

Flouting of Grice's Maxims in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* Film

Ni Kadek Debi Puspita Manggalita, Desak Putu Eka Pratiwi, Putu Nur Ayomi

Faculty of Foreign Languages, Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia
debyuspita0505@gmail.com

Published: 24/10/2022

How to cite (in APA style):

Manggalita, N. K. D. P., Pratiwi, D. P. E., Ayomi, P. N. (2022). Flouting of Grice's Maxims in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* Film. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 8(2), 151-159.

Abstract - Obeying the cooperative principle is an important rule that must be done to attain a good and relevant conversation, which can be divided into four categories of maxims, such as maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner, and maxim of relation. However, in everyday life, there are still many people who flout these maxims which causes their conversation to be ineffective. This study aims to determine the types of flouting maxim found in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film is based on the Cooperative Principle theory of Grice (1975). This study also aims to analyze the reasons of flouting maxim committed by characters using Flouting Maxim Strategies theory from Cutting (2002) and Illocutionary Functions of Politeness theory from Leech (1983). The method used in this research is the descriptive qualitative method. The data were collected from the utterances of the characters that flout the maxims in the film through the observation method. The results showed that there were 45 cases of flouting maxim found in the film. The maxim that is flouted the most is the maxim of relation. There were several reasons the characters flouted the maxims. Related to strategies and functions, the most frequently used reasons are the strategy of being irrelevant and competitive function. This is because the characters tend to say things outside the topic being discussed with the intention of asking people to do something.

Keywords: Cooperative Principle, Flouting Maxim, Reasons, *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* Film

I. INTRODUCTION

Language is the primary form of communication. It plays a significant part in human life. Humans can express their thoughts and feelings by using language to interact with one another. Communication is the process of sending and receiving messages from the sender to the recipient which is useful for making the same understanding between the two parties. Communication will occur if the meaning of what is discussed is shared by both parties. One form of communication is conversation. People can have effective and relevant conversations if they cooperate with one another. Contribute to

the appropriate conversation at the stage at which the conversation takes place, in accordance with the intended purpose or direction of the exchange of conversation between the speaker and the recipient (Grice, 1989; Levinson, 1983).

According to Grice (in Yule, 1996: 37), to achieve good conversation, people must adhere to the four cooperative principle maxims, namely: (1) Maxim of Quality requires the speaker to say the truth and based on the fact; (2) Maxim of Quantity demands the speaker to be informative as to what is needed; (3) Maxim of Relation, the speaker must be pertinent to the subject being discussed; (4) Maxim of Manner

requires the speaker present the information in a succinct and understandable manner.

Yet in everyday life conversations do not always go properly because listeners often give responses that are not in accordance with what the speaker said. Grice (1975: 30) defines flouting as the speaker's blatant failure to convey something to the listener. In other words, the speaker flouts the cooperative principle. Usually, the flouting was done on purpose by the speaker, not with the intent of misleading. The speakers essentially want the listeners to understand different interpretations of their words, which goes against the maxim. There are four types of flouting maxims, such as: (1) Flouting Maxim of Quantity, when the speakers utter excessively little or too much information; (2) Flouting Maxim of Quality, which happens when the speakers deliver information that is not based on facts in their utterances; (3) Flouting Maxim of Relation, when the speakers present information that is irrelevant to the prior topic; (4) Flouting Maxim of Manner, when the speakers convey their words ambiguously and not being brief.

People commonly flout the cooperative principle maxims for a variety of reasons. When someone says something, it is implied. Cutting (2002) proposed some ways to flout the cooperative principle's maxims, specifically: (1) Giving too little information, when speakers flout the maxim of quantity, they give their listeners insufficient information; (2) Giving too much information, when speakers flout the maxim of quantity, they frequently provide overload information to the listeners; (3) Hyperbole, when speakers flout the maxim of quality, they provide an exaggeration in their utterances; (4) Metaphor, the speakers compare two distinct things that share similar characteristics to flout the maxim of quality; (5) Irony, in flouting of the quality maxim, the speakers convey a favorable statement while indicating a negative one; (6) Banter, the speakers flout the quality maxim by conveying a negative remark while indicating a positive meaning; (7) Sarcasm, the speakers say something that seems positive to convey a negative meaning with the aim of hurting the listeners' feelings in flouting the quality maxim; (8) Being Irrelevant, the speakers provide information that is unrelated to the preceding topic when they flout the maxim of relation; (9) Being Obscure, when the speakers flout the manner maxim, they become vague and unclear in conveying their utterances.

