

Flouting of Conversational Maxims Analysis of Characters and Social Contexts in "All The Bright Places" Movie

Aulia Zahra Tasyarasita^a, Agus Hari Wibowo^b

^aFaculty of Cultural Sciences, University of Sebelas Maret. tasyarasita@student.uns.ac.id

^bFaculty of Cultural Sciences, University of Sebelas Maret. agushari67@staff.uns.ac.id

Article History: Submitted date: 7 July 2022 Accepted date; 27 August 2022 Published date: 30 August 2022

ABSTRACT

This research is carried out to investigate the types of flouting of maxims and the strategies used by the characters that occur within the background of power and social distance contexts in "All The Bright Places" movie. Moreover, this research is also aimed to reveal the reasons behind the execution of the flouting of maxims. This research is employed qualitative research. The data source of this research is presented in the form of words, phrases, and sentences containing flouting of the maxims obtained from the characters' utterances in the movie. The data were analyzed using Grice's cooperative principle theory, Cutting's theory of strategies to flout the maxims, Leech's theory of illocutionary functions of politeness, and Brown and Levinson's theory of social context. The research findings concluded that four types of flouting maxims are found in the characters' utterances: flouting the maxim of quantity, flouting the maxim of quality, flouting the maxim of manner, and flouting the maxim of relevance. Only three reasons for flouting the maxims were found of four types: competitive, collaborative, and conflictive. The most frequently used flouting maxim is flouting the maxim of quality which is aligned with the competitive reason as the most commonly used reason to flout the maxim.

Keywords: Flouting maxims, Grice's Cooperative Principles, Context, and Movie

1. Introduction

Speakers in a conversation strive to adhere to the Cooperative Principle by making their utterances clear, easy to understand, concise, contextually relevant, and constantly referring well to problems. According to Grice (1989), the cooperative principle is needed by a speaker and the hearer to help each other generate good conversations so that the speaker and hearer can understand each other's conversations. The maxims of the cooperative principle proposed by Grice, which include maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, are being used to summarize cooperative efforts between speakers and hearers.

The contribution of speakers and hearers is crucial in implementing this Cooperative Principle stated by Grice (1989). Each speaker must contribute as much as the hearer requires according to the maxim of quantity. Every speaker must tell the truth to meet the standard of maxim quality. In this case, the speaker is not expected to provide inaccurate or false information. According to the maxim of relevance, the speaker must contribute something to the utterance that is relevant or related to the conversation's context. According to the maxim of manner, the speaker must contribute directly and unambiguously.

The speaker and hearer must understand the context of the conversation to communicate effectively. Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed three essential factors to consider when determining the context of a conversation: power, distance, and imposition rank. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1987) define power as a value ascribed to roles or role sets rather than individuals. The closeness between speaker and hearer or how the speaker treats the hearer in a particular way is referred to as distance or social distance. The degree to which the speaker's intention is communicated to the hearer determines the rank of imposition.

Brown and Levinson (1987) identified three relevant circumstances influencing the speaker's choice of words in executing a conversation. Those circumstances are social distance, relative power, and rank of imposition. Gender, age, and intimacy are the three characteristics that determine social distance. For example, if the speaker and the hearer are the same age, it is assumed that both participants have little distance (-D) between them. On the other hand, as the social distance between the speaker and the hearer gets far, it emphasizes the distance and becomes (+D).

In addition to social distance, relative power also plays a role in determining the context of utterances. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), power is an asymmetric social dimension of relative power that influences someone to speak politely. Power is linked not only between individuals but also role-sets, such as employer-employee, teacher-learner, and parent-children. The power will be higher (+P) when the speaker with higher power communicates with the hearer who has lower power. It denotes that the speaker will converse in a friendly manner. Meanwhile, when the speaker with lower power speaks to the hearer who has higher power, the power will decrease (-P), and the speaker will apply to speak with great respect.

