



## FLOUTING MAXIMS IN *INSIDE OUT 2* MOVIE

Dewi Putri Basani Simarmata

Email: [dewi\\_putri@students.usu.ac.id](mailto:dewi_putri@students.usu.ac.id)

Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan

Tesalonika L.A

Email: [tesalonikalangoarang@gmail.com](mailto:tesalonikalangoarang@gmail.com)

Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan

Shandy Prasetyo

Email: [shandyp068@gmail.com](mailto:shandyp068@gmail.com)

Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan

Dylan Adji Pratama

Email: [dylanpratama18@gmail.com](mailto:dylanpratama18@gmail.com)

Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan

### Abstrak

Film sering kali berfungsi bukan hanya sebagai hiburan, tetapi juga sebagai cerminan kompleksitas komunikasi manusia dalam kehidupan nyata. Dialog dalam film menggambarkan bagaimana orang berinteraksi, termasuk ketika penutur secara sengaja menyimpang dari norma percakapan yang diharapkan. Penelitian ini meneliti pelanggaran maksim percakapan Grice dalam film animasi *Inside Out 2*, yang mengeksplorasi perkembangan emosional dan psikologis seorang remaja bernama Riley. Penelitian sebelumnya telah membahas pelanggaran maksim dalam berbagai film, namun masih sedikit yang menyoroti bagaimana strategi pragmatik tersebut muncul pada karakter yang mengalami pertumbuhan emosional dan masa remaja. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengisi kesenjangan tersebut dengan mengidentifikasi jenis dan fungsi pelanggaran maksim yang terdapat dalam film *Inside Out 2*. Dengan menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif dan teknik dokumentasi, peneliti mengumpulkan data dengan menonton film secara berulang dan mencocokkannya dengan transkrip resmi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan terdapat 21 data pelanggaran maksim, dengan maksim kuantitas dan kualitas masing-masing dilanggar sebanyak delapan kali (38%), maksim relasi empat kali (19%), dan maksim cara satu kali (5%). Hasil tersebut kemudian dibandingkan dengan temuan pada film *Inside Out* pertama, yang menunjukkan adanya perbedaan jenis dan konteks pelanggaran yang dipengaruhi oleh kemunculan karakter baru serta perubahan kondisi emosional dan psikologis Riley selama masa remajanya.

**Kata kunci:** pelanggaran maksim, prinsip koperatif, *inside out 2*, pragmatik

### Abstract

Movies often serve as more than just sources of entertainment, as they also reflect the complexities of real-life human communication. Dialogues in movies capture how people interact, including instances where speakers intentionally deviate from expected conversational norms. This study investigates the flouting of Grice's conversational maxims in *Inside Out 2*, an animated movie that explores the emotional and psychological development of a teenage girl named Riley. Previous studies have discussed maxim flouting





in various movies, yet little attention has been given to how such pragmatic strategies appear in characters experiencing emotional growth and adolescence. This research aims to fill that gap by identifying the types and functions of flouted maxims in Inside Out 2. Using a descriptive qualitative and documentation method, the researcher collected data by watching the movie repeatedly and cross-checking the dialogues with its official transcript. The findings reveal 21 instances of maxim flouting: quantity and quality were each flouted eight times (38%), relation four times (19%), and manner once (5%). The results were compared with findings from the first Inside Out, revealing differences in the types and contexts of flouting influenced by the introduction of new characters and Riley's changing emotional and psychological states during adolescence.

**Keywords:** flouting maxims, cooperative principles, inside out 2, pragmatics

## INTRODUCTION

Language is a fundamental tool for human beings as social creatures. In everyday social life, language is used through communication and it's not only to provide information but also to build relationships, shape impressions, and form self-identity. Historically, communication skills have played an important role in human development. Through communication, we can get to know ourselves and others, understand the environment, explain behavior, express our goals, feelings, and views of the world (Verkhovod et al., 2023). Communication takes place between ourselves and others through the understanding and interpretation of established codes and symbols (Kuiper, 2021). However, communication does not always run smoothly, and misunderstandings may occur. The reason for this misunderstanding is when the person involved in the conversation is unable to understand the implied meaning (Melania & Afriana, 2023). Thus, effective communication is needed to develop understanding.

According to Grice (1975), effective communication relies on the principle that participants in a conversation typically work together based on a common understanding known as Cooperative Principle. This principle is further divided into four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The quantity maxim requires speakers to provide appropriate and sufficient information, not less or excessive, and stay focused on the main topic of the conversation (Dewi & Indriani, 2021). The speaker should convey only what is essential for the exchange, without overwhelming the listener with excessive or irrelevant detail (Grice, 1975). The quality maxim encourages speakers not to say anything that they don't think to be true or for which there is no sufficient evidence. The information provided should be as truthful and reliable as possible in accordance with the needs (Waget, 2015). The Maxim of Relation is based on the principle that conversational contributions should be meaningful and relevant to the ongoing topic or context. When someone speaks, their input is assumed to be relevant to what was previously said. In the Maxim of Manner, speakers should avoid obscurity and ambiguity, express themselves briefly, and present information in an orderly way. In other words, speakers should not say things in a rambling manner or in a way that can lead to multiple interpretations (Waget, 2015).