There are four types of politeness illocutionary functions classified by Leech (1983) that can be used to analyze the reasons of flouting maxim, such as: (1) Competitive, the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal as in begging, ordering, demanding, and asking; (2) Convivial, the illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal as in congratulating, inviting, offering, greeting, and thanking; (3) Collaborative, the indifference between illocutionary goal and social goal as in instructing, asserting, reporting, and announcing; (4) Conflictive, the illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal as in reprimanding, threatening, accusing, and cursing.

This case not only occurs in real life but also in films where the characters communicate (Duha et al., 2022). Film is one of the mass communication tools created by combining animation techniques and sound both audio and visual information. Film is a type of oral discourse that can clearly reflect the flouting of maxims through facial expressions and context. Analyzing flouting maxim through a film can represent a real-life analysis of flouting maxim.

The Mitchells vs. The Machines film directed by Mike Rianda is an American computer-animated science-fiction comedy film released in 2021. This film tells about a family that is described as a strange family. Each family member has characteristics that are very different from one another. Especially the character of the first child and her father. This difference causes frequent conflicts between them. However, they are forced to work together to save the world from the attacks of AI robots. This family is called The Mitchells. This conflict arises as a result of the characters' refusal to cooperate with each other during their conversations which leads them to flouts the maxims.

There are several studies that are similar to this research. First, the research conducted by Lasiana & Mubarak (2020) on the flouting maxim in the Ruby Spark Movie. According to their research, the flouting maxim of quantity is the one that is most frequently imparted. Because the characters want to clarify the plot in more detail so that it is easy to understand. Second, the research conducted by Kurniati & Hanidar (2018) about flouting maxim in *Insidious* and *Insidious 2* movies. The results of their research show that the characters intentionally flout the maxims when they are in a tense and frightening situation due to several factors. A big part of this is providing a comprehensive situation of

supernatural activity yet evading offending anyone in order to be truthful. Third, the research written by Sinaga & Handayani (2020) found that the maxim most frequently flouted by the characters in the film is the maxim of quality. Fourth, Gustary & Anggraini (2021) conducted a research that showed the characters in the "UP!" film tends to flout the quality maxim by holding onto untrue information. The strategy that is frequently employed is to present unnecessary detail of information. Fifth, the research written by Sapalakkai (2018). Her research shows that the main character constantly used the flouting maxim of manner. There are several implicatures that can be interpreted from the film's character who flouts the maxim of manner to form positive relationships and meet the main character's wishes.

Based on the relevant research above, this research is different from the previous research because this research analyzes the types and the reasons of flouting maxim in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* Film. The aims of this research are to examine the uses of flouting maxims in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film in order to specify what types of maxims were flouted in the film based on the Cooperative Principle theory by Grice (1975) and the reasons why they were flouted using the theory of Flouting Maxim Strategies by Cutting (2002) and Illocutionary Function by Leech (1983).

II. METHOD

The descriptive qualitative research method was used in this research. This method was used to conduct a descriptive analysis of the data. The research's data were derived from *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film directed by Mike Rianda. The data were collected from the characters' conversations in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film that contained flouting maxim. In collecting the data, the observation method, which was carried out in several steps, was employed by the researchers. First, the researcher watched the film and read the transcript several times. Second, take note of the remarks that flout the maxims. Lastly, the data were classified and analyzed the data based on the types of flouting maxims using the theory Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975) and the reasons of flouting maxims using the theory of Flouting Maxim Strategies by Cutting (2002) and Illocutionary Function of Politeness by Leech (1983). To present the percentage of the data obtained, the researcher employed a formal method and provided the data in table form. The informal method was employed to provide the data in narrative form when presenting data.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result showed that the characters in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film flout all types of the cooperative principle's maxims along with each reason. The researchers present the data in tables and the frequency of each type in order to offer more specific information about the occurrence of the data in the film.