Cutting (2002) further divided the context of observing in a situation into three categories: situational context, background knowledge context, and co-textual context. The situational context is used when the speaker and hearer are in the same situation. What the speaker and hearer know about each other and the world is referred to as background knowledge. The speaker and the hearer's understanding of what they have been saying is co-textual context.

Regarding communication, both speaker and hearer occasionally disobey the Cooperative Principles. Speakers are deemed to be flouting Grice's (1989) cooperative principle if they do not deliver information under what the hearer requires, is not based on facts, is irrelevant, or is unclear. The flouting of the cooperative principle is done to break the rules, not just to break the rules. When people interact with one another, context determines whether or not flouting occurs. It is almost sure that the communication process will not run smoothly if one of the speakers does not understand the situation and context of the speech. Even the information conveyed to the partner may not be well received.

In breaking the maxims in their utterances, some strategies are applied by the speaker. Overstatement and understatement strategies can be used to flout the maxim of quantity. The speaker will frequently use these techniques to flout the maxim of quantity by providing less or more information than is necessary. Grundy (2000) coined the term "overstatement" to describe the phenomenon of a speaker providing more information than is required. On the other hand, understatement is a strategy for flouting the maxim of quantity, in which the speaker provides far less information than the hearer needs.

Metaphor, irony, banter, and sarcasm are the strategies that are usually used when the speaker flouts the maxim of quality. Metaphor is a type of maxim flouting strategy in which the speaker compares an object or action to something that is not accurate but has similar characteristics to the one they are referring to, thus aiding in the concept's explanation. According to Leech's definition (as stated in Cutting, 2002), the irony is an expression that appears to be

pleasant and welcoming but is offensive. According to the definition, irony is someone's method of defying a maxim by saying something pleasant but not genuine. On the other hand, banter is when someone says something offensive while trying to be polite (Leech as cited in Cutting, 2002). This expression expresses the closeness between the speaker and the hearer. Sarcasm, according to Cutting, is an aggressive form of irony intended to hurt someone's feelings. People usually use sarcasm to express something utterly contrary to the truth.

The speaker flouts the maxim of manner by making an ambiguous statement that does not state things clearly. The speaker intends for their statement to be ambiguous to the hearer. This strategy is frequently used in the most blatant manner possible because the speaker does not want to include the third party in the conversation (Cutting, 2002).

An irrelevant statement is a strategy for flouting a maxim of relevance by responding with something completely unrelated to the discussed topic. This strategy is commonly used when the speaker does not want to say anything or simply wants to end the conversation. When a speaker makes an irrelevant statement, the hearer is expected to assume what they are not saying (Cutting, 2002).

Speakers who break the rules of the Cooperative Principle's maxims do so to convey a hidden meaning to the hearers. Mey (2001) argued that flouting of maxims could occur for various reasons. Its goal is to allow the hearer to conclude the speaker's implied meaning from his or her words. The reasons for flouting the maxim are associated with Leech's illocutionary politeness functions (Leech, 1983). The functions are the purposes of asserting something with intended meaning to appear considerate in front of others.

The phenomena of flouting maxims can be found not only in ordinary conversation but also in movies. According to Bordwell and Thompson (1997), movies are comparable to buildings, books, and symphonies, all created by humans for human purposes. A movie is a good match for studying linguistic phenomena because it depicts the characters' gestures, intonation, situation, and expressions as realistically as possible in a real-life situation. The researcher chose a movie entitled "All The Bright Places" to scrutinize the types and strategies of flouting maxims occurring in the characters' utterances in specific social contexts and the reasons behind the flouting maxims.