Based on this explanation, communication can run smoothly if the speaker and listener understand each other and apply the principles of Grice's maxim in their conversation (Prasetyo & Kurniyawati, 2021). However, even though Grice's Cooperative Principle clearly outlines how conversations should proceed through the observance of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, real-life communication does not always align with these standards. Many real-world interactions show deviations of maxims, either intentionally or unintentionally. This usually happens because communication is not only about following





linguistic rules but is also influenced by social, emotional, and psychological factors. Ladegaard (2009) supports this view by arguing that Grice's theory tends to be overly idealistic, assuming that all speakers are rational and cooperative, while in reality, conversations are often affected by power relations, politeness, and personal motives. In many situations, speakers may resist, avoid, or deliberately mislead to manage impressions or protect themselves.

According to Chepkemai et al. (2023), if speakers give a non-cooperative response in their communication, they have two choices; whether to violate or to flout the maxims. Violation occurs when a speaker fails to follow a maxim in a way that may mislead or confuse the hearer (Kurniati & Hanidar, 2018). In contrast to maxim violation which can mislead and misunderstand the listener, maxim flouting occurs when the speaker intentionally chooses not to follow the Cooperative Principle, allowing the listener to infer the hidden meaning behind the speaker's literal utterance. In this case, flouting is not meant to mislead, but to create an implicature. Rather than undermining cooperation, flouting relies on the concept that the speaker assumes the hearer will recognize the intentional break and interpret the underlying message.

Following Grice's theory, Cutting (2002) then categorizes maxim flouting into four types: flouting of quantity, quality, relation, and manner maxims. The flouting of the quantity maxim occurs when the speaker disobeys the maxim of quantity by providing more or less information than the listener actually needs (Subagyo, 2023). This type of flouting is actually not intended to confuse the listener, but rather so that the listener can perceive the hidden meaning behind the words conveyed by himself. However, these flouting can lead to confusion or ambiguity, as the information provided does not fully help the listener understand the actual meaning because the information provided is too convoluted or too limited.

Meanwhile, the flouting of the quality maxim happens when a speaker deliberately says something that is not literally true, expecting the listener to understand the implied meaning behind the words. To flout these maxims, the speaker may usually use hyperbole, metaphor, irony and banter (Ibrahim et al., 2018). Hyperbole is a form of statement that is deliberately exaggerated to emphasize a certain situation. Meanwhile, metaphors are used to convey meaning by comparing one thing to another that actually has nothing in common, but can be understood contextually. In addition, irony arises when the speaker says something that sounds positive, but it actually has a negative meaning, and is used to convey satire or disappointment. On the other hand, sarcasm is a form of irony that is sharper and tends to be painful, because it is deliberately used to criticize or satirize someone directly. And the last one, banter, is the opposite form of irony, which is when the speaker delivers a statement with a negative tone, but in fact the speaker intends to show closeness or familiarity with the other person (Cutting, 2002).

On the other hand, the flouting of the relation maxim occurs when a speaker intentionally gives a statement or answer that seems irrelevant to the topic of the conversation, but still expects the listener to be able to understand the meaning that is actually being conveyed (Cutting, 2002). This shows that explicit incoherence in responses does not mean that the conversation loses meaning. Flouting of the relation maxims can also occur when speakers want to convey hidden meanings to their listeners (Dwiyanti & Ambalegin, 2022).

Finally, the flouting of the manner maxim occurs when the speaker deliberately uses language that is vague, ambiguous, or overly complicated, but still expects the listener to understand the real message. Usually, this form of flouting is used to avoid being too direct, especially when there is a third party who is not supposed to know the full meaning of the



utterance (Cutting, 2002). Even though this theory is considered to be overly idealistic, this theory is important in understanding how humans communicate. It helps explain how someone can capture a meaning that is not spoken directly by the other person. In other words, this theory helps us understand the hidden meaning behind someone's words.

