

The Analysis of Grice's Maxims in Selected Children Movies

Author's Name (DALAL FANAR ABDULBAQI)

Tikrit University (College of Islamic Sciences)

Email (dalal.f.abd@tu.edu.iq)

تحليل قواعد غريس في الأفلام المختارة للأطفال

مؤلف: دلال فنر عبد الباقي الزبيدي

جامعة تكريت / كلية العلوم الإسلامية

Abstract

this study is to examine how Grice's Maxims are applied in a few kid-friendly films. This study examined the Kung Fu Panda 4 film's violation of the dictum using a descriptive qualitative approach. The Kung Fu Panda 4 movie and script are downloaded, watched, and the violations of the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and method are examined in order to gather data. The researchers found that the main character from Kung Fu Panda 4 made 11 utterances in all that violated the rule. The quantity maxim was broken four times, or thirty percent. Two times, or five percent, the maxim relation was broken. Five times, or 45%, the quality maxim was broken. Three times, or 20%, the maxim way was broken. It is dominated by the flouting maxim.

Key Words; Linguistics, Pragmatics, Cooperative Principle, and Maxim.

الخلاصة:

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى اختبار كيفية تطبيق قواعد غريس في عدد من الأفلام الموجهة للأطفال... استخدمت هذه الدراسة نهجاً وصفيًا نوعيًا لتحليل كيف تطبق القواعد في فيلم "كونغ فو باندا ٤". حيث تم تنزيل الفيلم ونصه، ومشاهدته، وتحليل الانتهاكات المتعلقة بالقواعد الكمية، الجودة، العلاقة، والطريقة من أجل ضم البيانات. حيث وجد الباحثون أن الشخصية الرئيسية في فيلم "كونغ فو باندا ٤" وأقامت ب إحدى عشر قولاً تنتهك القواعد. وتم انتهاك قاعدة الكمية ل أربع مرات، أي ما يعادل 30%. وتم انتهاك قاعدة العلاقة لمرتين، أي بنسبة 5%. أما قاعدة الجودة فتم انتهاكها ل خمس مرات، أي بنسبة 45%. وتم انتهاك قاعدة الطريقة 3 مرات، أي بنسبة 20%. ويتضح أن الاختراقات كانت تهيمن عليها قاعدة الانتهاك المتعمدة الكلمات المفتاحية: اللسانيات، التداوليات، مبدأ التعاون، القاعدة.

1.Introduction

Human expression and communication depend heavily on language. They use a common language to speak to each other. They communicate using language in their methods. It is the responsibility of both the speaker and the interlocutors to ensure that the discourse is understood. When arranging a discussion, the speaker and the interlocutor need to take a few things into account in order for it to be comprehensible. People always have something to say when they communicate to each other, according to one of Mey's core communication ideas. (2001: 71–72). In everyday conversation, it is presumed that the speaker is expressing their thoughts and feelings with the expectation that the listener would comprehend them. On the one hand, the speaker consistently conveys the facts in an understandable and straightforward manner that is pertinent to the subject matter. On the other hand, occasionally a speaker will say something that has a deeper meaning. The cooperative principle, according to Rankema (1993: 9), is a general rule of language use that is required for both the hearer and the speaker to comprehend a discourse. The cooperative principle is predicated on the idea that meaningful and skillfully conducted conversations with others are the most efficient means of promoting collaboration and communication. People communicate with each other to share ideas, facts, and objectives. According to Grice (1975), utterances have consequences after they are made. Following the listener's acceptance of the implications, the interlocutors develop a variety of impressions. This frequently results in miscommunications during the discussion. The following general "Cooperative Principle" should be adhered to by all conversation

participants, according to Grice (1975: 45): "At the moment it happens, provide your conversational contribution as needed by the agreed-upon goal or direction of the discussion exchange in which you are engaged. Four conversational maxims form the basis for effective cooperative language use and collectively convey a wide cooperative concept, according to Levinson (1983: 101). Method, quality, quantity, and relevance are the four established guiding principles. According to Levinson (1983: 102), in order to conduct conversations that are as efficient, rational, and cooperative as possible, people must be truthful, pertinent, and clear while giving enough information. People may give vague information or even say something that is not entirely true in casual chats. Someone is probably trying to make a point because they are breaking the three maxims in their conversation. It is the author's vision in the case of film, but the same is true. Therefore, the following are the research questions: 1. What are the four maxims that are found in "Kung Fu Panda 4" the children movie?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Pragmatics