Several researches on flouting maxim have been carried out previously by many researchers. These researches use Grice's Cooperative Principle theory to analyze the four types of flouting maxims and what is the meaning behind them (Kurniati & Hanidar, 2018; Wahyuni et al., 2019; Marlisa & Hidayat, 2020; Nurjannah et al., 2020; Al-Shboul, 2022; Maulida et al., 2022; Hamidah et al., 2022). Even though they have investigated the types of flouting maxims, those studies did not analyze the social context (power and distance) behind the occurrence of flouting maxims. Moreover, a study has not examined the contextual situation when the flouting maxim occurs (Marlisa & Hidayat, 2020). Several studies have analyzed the functions of flouting the maxim using the theory from Grice and Leech (Wahyuni et al., 2019; Hamidah et al., 2022), however, it is still not connected the results of the flouting maxims and the reasons for flouting maxims to the contexts of each utterance.

Based on the previous researchers in flouting maxims that have been reviewed, researchers may have many opportunities to analyze cases related to the flouting of maxims, more importantly, discuss contextual situations and social contexts in their analysis. As summarized, the gaps in the research include (1) types of flouting of maxims and the strategies used by the characters that occur within the background of power and social distance context and (2) the reasons behind flouting of maxims. Therefore, to fill the gaps of previous research, this study aims at the character utterances that contain maxim flouting. It is carried out by revealing four types of maxim flouting: maxim

quantity, maxim quality, maxim manner, and maxim relevance and the strategies of each maxim, as well as examining the reasons for each type of maxim. Flouting of maxims of the characters in the movie "All The Bright Places" can be seen by the utterances. Besides that, the statements can show the relationship to the strategies and the social context of power and social distance.

2. Methodology

This research employs descriptive qualitative research since it focuses on language phenomena concerning maxim flouting. Qualitative research is a type of research in which the results are not obtained using statistical processes or another calculation process (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Moreover, as stated by Gay et al. (2012), in qualitative research, the data is collected in descriptive to gain insights and answer questions about the phenomena that are being studied.

This research used media, particularly a film, as the research location, entitled "All The Bright Places". The film was directed by Brett Haley and was released on February 28th, 2020 on the Netflix streaming site (Mehok, 2020). This research focused and explored the utterances containing flouting of the maxim carried out by all the characters in the film. The data source in this research were a movie entitled "All The Bright Places" and a document transcript containing flouting maxims from the utterances employed by characters in the film. The transcript of dialogues was downloaded from the site Sublikescript (n.d.). The data in this research were primary data presented in the form of words, phrases, and sentences containing flouting of the maxims obtained from the characters' utterances in "All The Bright Places" movie.

The researcher took the following steps while conducting this research: collecting data, analyzing data, and presenting the results. The data was collected using the note-taking technique after the researcher watched the entire movie of "All The Bright Places". The data was in the form of a sentence from the characters' utterances related to the flouting maxim. They were analyzed using Grice's Cooperative Principle theory, Cutting's flouting maxim strategies theory, Brown and Levinson's social context theory, and Leech's illocutionary politeness functions to analyze the reasons for the flouting of maxims. This study employed the source triangulation technique to check the data's validity. Triangulation of data sources combined multiple data sources that contain information related to the research subject (Lincoln and Guba and Patton in Santosa, 2021), as evidenced by the characters' utterances and the conversation context. The relevant data sources contained the analysis of flouting maxims and the social context.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Result

There are 18 data of utterances containing flouting maxims which are found in the "All The Bright Places" movie. The data reveals that the characters in the movie employ all types of flouting maxims.

Table 1. The frequency of the types of flouting maxims and its strategies found in the "All The Bright Places" movie.

Type of Flouting Maxims	Strategy	Frequency	Σ
Flouting Maxim of Quality	Irony	3	7
	Banter	2	

	Metaphor	1	
	Sarcasm	1	
Flouting Maxim of Quantity	Understatement	3	4
	Overstatement	1	
Flouting Maxim of Manner	Ambiguous	3	3
Flouting Maxim of Relevance	Irrelevant	4	4

Total 18

As shown in Table 1, four flouting maxims are found in the "All The Bright Places": flouting the maxim of quality, flouting the maxim of quantity, flouting the maxim of manner, and flouting the maxim of relevance. The flouting maxims section depicts how the characters in the "All The Bright Places" movie implement flouting maxims based on Grice's theory. Furthermore, the strategy section shows how the characters in the "All The Bright Places" movie make use of the flouting maxims in their utterances. The frequency section indicates the number of times a specific type of flouting maxim appears in the film for a particular reason and with a detailed strategy.