The phenomenon of flouting maxims can be easily found in everyday social life because it cannot be separated from daily communication (Melania & Afriana, 2023). Speakers in daily conversation may intentionally break these maxims to achieve various communicative goals, such as humor, sarcasm, or politeness, acting under the assumption that listeners can derive deeper meanings from such deviations. For example, Al-Shboul (2022) examines how Jordanian Arabic speakers violate the Grice maxim in everyday conversation. With a qualitative approach, the author analyzed 42 cases of flouting from informal conversation recordings. The results show that the quantity maxim is the most often flouted (33.3%), followed by quality (30%), manner (19%), and relevance (16.6%). In this research, flouting is done for various functions, such as conveying humor, sarcasm, avoiding conflict, or maintaining privacy. Likewise, the results of the research conducted by Wahyudi et al. (2020) which analyzed maxim flouting in classroom interaction showed that the four types of maxims were quantity, quality, relevance were flouted during class interaction. Flouting of the quantity maxim is the most dominant (53%), followed by relevance (22%), quality (19%), and method (6%). Concrete examples of this flouting include students giving excessive or irrelevant answers to the teacher's questions, or not answering at all.

Flouting maxim can be found not only in real-world conversations. Flouting maxim in this digital age, especially in a global context, can be found in various forms of communication such as podcasts, social media, daily conversations, movie scripts, and other online platforms (Ulil Azmi et al., 2024). Movies are a medium that has evolved with digital technology, shaping how stories and dialogues are created and delivered to audiences (Palanimurugan et al., 2024). Characters in movies are designed to communicate in ways that reflect real social interactions, which means they may also flout conversational maxims. As flouting maxim can be found in movies, animated movies are also the same. Animated movie which we often think of as movies intended for children, can actually sometimes relate to anyone. The narratives and dialogues presented often contain complex meanings and reflect the dynamics of human communication. In some cases, moviemakers deliberately include a flouting of maxims into the dialogue so that the audience can guess and understand the hidden meaning behind the conversation, according to the situation in the scene that is shown (Sari & Jamaris, 2024).

For example, research by (Ardianti et al., 2022; Aristyanti et al., 2020; Dwiantari et al., 2022; Hidayah et al., 2024; Pradika & Rohmanti, 2018; Sagheer et al., 2024; Wirayudha & Sugiharti, 2025) examined the flouting maxims in animated movies such as Onward, Incredibles 2, Finding Dory, Turning Red, COCO, The Magician's Elephant, and Transformers One, and the authors' research results revealed that the characters in the movies flouted all the four maxims, which included quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

Inside Out 2 is a continuation of the animated movie Inside Out (2015) produced by Disney and Pixar. This movie again raises the life of Riley, a teenage girl, but with a new focus: her transition period from children to teenagers. In this phase, Riley not only faces physical and social changes, but also more complex emotional upheavals. In her mind, her emotional control center (Headquarters), has undergone many changes. Previously, Riley only had five main emotions, namely Joy, Sadness, Anger, Disgust, and Fear. In Inside Out 2, which tells the story of Riley's change from childhood to adolescence, there are four new emotions, namely Anxiety, Envy, Embarrassment, and Ennui. The presence of these new emotions





represents the inner complexity of teenagers that are beginning to form, including social pressure, identity search, and changes in relationships with the surrounding environment.

The first Inside Out movie (2015) has actually been analyzed before. The study was conducted by Firdaus & Simatupang (2024) and they explored the flouting of conversational maxims in the Inside Out (2015) movie, using a descriptive qualitative approach. Their study found that the most frequently flouted maxims were those of quality and manner, each accounting for 30% of the total observed instances, followed by quantity and relation, both at 20% and that the majority of instances served competitive functions. However, their research was limited to the original movie, which only portrayed five core emotions, Joy, Sadness, Anger, Fear, and Disgust, interacting within the mind of a child version of Riley.

While Inside Out 2 introduces several new emotion characters, such as Anxiety, Envy, Embarrassment, and Ennui, this new season reflects a more nuanced emotion in Riley, who enters adolescence. These new characters bring not only expanded emotional complexity but also the potential for different communication patterns, including new ways in which Grice's conversational maxims might be flouted. Another previous study has also examined both Inside Out and Inside Out 2 altogether conducted by Prameswari & Pradipta (2025). However, their analyses were limited to only discussing how conversational rule-breaking shapes character interaction. To date, no study has explored how the additional of new emotions affect the changes in speaking style of the main character and leads to instances of the flouting maxim while this factor may significantly influence how characters express themselves and how often they intentionally flout cooperative principles in conversation.

Given this gap, this study aims to examine the types and functions of flouting maxims as performed by the main character and her emotions in Inside Out 2. By doing so, it seeks to provide a richer understanding of how emotional growth and character expansion shape conversational dynamics.

## **METHOD**

This study employed a descriptive qualitative method to analyze the flouting of conversational maxims in Inside Out 2 (2024). The qualitative approach was selected because it allowed for an in-depth exploration of how characters' utterances flouted Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. Qualitative research aims to expand and deepen our understanding of how things can happen in our social life (Hancock et al., 2007). As this study focused on examining linguistic strategies and underlying meanings within movie dialogue, a qualitative method was considered appropriate. Rather than relying on numerical data, this approach enabled the researcher to interpret utterances contextually and meaningfully.