Table 1. Types of flouting maxim found in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film

Types of Flouting Maxim	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Quantity	9	20,00%
Quality	12	26,67%
Relation	15	33,34%
Manner	9	20,00%
Total	45	100%

Researchers discovered 45 cases of flouting maxims in the film, as seen in the table above. They are as follows: 9 data flouting maxim of quantity (20,00%), 12 data flouting maxim of quality (26,67%), 15 data flouting maxim of relation (33,34%), and 9 data flouting maxim of manner (20,00%). The maxim of relation is the

one that the characters most frequently flout (33,34%). The characters tend to change the subject frequently in their conversations. In addition, providing irrelevant information related to the topic of conversation is one way that can be done to convey humor in the speakers' utterances.

Table 2. The strategies of flouting maxim found in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film

Types of Flouting Maxim	The Strategies of Flouting Maxim	Frequency	Percentage (%)
-------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------	----------------

Quantity	Giving Too Little Information	2	4,45%
	Giving Too Much Information	7	15,56%
Quality	Hyperbole	1	2,23%
	Metaphor	0	0,00%
	Irony	3	6,67%
	Banter	8	17,78%
Relation	Sarcasm	0	0,00%
	Being Irrelevant	15	33,34%
Manner	Being Obscure	9	20,00%
Total		45	100%

In the table above, except for the metaphor and sarcasm strategy, all forms of flouting maxim strategies were used in the film, such as 2 data giving too little information (4,45%), 7 data giving too much information (15,56%), 1 data hyperbole (2,23%), 3 data irony (6,67%), 8 data

banter (17,78%), 15 data being irrelevant, and 9 data being obscure (20,00%). The strategy of being irrelevant (33,34%) is the one that the characters most frequently convey in flouting the maxim of relation. The characters often make the conversation irrelevant to the previous topic.

Table 3. The illocutionary functions of politeness found in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film

Types of Flouting Maxim	The Illocutionary Functions of Politeness	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Quantity	Competitive	3	6,67%
	Convivial	0	0,00%
	Collaborative	3	6,67%
	Conflictive	3	6,67%
Quality	Competitive	6	13,34%
	Convivial	1	2,23%
	Collaborative	4	8,89%
	Conflictive	1	2,23%
Relation	Competitive	8	17,78%
	Convivial	3	6,67%
	Collaborative	4	8,89%
	Conflictive	0	0,00%
Manner	Competitive	3	6,67%
	Convivial	1	2,23%
	Collaborative	4	8,89%
	Conflictive	1	2,23%
Total		45	100%

The table above shows the types of illocutionary functions that are used by characters in flouting maxims in total. Consists of 20 data competitive (44,45%), 5 data convivial (11,12%), 15 data collaborative (33,34%), and 5 data conflictive (11,12%). The highest illocutionary function used by the characters in the film is the competitive function (44,45%). Specifically, the characters often used the competitive illocutionary function namely 8 data (17,78%) in flouting the maxim of relation in the film, which is the highest frequency based on the table above. The illocutionary goals of the characters compete with the social goals. Characters who flout the

maxims tend to ask others to do something. The representatives of the flouting maxims and the reasons of each flouting maxim are discussed below:

Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Flouting maxim of quantity happens when the speakers intentionally deliver more or less information than is needed. The speakers tend to talk too much or too little during their conversation (Grice, 1975).

Data 1

Katie: Dad, can you finish watching it, at least?

Rick: I will, **but I just worry that you're gonna be all the way in California and, you know, we're not gonna be able to help you, if things don't... [thumping] ...pan out.**

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 0:09:23 – 0:09:33)

The conversation above occurred in the afternoon when they have dinner. Rick just come home from work and approached the rest of his family at the dining room who were busy playing on their phones. Rick tells his family to put down their phones so they can focus on their dinner. In the midst of their activities, Katie distracts her family by showing her the latest effects film that she made because her dream is to become a filmmaker, and hopes that her family will like it. However, Rick was seen put a disapproving expression that made Katie ask him.