The researcher found that the maxim of quality, which was flouted seven times, is the one that is used the most frequently. Other than that, the researcher also found a flouting maxim of quantity that occurred four times. Besides, the flouting maxim of relevance happened four times. Moreover, the flouting maxim of manner appears three times. This flouting maxim is the least used in conversation in the movie.

The characters in the movie employed various strategies, depending on the maxim itself, to flout the maxim in their conversation. The flouting maxim of quality found in this movie employed irony, banter, metaphor, and sarcasm strategy. The maxim of quantity is flouted by using overstatement and understatement strategies. Ambiguous strategy is used to flout the maxim of manner, and the maxim of relevance is flouted by irrelevant strategy.

Table 2. The reason for flouting the maxims in the conversation found in the "All The Bright Places" movie.

Reason for flouting the maxims	Frequency
Competitive	10
Collaborative	6
Conflictive	2
Convivial	0

Total 18

Table 2 examines only three of the four types of reasons for flouting the maxims. There are competitive, collaborative, and conflictive reasons. The competitive reason became the most frequently used, which occurred ten times. Then collaborative reason occurred six times, whereas the conflictive reason is rarely used, only occurred twice. The convivial reason is absent from the

conversation throughout the movie because none of the characters flouts the maxim using that reason coinciding with the social goal with the illocutionary goal.

3.1.1. Flouting Maxim of Quality

DATUM 10/00:38:30/+P-D/QL/IR/CTV

Mr Embry: *Did you look into that support group I told you to check out?*

Finch: *I might've lost the info on that one.*

Mr. Embry: *Come on, Theodore. It's a small ask, man.*

a. Context of Situation

Mr Embry is Finch's school guidance counsellor. This scene happened when Finch visited Mr Embry's room to meet his counselling appointment. Mr Embry and Finch have close relationships, and even Finch called him Embryo. As a result, the context is shown as +P and -D, indicating that the distance between them changed and they were close. Because of their positions as teachers and students, in which the teacher has more power, the power is still positive. The conversation happened when Mr Embry asked about the support group information. He told Finch to check out what could help Finch to lessen his anxiety.

b. Data Interpretation

From the conversation above, an utterance can be found that flouted a maxim of quality from Finch's statements. This scene happened when Finch had a counselling appointment with Mr Embry. Mr Embry asked Finch whether he had checked out the mental health support group information he recommended. In the dialogue, Finch flouted the maxim of quality by using an ironic strategy. He answered Mr Embry's question as if he had done the task and just lost and forgot the information. Still, he did not do the command given by Mr Embry.

In terms of the reason for this flouting, the social goal was that Finch confessed that he lost the information that Mr Embry asked about, but the illocutionary goal was that Finch disregarded Mr Embry's request not want to do the order. In conclusion, the illocutionary goal competed with the social goal because it focused only on Finch's personal and did not care about the other participant. The reason for flouting the maxim of quality found in this utterance is the competitive reason.