The data were collected through documentation method of the movie. The researcher carefully watched Inside Out 2, identifying scenes that contained potential instances of maxim flouting on quantity, quality, relation, and manner. During this process, notes were taken to record relevant segments of the movie where characters appeared to intentionally deviate from the conversational norms. To support the accuracy of the data, the full transcript of the movie was also retrieved from an official source, Disney's script archive. This transcript was examined line by line, and segments that contained floutings of maxims were marked and categorized. Each identified case of flouting was cross-referenced with the visual and situational context from the movie to ensure correct interpretation.





## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the findings of the data analysis, which focused on identifying the occurrences of flouting conversational maxims in the animated movie *Inside Out 2*. Based on the results of the analysis, a total of 21 cases of flouting of conversational maxims were found by the main character, Riley and the emotional characters in Riley. These 21 utterances were identified from a total of 1,452 utterances throughout the movie, which indicates that only a small proportion, approximately 1% of the overall dialogue.

Table 1. The frequency and distribution of flouted maxims identified in the movie

Maxim Flouting	Number	%
Quantity	8	38
Quality	8	38
Relation	4	19
Manner	1	5
TOTAL	21	100

Based on the table above, among the four conversational maxims proposed by Grice (1975), it can be seen that the maxims that are most often violated are maxim quantity and quality, which are each found 8 times (38%) of the entire script. This was followed by the maxim of relation, which was flouted 4 times (19%). While the maxim of manner appeared least frequently, with only 1 instance (5%).

### *The Flouting of the Quantity Maxim*

A flouting of the quantity maxim occurs when a speaker provides too much or too little information, which can leave listeners confused as to the speaker's intentions and even attempt to interpret the hidden meaning based on their own understanding.

#### Data 1

Context: Riley, now a teenager, is experiencing a major change in her emotional system. After the Puberty Alarm (a sign that puberty has begun), new emotions such as Anxiety, Envy, Ennui, and Nostalgia will come to Headquarters-the emotional control center in her mind, to join the old emotions: Joy, Anger, Fear, Disgust, and Sadness. The mind workers started preparing the new place for their arrival.

JOY: Ah! Could do me a favor and stop tearing Headquarters apart?!

FOREMAN: No can do, didn't ya hear? Permits just came through.

JOY: Permits? For what?!

FOREMAN: For expanding the place! You know, for the others!

JOY: What others?

FOREMAN: They're not here yet? Aye, aye, aye.

Inside Out 2 (13:05 – 13:19)

Foreman flouts the maxim of quantity because he does not provide enough information. When Joy asks “for what?”, Foreman only answers vaguely and only explains part of the information, that there will be “others” coming, without mentioning that it is the new emotions. Foreman expects that Joy already understands who “the others” are, given that they all have personally seen the Puberty Alarm go off, so Foreman feels no need to provide further information. This shows that Foreman deliberately did not explicitly mention that he





meant the new emotions that would come as Riley would be going through puberty. In other words, he relied on Joy's ability to infer the meaning of his words, even though the information conveyed was not entirely complete. But what actually happened was this caused confusion in the conversation. This flouting shows one of the dynamics of communication when information is not given directly, and in the context of this movie, it is a sign that Riley's emotional system is undergoing a major transformation.

#### Data 2

Context: Riley accidentally bumps into someone at school, who is Valentina Ortiz, the captain of the hockey team and a figure Riley admires a lot. Because of panic and nerves, Riley ended up overreacting.

RILEY: Ahhh...

VALENTINA: Hey, hi. I'm Val.

RILEY: I know! You're the Varsity Captain, you set the all time goal record as a junior, your favorite color is red, and your skate size is nine and a half.....just like me!

Inside Out 2 (18:23 – 18:42)

Riley flouts the maxim of quantity when she first meets Valentina. Although Val only introduces herself briefly without asking any questions, Riley immediately responds by providing very detailed information about Valentina, such as her achievements, favorite color, and even her shoe size. This information is not needed in the context of the introduction, but Riley still delivers it because she highly idolizes Valentina. By providing excessive information, Riley indirectly wants to show her great admiration for Val, and hopes that Val understands this intention even though her response is literally too informative.

#### *The Flouting of the Quality Maxim*

Flouting the maxim of quality occurs when a speaker consciously conveys something that is untrue or lacks sufficient evidential basis, but does so with the intention that the untruth is recognized by the listener. This is not a form of lying, but rather a means to convey something more subtle through the contrast between what is said and what is actually intended.

#### Data 3

Context: Joy, Anger, Sadness, Disgust, and Fear had just come out of the Vault, the secret storage room inside Riley where they had been locked up by the new emotions. After escaping, they realized that they had no way to get back to Headquarters (the emotional control center in Riley's mind), which caused panic and tension among them.

ANGER: So... we're lost.