When Rick answered Katie's question, it was clear that he flouted the maxim of quantity. Rick responded by providing too much information than the question asked by Katie. Initially, Rick provided information as needed such as 'I will' but ended with Rick by adding other information related to the concerns he felt about his daughter's dream. In terms of the flouting maxim strategies, Rick uses the giving too much information strategy. The reason Rick flouts the maxim of quantity is related to the illocutionary function, such as conflictive as reprimanding. There is a conflict between his illocutionary goal and social goal. Rick wants to reprimand Katie if the future needs to be thought out rationally and not as simple as she thinks.

Data 2

Linda: Did you talk to her yet?

[sink water stops]

Rick: [clears throat] No, not yet. **I don't know what happened, Lin. I know teenagers are supposed to rebel against their parents or something, but... I don't know. I just thought that we'd be different.**

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 0:11:00 – 0:11:13)

This conversation took place in the kitchen after dinner when the fight between Katie and Rick was over. Rick accidentally destroys Katie's laptop that causing an awkward situation during their dinner. So that Katie went to her room annoyed with Rick's behavior. Linda walked over to her husband who was washing the dishes in their sink at the kitchen. Linda asked her

husband whether he had made up with his daughter or not.

Based on the conversation above, Rick flouted the maxim of quantity. In this case, Rick provided more information than needed. He adds facts to support his argument that they can be good parents to their children and express how he feels about the situation he is in. This causes the information delivered to be longer. Based on this statement, Rick is indicated to use the strategy of giving too much information. Regarding the illocutionary function, the reason Rick flouts the maxim of quantity is the collaborative function as asserting. There is indifference between his illocutionary goal and social goal. Rick wanted to make it clear to Linda that he was at a loss as to what to do because he felt that he had done what a parent should have done.

Data 3

Rick: We called the school. You can miss orientation week. No problem.

Katie: **But it... it is a problem. I've got all these friends to meet. There's this really cool girl, Jade, and we... we just like all the same stuff. And it's like everyone at this school just gets me. There's a mixer, Dad. A mixer!**

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 0:15:41 – 0:15:57)

The conversation above happened in the morning right in front of The Mitchells' house. Katie was getting ready to go to the airport. However, Katie was confused when she saw her family who would take her to the airport with a lot of stuff in the trunk of the car. Rick explains that he is sorry for his behavior last night. Rick wants to make amends by planning a family vacation while dropping Katie off to her college as proof that he supports Katie to achieve her dream. Rick canceled Katie's ticket to support his plans. Katie was surprised because she will miss the orientation she had been waiting for.

Katie flouts the maxim of quantity by providing additional information about her crush and explaining the fun part of the orientation activity. Rick did not need an explanation from Katie but just wanted to get her understanding. Katie flouts the maxim of quantity by using the strategy of giving too much information because she wants to show that she strongly disagrees with her father's decision. Regarding the illocutionary function, Katie's illocutionary goal conflicts with her social goals as in reprimanding. The reason Katie reprimanded her father was

forced by Rick's words who decided to cancel the ticket unilaterally without asking for Katie's approval. She was mad that the thing she had planned was once again thwarted by his father.

Flouting Maxim of Quality

Flouting maxim of quality happens when the speakers say lies in saying something or are not truthful which means they deny something they believe to be false (Grice, 1975).

Data 4

Katie: Mom, who knew you could handle yourself so well in the apocalypse?

Linda: I'm a first-grade teacher. **This is like a normal day for me.**

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 0:59:53 – 0:59:58)

This conversation took place in Mall Globe. When they were uploading a kill code on a laptop, all the electronic devices there that had PAL chips in them suddenly went crazy and attacked The Mitchells. With a forced state, they fight those electronic devices. During the battle, Linda always takes risks to help a Deborahbot 5000 (an AI robot that has malfunctioned so he is not affected by PAL) and her husband. In the end, they managed to defeat the electronic devices by turning off the Wi-Fi in that place. The Mitchells are happy and celebrate their win. Katie was amazed by the courage of her mother and did not expect her mother to be so brave.