DATUM 11/00:41:27/+P+D/QL/BT/CLB

Finch: *Hi, I'm Theodore Finch. Pleasure to meet you both.*

James: *Little early, don't you think, Theodore?*

Finch: *Yes. Yes, it is early. That is a fair observation. But you see, I'm your daughter's partner for the school project, and we really need to get to this place.*

a. Context of Situation

The conversation happened between James (Violet's Dad) and Finch in front of Violet's house in the early morning. That was the first time they met. As it was their first meeting, the context is shown as +P and +D, indicating that the distance was far and the power was high because their relationship was similar to that of parent and child. Finch was ready by wearing a neat shirt and sneakers and waiting in front of her house, asking for permission to persuade Violet to be his school project partner. The school project was wandering around Indiana. Therefore, they needed permission from Violet's parents to go to certain places using a vehicle.

b. Data Interpretation

In this dialogue, James flouted the maxim of quality by using a banter strategy. According to Leech (as cited in Cutting, 2002), banter is an expression for someone saying something offensive while being genuinely polite. James asked Finch if it was still early morning when he

visited their house. It could mean that James refused to be visited by Finch because it was too early to see someone.

James' flouting maxim of quality is categorized as a collaborative reason. James's social goal was to accept Finch's arrival at his house in the early morning. Moreover, the illocutionary goal was James wanted to assert Finch to agree to his statement that it was too early to visit someone's house. In short, the illocutionary goal works together with the social goal to reach an understanding among participants.

DATUM 16/01:18:12/-P+D/QL/SC/CLB

Amanda: *I heard you beat the shit outta Roamer. Why do you keep doing stuff like that? Aren't you tired of people talking about you all the time?*

Finch: *People are always gonna talk. It's their specialty.*

a. Context of Situation

The conversation happened after Finch and Amanda attended the mental health support group session to help them overcome their anxiety. Their encounter was unexpected because it was Finch's first meeting of the session. He did not know that Amanda was also there and was a member of the group. This was the first time they were talking. Therefore, the distance is symbolized as +D, which means they were distant. Amanda interrogated Finch why he did the action of beating Roamer when all the people in school were already talking bad about him all the time. She also said that his action might trigger people to talk more about him behind his back.

b. Data Interpretation

From the conversation between Amanda and Finch above, Finch was the one who flouted the maxim of quality. He was using a sarcasm strategy in answering Amanda's statement. It is shown in the utterance "It's their specialty". The word "specialty" usually means complimenting someone's full effort of good action. However, in this case, what Finch meant of the "specialty" was people's idle talk which was nonsense. Thus, Finch did not intend to compliment the people who talked about him, but saying a positive word to show the negative in judging. Sarcasm has the potential to cover up the positive effects of compliments.

Finch's utterance that flouted the maxim of quality is categorized as a collaborative reason. Finch's social goal was to respond to Amanda's assumption. Moreover, his intention or illocutionary goal wanted to express that he did not really care what other people said about him. This relates to the reason for flouting the collaborative maxim as in asserting. Leech (1983) explained that collaborative reason aims to foster understanding between participants.

3.1.2. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

DATUM 07/00:22:04/-P-D/QN/US/CLB

Finch: *Hey. Hey! Violet. Hey, where you going?*

Violet: *Home.*

Finch: *How'd it go with Hudson?*

Violet: *Not great.*

a. Context of Situation

The dialogue above happened when Finch met Violet on their way home from school. Finch decelerated his car and stopped when Violet passed him on the road by riding a bike. While lowering the car window, Finch asked Violet where she was going and how the negotiation progress was regarding their school project that she had made with Hudson as their teacher. In this conversation, the context is shown as -P and -D, implying that they have no power and that the distance between them is short because they are close. Even though they were already close to each other, Violet responded to Finch's question bitterly by only answering short.

b. Data Interpretation

In this dialogue, Violet was flouting the maxim of quantity because she answered with a little information by answering in short “Home” and “Not great” and did not elaborate or give more detail on her answer to why it was not great. This could happen because Violet felt disappointed that she did not make any progress with the teacher. Violet used a strategy of understatement in flouting the maxim.

Violet flouted the maxim of quantity as a collaborative reason because the social goal is to respond to Finch’s question by providing not enough information than required, and the illocutionary goal is to report the progress she made with the teacher. The illocutionary goal was to collaborate with the social goal as in reporting. As a result, the reason for flouting the maxim found in this utterance is collaborative.