The study of "pragmatics" focusses on how people really utilise language. Pragmatics is the study of how language users may put sentences together in the right context. According to Levinson, pragmatics is the study of conversational utterances and how both the speaker and the listener understand them (Yule 1996:3). The analysis includes the circumstances or setting in which the contact takes place. One benefit of studying pragmatics, according to Yule (1996:4), is that it allows people to discuss not only what they mean but also their aims, assumptions, and speech patterns. The phenomena of speaking something that has been suggested in a conversation can be taught. Furthermore, understanding the conversational environment is necessary for pragmatics. By keeping an eye on the big picture, we can understand what people are trying to say even if we are not actively participating in the discussion.

Cooperative Principle One of the fundamental ideas of pragmatic philosophy is the cooperation principle. The cooperative principle, which holds that we are attempting to work together to achieve a common goal, is the fundamental assumption that underpins all of our interactions with one another. It sparks fascinating discussions. "The accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged should dictate your conversational contribution at the stage in which it occurs," argues Grice's "Logic and Conversation" (1975: 45). Consistent with the latter, it is expected that the speaker will make a substantial and positive contribution to the conversation. This will allow the discussion to naturally transition from one person to the next. Conversation is a shared endeavour, according to Grice (quoted in Wardaugh, 2006: 293). In a discussion, that is how speakers and interlocutors understand one another. Anything they want to say, they may share with ease. Regardless of their connection status—parents, teachers, close friends, sellers, or buyers—they are able to understand and accept one other's meaning. In order for the interlocutors to understand them and respond appropriately to what they have said, the speaker acts in a specific manner. The four maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and procedure make up the Cooperative Principle. The Cooperative Principle might or might not be noticed by the speaker. Presenters who adhere to the cooperative principle demonstrate their ability to follow its rules and are, thus, seen as cooperative during the discussion. However, if the cooperative principle is not observed, speakers are not abiding by its tenets.

2.3 Maxim

Assuming that such a broad principle is applicable, Grice (1975) states that four categories can be distinguished, each of which will have more particular maxims and sub-maxims that, when adhered to, will result in results that are consistent with the Cooperative Principle. As a result, the maxim is a pragmatically broad part of a cooperative. A talk exchange participant may not live up to a maxim in a variety of ways, including the following, according to Grice (2004):

1. He might just and silently break a maxim; in some situations, he will be held accountable for the loss.
2. He has the option to exclude both the cooperative principle and the maxim from the operation; he can express, state, or let it be obvious that he is grudgingly asked to collaborate as the maxim demands. For instance, he might say, "My lips are sealed; I cannot say more."
3. He might encounter a conflict: for instance, he might not be able to satisfy the first maxim of quantity (be as informative as is necessary) without going against the second maxim of quality (have sufficient evidence to support your claims).
4. He might blatantly fail to live up to a dictum, or he might flout it. Assuming that the speaker can meet the maxim without breaking another maxim (due to conflict), is not opting out, and is not attempting to deceive due to the blatantness of his performance, the hearer faces a slight issue. How can the assumption that he is adhering

to the general cooperation principle be reconciled with what he did say? This is a condition that typically results in a conversational implicature, and when this type of conversational implicature is produced, it indicates that a maxim is being taken advantage of. This study makes use of Grice's cooperation principle, which is a fundamental notion.

2.3.1 Maxim of Quality

According to the quality maxim, people should only state what they believe to be true and what they have proof for. They might not say anything they don't have enough proof for or something they think is untrue. Speakers may want to point out to their audience that they are merely stating what they think is true without providing sufficient evidence. Examples of maxim quality are as follows: A: Does Europe include Australia? B: Not at all. Australia, however, is in Asia. The exchange above demonstrates how A offers B the incorrect statement. Australia's location in Asia rather than Europe. Therefore, B uses the quality maxim in his comments since he tells the truth with sufficient evidence.