JOY: No! You're never lost if you're having fun!

DISGUST: No one is having fun Joy.

JOY: Oh, come on. Look at Sadness, she's having a great time!

(Joy gestures to Sadness face down on the ground)

ANGER: I thought you knew where you were going!

JOY: I do. I did-- I just need a moment--

Disgust: She doesn't know.

Inside Out 2 (36:16 – 36:29)

Joy is consciously flouting the quality maxim by making statements that are not in line with reality. She tried to cheer up the group by saying that their situation was fun, when it was clear that everyone was panicking and lost and even Joy herself didn't know the way to get home. When reprimanded, she still tried to maintain her optimism by stating that Sadness was having fun, while in fact Sadness was crying on the ground. Joy is not being deceptive or misleading. She knows that what she is saying is not entirely true. Through her words, she just





hopes that her friends will keep their heads up even though the situation is bad. In this condition, it reflects how Joy as a “positive” emotion in Riley tries to maintain her role in the midst of Riley's emotional complexity, which is now more complicated because she is entering adolescence.

#### Data 4

Context: Joy was planning to send one of the emotions back to headquarters to provide information about the state of headquarters that was being controlled by anxiety, when Joy and the other emotions wanted to find Riley's old “mindset” in the memory dump. Joy asked Sadness to be the one to return to headquarters, she finds a walkie-talkie and tries to keep it connected to Sadness. She tells Sadness to get on the Recall Tube, a memory channel that connects their location to the control center. However, Sadness refuses as she feels she is not physically or emotionally strong enough.

JOY: Sadness, it's the fastest way back to Headquarters.

SADNESS: Joy, I can't do it. I'm not strong like you are.

JOY: I know you, Sadness! You ARE strong! I can't give you specific examples right now but, YOU GOT THIS.

Inside Out 2 (39:56 – 40:09)

Joy is flouting the quality maxim by saying something that isn't supported by concrete evidence. She says that Sadness is strong, but immediately admits that she can't even give a concrete example. Even though her statement is not literally true, Joy still says it as a form of emotional support. This flouting is done consciously, as Joy hopes Sadness grasps the emotional meaning behind her words, not the literal meaning.

#### *The Flouting of the Relation Maxim*

Flouting the maxim of relevance occurs when the speaker says something that is irrelevant to the context on the surface, but it is done with full awareness that the listener will see the incongruity as a cue.

#### Data 5

Context: Riley was supposed to prepare for an out-of-town school activity. Her mom comes into the room and asks why Riley hasn't packed her things yet. Her mother's question was neutral and simple. But in Riley's emotional control center, Headquarters, the emotion of Anger reacted impulsively by pressing a button on the control console. The emotional reaction was not in line with their expectations, so Disgust reprimanded Anger for being too reactive, and Anger blamed a malfunction in the console as the cause.

MOM: Riley, you aren't packed yet?

RILEY: UGH! YOU'RE ALWAYS ON ME, CAN'T YOU JUST LAY OFF FOR LIKE ONE SECOND??!

DISGUST: Uh, overreact much?!

ANGER: I barely touched it! Those morons broke the console!

Inside Out 2 (13:42 – 13:55)

Riley flouts the maxim of relation because her response does not directly answer her mother's question. Instead of explaining why she hasn't packed her things yet, Riley expresses her frustration which is clearly irrelevant to the context of the ongoing conversation. However, Riley's statement implies the emotional pressure she feels. She hopes her mother understands the emotional message behind her response, which was that she felt burdened and felt that she was always being controlled. She was experiencing the emotional instability of puberty and felt that she was no longer a child who needed to be watched and wanted to be set free.

#### Data 6







Context: Anxiety is leading new emotions in Headquarters (Riley's emotional control center). At that time, Riley was restless and couldn't sleep because of the pressure before the hockey team selection. And what creates that anxiety is the Anxiety character in Riley who is busy preparing a projection that he "thinks" is appropriate to keep Riley's performance focused and ambitious, but in fact the projection increases Riley's anxiety. This was witnessed by Joy and other old emotions so they started to draw positive projections and also asked the projection workers to create positive projections to be sent to Riley's mind.

In this scene, when Anxiety is focused on making a plan, suddenly Embarrassment secretly presses the button and sends a positive projection to Riley, without Anxiety's knowledge.

ANXIETY: What?! Um, who sent that projection to Riley?!

ENNUI: Why would I know that?

ENVY: Don't look at me.

Inside Out 2 54:42 – 54:48

Envy does a flouting of the maxim of relation because the answer is not relevant to the question asked. When Anxiety asked who sent the positive projection to Riley, Envy did not answer directly. If she really doesn't know, she should be able to say "I don't know." But what she said was, "Don't look at me." The sentence does not answer the question, but diverts the conversation by giving a new statement that is off topic. Although it sounds simple, the statement implies something, that Envy wants to show that she is not the perpetrator, without stating it explicitly. In other words, she hopes that Anxiety captures the implied meaning of her words, not understand it literally.