DATUM 09/00:37:41/+P-D/QN/US/CLB

Mr Embry: *How are things?*

Finch: *Just your average teenage melodrama.*

Mr Embry: *Come on. You gotta give me more than that.*

a. Context of Situation

During their second meeting, the conversation above is between Finch and Mr Embry, the school guidance counsellor. For that reason, the context is shown as +P and -D, meaning that the distance between them changed, resulting in being close to each other. The power relation is still positive because of their position as teacher and student, in which the teacher has higher power. The conversation happened when Mr Embry asked about the things Finch was going through since he is Finch’s counsellor. However, Finch answered the question not as expected as what Mr Embry wanted.

b. Data Interpretation

In this case, Finch flouted the maxim of quantity because he gave too little information. When Mr Embry asked him to explain his life’s condition, he only responded by saying, “Just your average teen melodrama,” which did not answer what Mr Embry wanted to hear. Thus in the following dialogue, Mr Embry asked Finch to give more detailed information so that the conversation would be cooperative.

Regarding to the reason for flouting the maxim of quantity, Finch did not specify how his life had recently changed and instead stated, “Just your average teenage melodrama,” which could imply that his life was similar to any other teenagers living their lives. Finch only provided less information, but he assumed Mr Embry understood what he was informed. Therefore, Finch flouted the maxim of quantity because he did not give enough information as required, but his illocutionary goal is to report what he had done. The illocutionary goal was indifferent to the social purpose as in reporting. As a result, the reason for flouting the maxim found in this utterance is collaborative.

DATUM 14/01:11:41/-P-D/QN/US/CTV

Roamer: *Hey, V.*

Roamer: *Hey, what's up?*

Roamer: *How are you?*

Violet: *Fine.*

a. Context of Situation

This scene happens when Roamer greets Violet in a school corridor. Roamer and Violet were friends at school. Therefore, the context is shown as -P and -D, telling that both had no power and the distance was close. However, by looking at Violet's expression, she seemed irritable with

answering Roamer's greeting, so even though Roamer greeted her three times, she only gave a short answer.

b. Data Interpretation

Based on the data above, a flouting maxim of quantity arises from Violet's utterances. From what we can see from the statement, Roamer approached Violet three times before she finally answered his greetings. Even though she answered his greetings, she only responded with a simple word. Violet could answer the question "What's up?" and "How are you?" by saying "I'm fine", but she responded only by saying "Fine" as if she answered Roamer's greeting insincerely that Roamer would stop calling her. Violet flouted the maxim of quantity by giving too little information, not in complete sentences. Violet implemented the understatement strategy in doing this kind of flouting maxim. Giving too little information could mean that Violet did not intend to respond to Roamer.

Regarding the reason for flouting the maxim of quantity, Violet's utterance will relate to the competitive reason because her illocutionary goal of not responding to Roamer's greetings competes with her social goal to reciprocate his greetings.

3.1.3. Flouting Maxim of Manner

DATUM 03/00:04:23/+P+D/MN/AB/CTV

Mr. Embry: *How's everything going?*

Finch: *"Everything" is a really big word.*

Mr. Embry: *Let's start with...*

Finch: *Do you mean physically? Emotionally? Those both could encompass "everything." Or is "everything" encompassed by both things?*

a. Context of Situation

The dialogue happened when Finch had counselling time with the guidance counsellor at school, Mr Embry. The utterances between Mr Embry and Finch appear for the first time in the orientation part of the movie. The context is shown as +P and +D. The distance between them is high, which symbolizes (+), which means they were not close. As the relationship between them is teacher and student, the power is realized with (+), meaning that the teacher has more power and authority than the student. As a counsellor, Mr Embry did his mandatory duty by asking Finch about his life updates and how everything was going around him and letting Finch talk about anything he wanted.

b. Data Interpretation

In those utterances, Finch is the one who flouted the maxim of manner. Finch responded to Mr Embry's question by not expressing his statement briefly. It can be seen from how he did not directly answer Mr Embry's question and just answered ambiguously. Finch could talk about what he has been going through, but he countered Mr Embry's question with an unrelated question instead.