Linda said '**this is like a normal day for me**' which indicated that Linda flouted the maxim of quality. Linda seemed to convey information that did not match the facts. Being a first-grade teacher is indeed quite a hassle because she is dealing with children who still like to play and make a mess. However, it is not comparable to the problem of the threat of the world from AI robots. The war against AI robots is not a problem that occurs in everyday life in general, but the apocalypse of the world. So, Linda's words are not based on the truth. Linda flouted the maxim of quality because she wanted to tell a joke to Katie. Based on this statement, Linda clearly used the banter strategy in her utterance. The reason Linda flouts the maxim of quality is related to the illocutionary function, such as collaborative as asserting. Linda's illocutionary goal is indifference to the social goal. She wanted to emphasize that she was used to dealing with chaos and that she was fine.

Data 5

Aaron: I... is Abbey Posey okay?

Katie: [gasps] You like that Posey girl?

Aaron: **No. [laughs]**

Katie: Don't hide your feelings, man. That's no way to live.

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 1:06:46 - 1:06:58)

The conversation above happened when The Mitchells managed to get to the Rhombus of Infinite Subjugation, the headquarters of AI robots and spaceships that lock up all humans on earth, including The Poseys. Aaron was worried about Abbey Posey's condition while staring at the picture of Abbey Posey's face in the book he was holding. Katie realized that picture and teased her brother. Aaron was flustered as he tore up the picture and put it in their dog's mouth.

Aaron seems to flout the maxim of quality. He said things that did not match the facts. Aaron lies that he does not like Abbey Posey which is obvious if he is attracted to Abbey from the picture he holds and his clumsy demeanor. Katie realized what her brother's action meant and realized that her brother liked Abbey. Based on this statement, Aaron uses the strategy of banter in flouting the maxim of quality. He said something negative but implied a positive meaning. In this case, related to the illocutionary function, Aaron flouts the maxim of quality by using the competitive function as demanding. His illocutionary goal competes with his social goal. Aaron's illocutionary goal is to keep his feelings to himself without anyone knowing and his social goal is to tell Katie the truth. In this case, his illocutionary goal is over than his social goal.

Data 6

Katie: This is the photo you picked? **Mom, we look horrible.**

Linda: I like it. It looks like us.

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 1:35:27 - 1:35:33)

The above conversation occurred in the morning. A few months after the war with AI robots is over and the world is back to normal. The Mitchells escorted Katie to her college which had been delayed. During the trip, in the car, Katie held a magazine with a cover photo of their family with the headline "The Family that Saved the World". After viewing the magazine, Katie asked her mother about the cover photo and left a comment about it.

Katie flouts the maxim of quality. Katie said something that had a negative connotation when she did not really mean it. Katie inserts positive meaning in her words that she likes the cover photo because it looks unique and reflects the character of her family. She just wanted to convey that meaning with a sense of humor to his mother. In this case, Katie deliberately lied about her response to the cover photo. Based on the statement, Katie is indicated to use a banter strategy. Regarding the illocutionary function, Katie's illocutionary goal coincides with her social goal as in thanking. Katie wanted to thank and appreciate her mother for choosing the photo as a magazine cover. The photo really reflects the characteristics of her family which is different from the other family.

Flouting Maxim of Relation

Flouting maxim of relation happens when the speakers say some things that are not relevant to the topic of the ongoing conversation (Grice, 1975).

Data 7

Katie: What? What's the face?

Rick: Uh, well, I just wonder, do you really think you can make a living with this stuff?

Katie: **Dad, can you finish watching it, at least?** (*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 0:09:15 – 0:09:24)

This conversation took place in the dining room. Rick had just come home from work and greeted the rest of his family at the dinner table who were busy with their phones. Rick tells his family to put down their phones and do the family eye gaze for 10 seconds. In the middle of doing that, Katie distracted her family's attention by showing the latest effects film that she made and hoping to get a positive response from her family. However, Rick does not seem to like the film, which irritates Katie's feelings.

Based on the conversation above, Katie clearly flouts the maxim of relation. Katie seemed to change the topic of conversation with something different from what was discussed in their conversation. Rick asks if editing a film can guarantee her future. Instead of answering, Katie changed the subject by saying '**Dad, can you finish watching it, at least?**'. It also shows that Katie is using the strategy of being irrelevant because Katie avoids discussing the subject. The reason Katie flouts the maxim of relation is related to the illocutionary function, such as

competitive as begging. Her illocutionary goal competes with her social goal. Katie wants herself to do what she loves without being forced to do it and enjoy it according to her dreams.