#### *The Flouting of the Manner Maxim*

Flouting the maxim of manner occurs when speakers deliberately use expressions that are unclear, convoluted, or disorganized.

Data 7

Context: Joy and her old emotional colleagues are trapped inside a hidden chamber in Riley's mind, The Vault, that is used to store memories or mental elements that are considered no longer active. They look for a way to get out and met Bloofy, a character in a children's show that originated from Riley's memories as a child. They asked bloofy for help but bloofy acted as if he was still in the educational cartoon show.

JOY: Bloofy! We're in a real pickle! Could you help us get outta here?!

BLOOFY: Uh-oh! We're gonna need your help! Can YOU find a way out?

ANGER: Who are you talking to?!

BLOOFY: My friends! (to the wall) Do YOU see a key? (LONG PAUSE) Hmmm... I don't either.

Inside Out 2 (31:14 – 31:31)

Bloofy is clearly flouting the maxim of manner by giving ambiguous respons. When Joy seriously asked Bloofy for help to find a way out of the room where they were trapped, Bloofy's response was actually confusing. Instead of answering directly or trying to help, Bloofy instead stared at the wall and spoke as if he was greeting the audience of a television show. He asked, "Can you find a way out?" To the wall, like recording an episode of an interactive children's show. This response made the atmosphere even more unclear, because the other characters in the room did not know who Bloofy was actually talking to. This shows that Bloofy is not a character who really lives in the real world, but an imaginative character that only exists in Riley's childhood memory, and is used to "communicating" with audiences. So, Bloofy's words are not a real effort to answer Joy, but part of his role as a fictional





character. This shows that Bloofy does not have the ability to help concretely, and instead obscures the direction of the conversation that was originally serious.

The present study revealed that the most frequently flouted maxim in Inside Out 2 was the maxim of quality. This differs from the findings of Firdaus & Simatupang (2024) who found that the maxims of quality and manner was most flouted in the first Inside Out (2015). In the first Inside Out movie, the characters in the movie are Joy, Sadness, Anger, Fear, and Disgust communicate in Riley's mind who is still a child. Because the context is the emotional world of a child, many conversations are expressive and not literal. Floutings of maxim quality appears because the character often uses sarcasm, hyperbole, or statements that are not entirely true to convey feelings. While the floutings of manners appears because their way of speaking is often unclear or ambiguous, reflecting the child's emotional confusion.

On the other hand, in Inside Out 2, the results of this study show that the floutings of quantity and quality appear the most often. In adolescence, communication is no longer just expressing feelings, but also used to manage social impressions and self-identity. This is marked by the emergence of new emotions that affect the way Riley expresses herself in conversation. One example is the Anxiety character, a new emotion that controls Riley to be able to give the best impression, either through the choice of words, tone of voice, and speech structure. Diverse emotional conditions make Riley's speaking style change to be more varied and sometimes not in accordance with Grice's cooperation principle, thus causing a flouting of certain maxims.

Therefore, the flouting of quantity in this movie often occurs because Riley gives excessive or insufficient information as a way to hide nervousness and build an impression. For example, Riley gives too much information when talking to Valentina because she wants to impress Valentina. While flouting of quality often happen because characters like Joy and Anxiety in Riley's mind use exaggerated statements to motivate, convince, or protect Riley's feelings. In Grice's theory, this shows that the speaker deliberately flouts literal honesty so that the listener can capture the emotional meaning. The fewer number in the flouting of relation and manner in Inside Out 2 show that communication in teenagers tends to be more relevant and more direct, not as ambiguous as childhood.

The difference in the results between these two studies can be understood through the psychological context of the characters. In the first Inside Out, Riley was still a child, so the flouting of the maxim appeared due to limited understanding and emotions. Meanwhile in Inside Out 2, Riley has entered a teenage year full of social pressure, search for identity, and higher self-awareness, so that the maxim floutings are used more strategically and socially.

Compared to another previous study by Aristyanti et al. (2020) which analyzed the flouting of maxims in the movie Incredibles 2, the results of this study on Inside Out 2 show a fairly clear difference in the type of maxim that is most often flouted. In the research of Aristyanti et al., the most common type of maxim flouting is relevance (33%) and manner (32%). The flouting is widely used to create humor and enliven the interaction between the characters. The dialogue in Incredibles 2 often contains a funny, sarcastic, or out of context-appropriate word exchange so that it produces a comedic effect and strengthens the relationship between the characters.

While in Inside Out 2, the most common floutings are quantity and quality. This difference can be explained from the theme and focus of communication in each film. Incredibles 2 is an animated comedy movie, so the conversation of the characters focuses on creating humor. Flouting of relevance and manner are effective to make the dialogue feel spontaneous and funny.





