about anything unrelated to the subject under discussion or a previous issue.

Scene 25 (00:03:08) - (00:08:09)

Patty: So, here's a novel idea. How about you just pick up some takeout on your way home.

Gates: Oh, God, Stop. I'm getting depressed.

Patty: Get into your most comfortable pair of pajamas.

Gates: Oh, no, no, no. This isn't really a Friday night for you, is it?? Can't be.

Patty: Curl right up in front of the TV?

Gates: Oh... It's cause the idea of television and pyjamas and takeout, good God, It's like... you get a pool cue, and I want you to sharpen it down to a fine point, and I want you to shove it.

During this scene, Gates is starting to prepare to start live news broadcasting in the broadcasting room, but he is having a conversation with his director, Patty. In this conversation, Gates is flouting the maxim of relation because Patty asks him "Curl right up in front of the TV?", but Gates did not give him a direct response; instead, he did not give the right answer.

According to Cutting & Fordyce (2020), the speakers flout the maxim of relation when they are discussing unrelated topics from the previous topics. In the conversation, Patty gave Gates an idea when he went home to take some takeout, wear the most comfortable pajamas, and curl right up in front of the TV, but Gates did not give a proper response; instead, he did some small talk, which is nonsense.

Scene 29 (00:09:01) - (00:09:46)

Gates: Thank you very much. The name is Lee Gates. The show is Money Monster, the day is Friday, and the Dow has dropped a seismic seven points this morning.

Patty: Ready scream one.

Gates: So what does that mean for the market... Should you...

Patty: Ready cheer three...

Gates or should you...

Patty: Roll.

Gates: and the answer is, who cares about the Dow? It's a measly 30 companies. So why do you people keep paying attention to it? well, probably because our network insists on tracking it. Right there at the bottom on the screen ...

Patty: Not sticking to the script.

In the context of this scene, Gates has already started the broadcast and started following the teleprompter. In this conversation, Gates flouts the maxim of relation because he starts small talks that do not relate to the topic of what he should be presenting. Gates should be presenting about the problem that Ibis stock is facing right now, which is a stock drop.

According to Cutting & Fordyce (2020), when speakers flout the maxim of relation, they usually expect their listeners to be able to figure out what they did not say and how it relates to what they said before. In the conversation, Gates said something that was not related to the previous topic because he did not follow the scripts that had already been put in the teleprompter. He then started talking about nonsense and did not follow the script.

Flouting Maxim of Manner

According to Cutting and Fordyce (2020), when a speaker violates the rule of manners by looking obscure, the speaker is frequently attempting to exclude a third party. There may be no

value in the conversation if one attempts to be as clear, brief, and structured as possible in what they say and stays away from obscurity and ambiguity.

Scene 57 – 58 (00:23:36 – 00:24:20)

Kyle: Fuck off.

Patty: Lee? You have to keep stalling. Just keep talking to him. You're good at that. So just keep talking. Talk.

Gates: Listen, I get it. What happen at Ibis is.. It's a disaster, there's no other word for it.

Gates (scene 58): I can promise you that Walt Camby is as sick about this as anybody else.

In this context, when Kyle was already breaking in, Patty, Gates' director, told him to buy some time, so Gates started to blabber nonsense. Scenes 57 and 58 are the same context of the conversation, only differentiating it with the position of the camera. Gates He is flouting the maxim of manners because he keeps talking nonsense about how he feels sorry for Ibis, but Gates does not really care about it, so he starts talking nonsense so Kyle would also understand that Gates is also feeling the same way as he did.

Scene 72 (00:26:50) - (00:27:24)

Kyle: Two people I came here to talk to. Him and Walt fucking Camby.

Patty: All right, well, then let's get him Walt fucking Camby already.

Gates: All right, so let's get him Walt fucking Camby already.

Patty: Right. Exactly. Throw him under the bus.

Gates: Look, he was supposed to be here today. He didn't show up. It's his company. It's his crash. So let's see what he has to say.

Patty: Right. Yes. What happened to the Ibis feed?

Crew: I have no idea.

Patty: God damn it. All right, find me Bree. Have her call Diane Lester back on the phone. I want her back up on that screen. And find out everything and anything you can about Ibis Clear Capital.

The context of the conversation between Gates, Patty, and Kyle Before that, there is a police officer that wants to make a negotiation with Kyle, but Kyle said he did not want to talk with the cops; he only wanted to talk with Gates and Walt, so Gates told Patty to cut the line because Kyle had already shot his gun to the ceiling. After that, Patty told Gates, "*All right, well, then let's get him Walt fucking Camby already,*" so Gates also followed what she said.

In the conversation, Gates is flouting the maxim of manners because he wants to buy some time for Patty and the crew because they need to find Walt Camby, who is the owner of the Ibis

Alvino: Flouting Maxims by The Main Character in *Money Monster* Film

Clear Capital. Based on Cutting and Fordyce (2020), a speaker who looks obscure often excludes a third party. If one avoids ambiguity and is straightforward, brief, and structured, the conversation may be pointless. It is clearly stated that if Gates states directly that he wants to buy some time, the conversation would be pointless because Kyle already knows what they are up to, and Kyle should not have known what they are up to.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing all of the data, four flouting maxims were found: flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of relation, and flouting maxim of manner. The maxim of quantity is flouted only once, and the other maxims are flouted more than once. The total of the data that the writer found in the appendix is 11. There are some reasons why Lee Gates flouted the maxim: First, Gates flouted the maxim because he wanted to keep stalling; second, he wanted to save himself from Kyle by lying; third, he started a small talk to buy some time so the police could get inside; third, he started to talk nonsense so his team could have enough time to find out about Walt Camby; and finally, sometimes Gates answered the question inappropriately in order to stall. In addition, the findings of the study demonstrated that there was a possibility that a single respondent may violate more than one maxims.

REFERENCES

- Angles, E. (2017). *The implied meanings of the flouting maxims in "harry potter and the goblet of Fire movie"* [Undergraduate thesis, The University of Petra Christian]. Petra Christian University. <https://dewey.petra.ac.id/catalog/digital/detail?id=7652>
- Cutting, J. & Fordyce, K. (2020). *Pragmatics (4th ed)*. Routledge.
- Geoffrey, L. (2019). *Principles of pragmatics (modified)*. Longman Linguistic Library. Libraries, University of Oxford, on behalf of the BNC Consortium. Available online: <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>
- Maulinawati, R. (2018). *Flouting maxims in central intelligence movie script*. [Undergraduate thesis, The State Islamic University of Syarif Hidayatullah]. State Islamic University wSyarif Hidayatullah. [https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/43376/1/RIZKI%20MAULINA WATI-FAH.pdf](https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/43376/1/RIZKI%20MAULINA%20WATI-FAH.pdf)
- Manvell, R., Sklar, Robert, Andrew, Dudley, Stephenson, Ralph and Murphy, Arthur D. (2022, November 11). *Film*. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/art/motion-picture> (accessed 9 December 2022).
- Research design. (n.d.). Google Books. https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Research_Design/hxyDDgAAQBAJ?hl=en