2.3.2. Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity states that speakers must provide as much information as is necessary for the exchange's current goal (Anneke and Helen, 2008). In other words, presenters shouldn't provide too much or too little detail. One may also draw the conclusion that (1) your contribution should not be as informative as necessary (don't say too much), and (2) it should be as informative as necessary (don't say too little). Typically, we presume that the folks are providing us with all the information we require. We'll presume they don't know if they don't say anything (Muhartoyo & Sistofa 2013). Anneke and Helen (2008) assert that the situation determines the maxim of amount. The maxim of quantity will be demonstrated in the 13 examples that follow the declaration of B. A: What's your destination? B: I am heading to the medical facility. B makes a comment in that instance without providing any additional details. Additionally, speaker B has previously presented an instructive scenario.

2.3.3. Maxim of Relation

According to Muhartoyo & Sistofa (2013), the goal of this maxim is for each person participating in a conversation to contribute something relevant to the topic at hand. Additionally, the participant must only make remarks that are pertinent to the topic and that each of them understands. Therefore, the topic of discussion needs to be connected to the speaker's mean. It indicates that the participant might not be off topic. An illustration of the relevance maxim can be found below. A: I can't find my bottle. B: The table has it. According to the interpretation of the example, it is pertinent to the current activity. A asks "where," and B responds "in the table." Thus, B's response aligns with A's query. iv. Manner Maxim The final rule of manners states that people should be polite and concise. A person who abides by these 14 maxims should also stay clear of ambiguity and obscurity. It implies that they must avoid ambiguity, be succinct (no need to be didactic), be ordered, and avoid obscurity of expression. These maxims have to do with the speech pattern being employed. Words that are difficult to understand or statements that could be interpreted in several ways should be avoided. Additionally, if you can express anything considerably more succinctly, you should do so rather than in a lengthy, convoluted manner. According to these maxims, participants in a conversation should be logical, helpful, and efficient. To give adequate information, they must talk intelligibly, without ambiguity, pertinently, and truly (Levinson, 1983). In order for the hearer to understand the information or meaning, the speaker is presumed to be cooperative in accordance with those sets of regularities and not to mislead them. A: Is Natalie there? B: In agreement. She is (The man approaches the girl immediately and calls her name, but he is mistaken.) A: Hello! You mentioned that Natalie is her name. B: That girl in the blue dress is, but she isn't. Both speakers in the aforementioned exchange are uncooperative. This is because the speaker assumed that "that girl" was the answer to his query. From Speaker A's point of view, Speaker B provides less information (quantity) than anticipated. The information in the final line may be expected from Speaker B. There is false information or meaning here.

2.4 Kung Fu Panda 4

Kung Fu Panda 4 is a 2024 American animated martial arts comedy that is produced and distributed by Universal Pictures and DreamWorks Animation. The fourth entry in the Kung Fu Panda series, it is the follow-up to Kung Fu Panda 3 (2016). Mike Mitchell directed the movie, Stephanie Ma Stine (who was directing her first feature picture) co-directed it, Darren Lemke and the creative team of Jonathan Aibel and Glenn Berger wrote the screenplay, and Rebecca Huntley produced it. In addition to newcomers Awkwafina, Ke Huy Quan, Ronny Chieng, Lori Tan Chinn, and Viola Davis, returning cast members include Jack Black, Ian McShane, Dustin Hoffman, James Hong, and Bryan Cranston. In order to stop the wicked sorceress The Chameleon (Davis) from stealing the kung-fu methods of all Chinese masters, Po (Black), who has to locate and train his successor as the