On the other hand, *Inside Out 2* highlights the emotional world and psychological processes of teenagers. In this context, the flouting of the quantity maxim often appears when Riley gives too much information or even too little because she is nervous and trying to manage her social impression. The flouting of quality also often occurs because characters like Joy use exaggerated statements to encourage and calm Riley. Thus, this difference shows that the genre and pragmatic function of conversation have a great influence on the dominant type of flouting maxim.

Overall, the results of this study show that Grice's Cooperative Principles theory can be applied well to analyze conversations in the film *Inside Out 2*. Every form of maxim flouting found can be explained through four types of Grice maxim, namely quantity, quality, relevance, and manner maxims. Thus, the results of this study confirm that Grice's theory is relevant and effective in use to understand how the characters in this film use language pragmatically to convey indirect intentions.

#### Conclusion

The analysis reveals that the way conversational maxims are flouted in *Inside Out 2* mirrors the psychological and social transformation that occurs during adolescence. The characters' non-literal expressions demonstrate how language is used to manage emotions, navigate social pressure, and construct personal identity. These pragmatic strategies highlight that communication is not merely guided by linguistic rules but deeply influenced by emotional and developmental factors.

When compared with Firdaus and Simatupang's (2024) study on *Inside Out* (2015), this research shows that maxim flouting evolves alongside the speaker's emotional maturity. While the earlier film depicted the spontaneous and affective communication of childhood, *Inside Out 2* illustrates a more socially aware and self-conscious form of expression. Within Grice's theoretical framework, this indicates that the Cooperative Principle is dynamic rather than absolute, adapting to the psychological context of the speakers. Therefore, this study contributes to the understanding that pragmatic behavior is intertwined with emotional growth and the complexity of human communication.

#### Suggestion

Although this study provides new insights into the flouting of the conversational maxim in *Inside Out 2*, this study still has some limitations that need to be recognized. This analysis focuses solely on the Cooperative Principles of Grice (1975), which although effective in identifying the types and functions of maxim violations, this may not fully capture the emotional and psychological aspects of character communication. Because this film depicts adolescence and the complex interaction between emotions and behavior, relying solely on the Grice framework may limit the interpretation of how social identity, politeness, or emotional control affects conversational choices. Therefore, future studies are encouraged to combine Grice's theory with other pragmatic or psychological perspectives, such as Leech's Politeness Theory (1983) or Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory (1986), to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how emotional and social factors shape the way the speaker flouts cooperative principles. In addition, further investigation into different communication settings and age groups in other movies is also recommended so that the relationship between language use and psychological development can be explored more deeply.

#### REFERENCES

Al-Shboul, O. K. (2022). Jordanian speakers in everyday communication. In *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* (Vol. 18). [www.jlls.org](http://www.jlls.org)