Data 8

Rick: Hey, your drawing actually worked. I didn't know art could be useful.

Katie: [chuckles] **Well, who knew having a 500-year-old car could be useful?**

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 0:47:05 - 0:47:14)

The above conversation happened when The Mitchells went to the Globe Mall to activate a kill code to stop the AI robots' attack. They are in the car by covering the top of the car using a black cloth that is given a yellow line in the middle with the aim that their car can camouflage with the road when viewed from above. This idea came from Katie and they managed to trick some of the robots on patrol. Rick is amazed by Katie's idea.

Katie's answer in response to Rick's question seems irrelevant. Rick is giving a compliment to Katie regarding her idea which managed to save them from the AI robots that were on guard. However, Katie was asking Rick a question that was clearly a different topic from what was being discussed. Judging from Katie's words, it is also clear that Katie uses the strategy of being irrelevant when answering Rick's questions. Regarding the illocutionary function, the reason Katie flouts the maxim of relation is the convivial function as thanking. Katie would also like to thank and praise Rick if his collection of old cars has contributed to their success in escaping from AI robots' attacks.

Data 9

Rick: This is the hardest thing to get. Downshift into third, put on the clutch...

Aaron: **Dad, if you see a place to stop, I do need to go to the bathroom.**

Rick: Aaron, here's an empty bottle. You know what to do, my man.

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 0:48:27 - 0:48:35)

This conversation occurred after they left Dino Stop Cafe to the Globe Mall with their old car. However, on their way to the Globe Mall, their disguises were revealed because the black cloth that covered their car came off and they were being chased by AI robots which are on

patrol. During the escape and in the midst of a panic situation Rick still managed to explain how to drive a car to his children.

In the conversation above, Aaron flouts the maxim of relation. Aaron purposely said something off-topic from their conversation. Rick is talking about how to drive a car and what steps need to be taken. However, Aaron interrupted Rick's words by talking about the bathroom. So, the topic of the previous conversation changed. Related to this statement, Aaron uses the strategy of being irrelevant in flouting the maxim of relation. Also in this conversation, his illocutionary goal competes with his social goal. This means that in relation to the illocutionary function, Aaron uses the competitive function as asking. Aaron wanted to quickly finish his business to go to the bathroom because his needs were more urgent than anything else and had to be done immediately.

Flouting Maxim of Manner

Flouting maxim of Manner happens when the speakers do not provide brief and clear information in their words or the speakers' words become ambiguous (Grice, 1975).

Data 10

Linda: Oh, your father used to be kind of an artist himself. He built that whole cabin with his own hands.

Katie: Oh, this is, like, super beautiful.

Linda: Oh, it was his pride and joy. Since I met him, that was his dream, to live in the woods. [sighs] He loved it up there. But, you know, it didn't work out. **It just killed him.**

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 1:05:29 - 1:05:53)

The conversation above took place at night and when they continued their journey to Silicon Valley. Linda drove the car with Katie sleeping beside her woken up by the sound of her father's snoring. Linda gave Katie a purple photo album. The album shows an old photo of Rick and Linda in front of a cabin in the middle of the woods. Katie asked about the photo and Linda explained.

Linda flouted the maxim of Manner. Linda flouted the maxim of the manner by saying ambiguous things. Linda said '**It just killed him**'. This statement contains ambiguous words in the word '**killed**'. According to the Oxford dictionary, the word '**kill**' means to make somebody or something die. But in his words, the word '**kill**' does not have that meaning. However,

the word '**kill**' is meant here as a deep sadness feeling. Regarding the flouting maxim strategy, Linda uses the being obscure strategy. Because Linda uses unclear words in her utterance. In this case, related to the illocutionary function, Linda flouts the maxim of manner by using the collaborative function as asserting. There is indifference between her illocutionary goals and social goals. Linda wanted to make it clear to Katie that her father was very sad to sell his dream cabin. Being in the middle of the woods was not good for Katie, who was still a child at the time.

Data 11

Pal: There they are.

Katie: No!

Pal: You're mine now!