new Dragon Warrior, partners up with fox bandit Zhen (Awkwafina).Po assists his father, Li Shan, and Mr. Ping in opening their new eatery in the Valley of Peace. Then Master Shifu informs Po that he must become the Spiritual Leader of the Valley of Peace and that Po can no longer serve as the Dragon Warrior and must find a worthy successor.Po finds Zhen, a Corsica bandit, attempting to take antiquated weapons from the Jade Palace as he is selecting the best applicant to retain his position. A group of mine workers inform Po that Tai Lung has returned from the Spirit Realm and destroyed an entire quarry, despite Po having already outwitted Zhen and imprisoned her. Zhen discloses that The Chameleon, a sorceress who can shape-shift into whatever animal she desires and mimic different kung fu techniques by only touching them, orchestrated Tai Lung's homecoming.Unaware that his father is pursuing them and fears he won't be able to overcome her, Po goes to Juniper City with Zhen's help in order to defeat The Chameleon. After avoiding the locals at a shady pub, Po and Zhen quickly travel to Juniper City. After they nearly end themselves imprisoned there, Han, the chief of the Den of Thieves, and Zhen's previous tutor assist them in escaping. Zhen and Po then proceed to The Chameleon's hiding area till Po is apprehended. After that, it is shown that Zhen has been working as a double agent for The Chameleon, and that their mission was to acquire Po's Staff of Wisdom, which allows them to enter the Spirit Realm. To Zhen's dismay, Po nearly escapes, but the Chameleon tricks him by assuming Zhen's shape and tosses him off a cliff. His fathers save him when he is on the verge of death, persuading him that change can occasionally be beneficial.The Chameleon uses the staff to call out all of the deceased kung fu masters and usurp their techniques, including Tai Lung, Lord Shen, General Kai, and Po's most ferocious enemies. After Zhen approaches him following a permanent escape, she, Mr. Ping, and Li return to the Den of Thieves to persuade them to assist them in saving Po; however, he is adamant about facing The Chameleon. While battling his army of Komodo dragons, Po makes a fruitless attempt to negotiate with The Chameleon, but she relinquishes the staff to him since she no longer requires it. When Zhen steps in to break up their fight, the Chameleon transforms into a Chimaera of many kung fu masters.Because he believes in her, Po gives Zhen the staff, which she uses to fight The Chameleon. Tai Lung takes The Chameleon with him after he defeats it and gives back all of the stolen kung fu to their owners, who then honour Po and leave for the Spirit Realm. Po was just acting as though he was stranded. When Po returns to the Valley, he chooses Zhen to be his heir and, confident in his choice, trains her to join the Furious Five as the next Dragon Warrior.

Methodology

A descriptive-qualitative approach is used in this study. Johnston (2009: 7) asserts that qualitative research generates textual or narrative descriptions of the events under investigation. On the other side, qualitative research is defined by Hancock (1998) in Ibrahim, Arifin, & Setyowati (2018) as study that focusses on creating explanations for social phenomena. To collect data for this study, the Kung Fu Panda 4 movie and script are downloaded, watched, and the violations of the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner are analysed.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The study's findings indicate that the maxim is violated eleven times throughout the film's dialogue. The table below summarises the maxim that is broken in the Kung Fu Panda 4 film:

Table 1 Summary of the Flouting Maxims

Maxims	Frequency	Percentage
Quantity	4	30%
Quality	5	45%
Relation	2	5 %
Manner	3	20%
Total	11	100%

Eleven maxims were flouted in the Kung Fu Panda 4 film overall, as the table above illustrates. Flouting the quality maxim is the most common type of maxim flouting. Five flouts, or 45%, were made. Four times, or 30%, the quantity maxim was broken. Relativity was violated twice, or 5% of the time. Three times, or 20%, the gentleman's rule was broken. The analysis and explanation of the four maxims are as follows;

Table 2. The Flouting of Maxim Quantity

No.	Conversation	Explanation
1.	Shifu: What is that you're holding? Po: <i>[mouthful]</i> <u>A cookie.</u>	At one point during Shifu's lecture on Po's new responsibility of being the spiritual leader
2.	Po: <i>[voice]</i> Inner peace. Inner peace. Dinner please. <u>Dinner with peas, in a sesame soy glaze.</u> Snow peas... <i>[Po suddenly opens his eyes with a disgruntled look]</i> Po: <i>[out loud]</i> This is not working at all.	Po's inner peace meditation
3.	Po: The Urn of Whispering Warriors! Which got broken, twice! Zhen: <u>Why would you keep an urn of souls?</u> Feels kind a creepy.	Zhen messing with the artifacts, including the Urn of Whispering Warriors.
4.	<u>Granny Boar:</u> I'm only hungry for one thing... <u>Po:</u> Dumplings? <u>Granny Boar:</u> Vengeance! <u>Zhen:</u> Well, I say bring it! <u>Po:</u> No, no, no! Don't bring it!	Type of food and its how much he wants is shown.

Table 2 show that the researcher finds 4 conversations that referred to the maxim of quantity. Each conversation expressed different meaning

Table 3. The Flouting of Maxim Quality

No.	Conversations	Explanations
1.	If things were to remain the same forever, they would lose their flavor.	One of Po's adoptive fathers was also a chef. He ran a restaurant where the menu changed ever so often.