- Ardianti, N. K., Putri, I. G. A. V. W., & Santika, I. D. A. D. M. (2022). The types of flouting maxims found in the onward movie. *ELYSIAN JOURNAL: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 2(3).
- Aristyanti, Y. A., Sutopo, D., & Yuliasri, I. (2020). The realization of maxim flouting to create humour in incredibles 2. *English Education Journal*, 10(3), 351–360. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v10i1.36727>
- Chepkemoi, N., Nganga, S., & Kandagor, M. (2023). *Analysis of conversational maxims flouted to achieve verbal humour in Churchill Show stand-up comedy performances*. <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5275-6923>
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse* (P. Stockwell & R. Carter (eds.)). Routledge.
- Dewi, M. C. S., & Indriani, L. (2021). Unraveling the use of quantity maxim among efl learners on online classroom interaction. *New Language Dimensions*, 1(2), 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.26740/nld.v1n2.p55-64>
- Disney. (2024). *Inside Out Script*. 1–160. [https://r.search.yahoo.com/\\_ylt=AwrX\\_tUKn1FoFQIAjmnLQwx.;\\_ylu=Y29sbwNzZzM EcG9zAzIEdnRpZAMEc2VjA3Ny/RV=2/RE=1751389195/RO=10/RU=https%3A%2 F%2Fassets.debut.disney.com%2Fdocuments%2F2024.10.08\\_INSIDEOUT2\\_FullScrip t\\_clean\\_FINAL.pdf/RK=2/RS=hBfjK2vDDiaKMe4M.A8](https://r.search.yahoo.com/_ylt=AwrX_tUKn1FoFQIAjmnLQwx.;_ylu=Y29sbwNzZzM EcG9zAzIEdnRpZAMEc2VjA3Ny/RV=2/RE=1751389195/RO=10/RU=https%3A%2 F%2Fassets.debut.disney.com%2Fdocuments%2F2024.10.08_INSIDEOUT2_FullScrip t_clean_FINAL.pdf/RK=2/RS=hBfjK2vDDiaKMe4M.A8)
- Dwiantari, N. M. A., Pratiwi, P. D. E., & Skolastika, M. P. (2022). Flouting of maxims in finding dory movie. *E-Journal Linguistics*, 16(2), 283–290. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2022.v16.i02.p09>.
- Dwiyanti, C. N., & Ambalegin. (2022). Flouting maxims in “five feet apart” movie. *IdeBahasa*, 4(1), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.37296/idebahasa.v4i1.83>
- Firdaus, N. C., & Simatupang, E. C. (2024). Flouting maxims of politeness in the inside out film (2015); pragmatics study. *Jurnalistrendi: Jurnal Linguistik, Sastra, Dan Pendidikan*, 9, 247–253. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.51673/jurnalistrendi.v9i1.1966>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation* (Issue 5/6, pp. 41–58). University of California. <https://doi.org/10.2307/324613>
- Hancock, B., Ockleford, E., & Windridge, K. (2007). *An introduction to qualitative research*. [www.rds-yh.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.rds-yh.nihr.ac.uk)
- Hidayah, A. N., Bunau, E., & Suhartono, L. (2024). Maxim flouting in turning red movie. *International Journal of Education, Language, and Religion*, 6(1), 50. <https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v6i1.9248>
- Ibrahim, Z., Arifin, M. B., & Setyowati, R. (2018). The flouting of maxim in the se7en movie script. In *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya* (Vol. 2, Issue 1).
- Kuiper, K. (2021). Communication theory of identity: a fifth frame. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 45(3), 175–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2021.1976069>
- Kurniati, M., & Hanidar, S. (2018). The flouting of the gricean maxims in the movies insidious and insidious 2. *Lexicon*, 5(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v5i1.41282>
- Ladegaard, H. J. (2009). *Pragmatic cooperation revisited: Resistance and non-cooperation as a discursive strategy in asymmetrical discourses*. April 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.021>
- Melania, P., & Afriana, A. (2023). Types of flouting maxims analysis in jurassic world dominion movie. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, 9(2), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v9i2.2470>
- Palanimurugan, P., Sivaprakasam, V., Pooja, M., & Sherlin, S. (2024). *The impact of*





technology on cinematic storytelling.

- Pradika, B. G., & Rohmanti, K. A. P. (2018). *An analysis of flouting maxims in “coco” movie*. 1(5). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i5.p657-663>
- Prameswari, G. N. C., & Pradipta, B. (2025). A gricean analysis of maxim flouting in inside out (2015 ) and inside out 2 ( 2024 ) movie. *UNCOLLCS: Proceeding Research on Literary, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies*, 2, 201–210. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30996/uncollcs.v4i1.6155>
- Prasatyo, B. A., & Kurniyawati, Y. (2021). *An analysis of flouting of maxim in aiman’s talkshow “tudingan konspirasi di balik korona.”* 8(1), 2021–2060.
- Sagheer, I., Nadeem, T., & Nasir, J. (2024). An analysis of flouting maxims in “the magician’s elephant” movie 2023. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 5(I). [https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024\(5-i\)27](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-i)27)
- Sari, P. M., & Jamaris, A. (2024). Flouting maxim in spider-man: No way home movie. *JEdu: Journal of English Education*, 3(2), 145–155. <https://doi.org/10.30998/jedu.v3i2.8488>
- Subagyo, Z. F. Z. (2023). An analysis of flouting maxims in tv show brooklyn nine-nine: Season 5 based on pragmatics approach. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Studi Amerika*, 28(2), 83. <https://doi.org/10.20961/jbssa.v28i2.54033>
- Ulil Azmi, N., Sabat, Y., & Sulistyaningsih. (2024). Flouting maxim produced by lay zhang in i heart radio interview: A pragmatics analysis. *ELITE: English and Literature Journal*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.24252/elite>
- Verkhovod, I., Oleksenko, R., Ratsul, O., Kushnir, N., & Ihnatchenko, I. (2023). Social communications and their role in the development of the social sphere. *Review of Economics and Finance*, 21(1), 836–843. <https://doi.org/10.55365/1923.x2023.21.91>
- Waget, A. (2015). Violations of grice’s maxims in the prince and the pauper movie. *Language and Language Teaching Journal*, 18(01), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2015.180101>
- Wahyudi, A., Yusuf, S., & Wiji Lestari, Z. (2020). Maxim’s flouting: An analysis of classroom interaction. In *Journal of English Education and Teaching* (Vol. 4, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33369/jcet.4.2.219-231>
- Wirayudha, M. T., & Sugiharti, D. R. (2025). Flouting maxim analysis in transformer one movie. *UNCOLLCS: Proceeding Research on Literary, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies*, 829–839. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30996/uncollcs.v4i1.6128>