Katie: **Dad! Dad? I... I'm sorry. I don't mean that anymore. I mean, I... I did then, but I... Uh...**

(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 1:11:40 - 1:12:26)

This conversation happened when The Mitchells disguised themselves as robots and infiltrated the Rhombus of Infinite Subjugation. Pal learns of The Mitchells' arrival and begins deploying AI robots to catch them. Pal plays a CCTV footage showing Katie and Aaron at the Dino Stop Shop. That CCTV uncovers a big lie from Katie aimed at Rick. Rick who was holding the steering wheel of an elevator to keep it running in its place suddenly let go because he felt betrayed by his own daughter. He thought that he had made up with his daughter and had earned her daughter's trust. Then, they all fall down from the elevator and Pal finds them.

The conversation above shows Katie is not being perspicuous in providing information. She tends to be long-winded which causes her utterance to be unclear. Based on this statement, Katie blatantly flouted the maxim of manner and used an obscure strategy. Also in this conversation, her illocutionary goal competes with the social goal. Katie is indicated using the competitive function as begging in her utterance. Katie wants to ask her father to keep her focus on their mission and apologize to him because her feelings right now are real and not just a lie. Katie felt very guilty but was reluctant to explain.

Data 12

Robot: **The lavender one has found us. We must retreat!**

Linda: Too late, scumbags!
(*The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film, 1:30:48 - 1:30:52)

The conversation above occurred when The Mitchells were fighting the AI robots. Linda flew in the sky with Aaron behind her back and killed a lot of AI robots. She uses the sharp, broken hand of the robot as a weapon. She is feared by the AI robots because of her agility in fighting. Linda let out her anger because the AI robots had dared to harm her youngest son, Aaron.

Based on the conversation above, the robot blatantly flouts the maxim of manner. The robot gives an unclear statement by saying '**The lavender one**'. This statement makes Robot's words obscure because it does not know whom it refers to. Here, the Robot should have mentioned Linda's name to provide clearer information, since it already has The Mitchells' identity. However, Linda can understand that '**the lavender one**' refers to her. The ambiguity in the word '**the lavender one**' shows that the robot uses a strategy of being obscure. Regarding the illocutionary function, Robot's illocutionary goal is indifference to his social goal such as collaborative function as in announcing. The robot wants to announce Linda's presence to the other robot friends that they must escape without mentioning Linda's name. At that time, Linda indeed wore purple clothes similar to the color of lavender flowers.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the result and discussion above, there were 45 cases of flouting maxim found in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* film. The characters in the film flouted all types of maxims. The maxim that is flouted the most in the conversation by the characters is the maxim of relation. Furthermore, regarding the reasons for flouting the maxims, the most dominant strategy used by the characters is being irrelevant strategy, while the illocutionary function that is most often used is the competitive function. It can be concluded that the most frequent flouting maxim performed by the characters in *The Mitchells vs. The Machines* Film is the flouting maxim of relation. The reason of the characters often says something off-topic or change the subject of the conversation is because they want to ask the listener to do something using negative politeness to reduce the disliking way between

what the speakers want to accomplish and the things that they should say in a good manner.

REFERENCES

- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book student*. Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
- Gustary, D., & Anggraini, S. (2021). The analysis of flouting maxim in "up!" movie. *Jurnal Lingua Idea*, 12(2), 124-135. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jli.2021.12.2.4118>
- Hornby, A. S. (2006). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- Kurniati, M., & Hanidar, S. (2018). The flouting of the gricean maxims in the movie insidious and insidious 2. *Journal Online Universitas Gadjah Mada*, 5(1), 65-76. <https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v5i1.41282>
- Lasiana, L., & Mubarak, Z. (2020). An analysis of flouting maxim in ruby spark movie. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 8(1), 321-331. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v8i1.1348>.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of pragmatics*. Longman Inc.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sapalakkai, C. O. O. (2018). Cooperative principle used by chris gardner in "the pursuit of happiness" movie. *Kata Kita Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 6(1), 105-112. <https://doi.org/10.9744/katakita.6.1.105-112>
- Sinaga, R., & Handayani, N. D. (2020). Flouting maxim in "white house down" movie. *Journal of English Education*, 6(1), 37-44. <https://doi.org/10.30606/jee.v6i1.409>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.