2.	Real change happens from within.	The Chameleon had stolen the powers of Po's former villains. She saw herself as always changing.
3.	There's always another option. Another way forward. Look for new possibilities. Look for the road less traveled.	The Chameleon traps Po in a magical cage. This is the point where Zhen shows her true colors and takes the Staff of Wisdom from Po. She hands it to The Chameleon.
4.	You'll discover you don't have to take the path you thought you did. You can do something different.	The Chameleon tells Po that he would need the spirits of ten Dragon Warriors to break through the bars. He understands this after trying to break out.
5.	Now, who wants to do the right thing for the wrong reasons?	The inner intention never contract the

Table 3 show that the researcher finds 5 conversations that referred to the maxim of quality. Each conversation expressed different meaning.

Table 4. The Flouting of Maxim Relation

No.	Conversation	Explanations
1.	"Catch you later Panda!" "No. I think I'll catch you <i>now</i> ."	Words express the strong intention and relation between them.
2.	Time to name your successor, Po!	Master Shifu takes Po aside from his photo sessions and reminds him that the tradition is to move on from his role as Dragon Warrior and become the Spiritual Leader (just as Master Oogway) of the Valley of Peace.

Table 4 show that the researcher finds 2 conversations that referred to the maxim of quality. Each conversation expressed different meaning.

Table 5. The Flouting of Maxim Manner

No.	Conversations	Explanations
1.	"He who resorts to violence now will only find more violence later" I just like how Po tries to be wise like Oogway	Different feelings can make a lot of confidence.
2.	Tai Lung" I would agree that Po is an idiot but I don't think he's	Wise up worse to make him doubt.

	useless when he gave that staff to you Chamelion”	
3.	Rule of the street, ‘Don’t trust anyone’	Speak up words to warm up and be brave.

Table 5 show that the researcher finds 3 conversations that referred to the maxim of manner. Each conversation expressed different meaning.

Discussion

Based on the research findings, it can be said that the Kung Fu Panda 4 movie featured several forms of flouting maxims, including number, relation, quality, and manner. It might be said that the movie's script applied or included all kinds of maxims that were flouted.

Based on the aforementioned result, the researchers found that the main character from Kung Fu Panda 4 made 11 utterances in all that violated the dictum. The quantity maxim was broken four times, or thirty percent. Two times, or five percent, the maxim relation was broken. Five times, or 45%, the quality maxim was broken. The maxim manner flouted 3 times or 20%. The flouting maxim is dominated by maxim quality.

Conclusion

The researchers have concluded, based on the aforementioned data, that the speakers from Kung Fu Panda 4 violate the four maxims that Grice introduced in Cutting: quantity, relation, quality, and method. They're: 30%, or four times, the maxim quantity flouted. The maxim was violated twice, or 5% of the time. Quality was violated five times, or 45% of the time. The maxim was broken three times, or 20% of the time. The speaker most frequently violates the quality maxim. One can violate the maxim in a number of ways. They are responding in an irrelevant manner, providing confusing information, providing less or more information, and saying something that is not accurate. Additionally, the researchers anticipate that their work will be helpful to future pragmatic studies researchers, particularly with regard to maxim conversations and other references. The researchers also recommend that future linguistic scholars examine the maxim conversation from a different perspective and with different objectives. Furthermore, it is hoped that this study will serve as a guide for future research on maxim flouting and the motive of the characters who violate the maxim, albeit with various film screenplays.

References

- Grice, H. P. (1975). Year : 1975. Logic And Conversation, 1975.
- Hancock, B. (1998). Year 1998. An Introduction To Qualitative Research, 2000–2000.
- Johnston, D. D. (2009). Methods For Blending Qualitative And Quantitative Approaches.
- Levinson, S. (2011). Pragmatics - Part 1 Of 2, 1–9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1357-3039\(14\)00311-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1357-3039(14)00311-9).
- Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An Introduction, 2d revised ed. [1993] Blackwell, Oxford/Malden, MA.
- Muhartoyo and Sistofa. (2013). Conversational Implicature of Peanuts Comic Strip Based on Grices Maxim Theory. *Humaniora*, 4 (1), 102-121
- Rankema, J. (1993) Discourse Study: An Introductory Textbook. Philadelphia: Jon Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics, 1996.