The reason Finch flouted the maxim of manner is competitive because the social goal is to answer Mr Embry's question by telling his recent life experience. Still, the illocutionary goal is to avoid counselling talks and want to have fun. As stated in Leech (1983), in adjusting the illocutionary goal, the speaker is unconcerned about the other participants. Therefore, the illocutionary goal competed with the social purpose of asking. In conclusion, the reason for flouting the maxim found in this utterance is competitive.

DATUM 04/00:07:29/+P-D/MN/AB/CFL

Kate: *Did you do something I should be worried about?*

Finch: *I'm genuinely offended by that supposition.*

a. Context of Situation

The conversation above happened when Kate and Finch were together in the kitchen of their home. Kate asked him if Finch had done something wrong at the school because she got a call from his teacher earlier. Kate and Finch are siblings, and Kate is Finch's older sister. Therefore, the context is shown as +P and -D. As the older sister, Kate had more positive power than Finch as the younger. In terms of the distance, they were close because they lived together in the same house. Finch also shows a slight joke in answering Kate's question, which proves their closeness.

b. Data Interpretation

In this dialogue, Finch is the one who flouted the maxim of manner. When Kate asked him if he had done something wrong because his guidance counsellor had called Kate earlier, Finch did not directly answer Kate's question. Kate's question was classified as a yes-or-no question which required a simple yes or no response. However, Finch jokingly said that he felt offended by her assumption while chewing a slice of cheese he took from the refrigerator because he thought he did not do anything harmful.

The reason for flouting the maxim of manner is categorized as a conflictive reason because the social goal is that Kate accuses Finch of bad behavior at school because his teacher called Kate his guardian. Still, the illocutionary goal is to remind Finch not to do anything harmful to other people which would cause a problem. Therefore, the illocutionary goal conflicted with the social goal as in accusing. In conclusion, the reason for flouting the maxim found in this utterance is conflictive.

DATUM 17/01:18:29/-P-D/MN/AB/CTV

Amanda: *Are you OK?*

Finch: *I don't know. I feel like I keep messing things up, and I'm not sure I know how to not do that.*

a. Context of Situation

The conversation above happened when Amanda and Finch met in the mental health support group session recommended by the school guidance counsellor. They were talking privately after the session was over. Amanda and Finch were not close as friends even though they were in the same school. This conversation was uttered after they had a simple chit-chat. The context is written as -P and -D, meaning the power and distance are low. Since the distance is low or minus, the relationship between Amanda and Finch becomes closer than before.

b. Data Interpretation

In this conversation, Amanda asked about Finch's condition in general, including his physical and emotional condition. Amanda's question was categorized as a yes-or-no question which should be answered with a simple yes or no. However, in this case, Finch was doubtful by saying "I don't know" and "I'm not sure". Finch also gave an ambiguous answer which did not directly answer Amanda's question.

In terms of the reason for this flouting, the social goal was that Amanda wanted to know Finch's condition after learning that he came to the group therapy session. Still, the illocutionary goal was that Amanda showed her concern by letting Finch talk about what he was going through. In conclusion, the illocutionary goal competed with the social goal of asking. The reason for flouting the maxim of manner found in this utterance is competitive.

3.1.4. Flouting Maxim of Relevance

DATUM 02/00:02:30/-P+D/RL/IL/CTV

Violet: *What are you doing?*

Finch: *I asked you first.*

a. Context of Situation

This conversation happens in the first part of the movie when Finch finds Violet standing on the bridge's ledge. The scene occurs after Finch calls Violet's name to ensure that the girl he saw standing on the ledge of the bridge was indeed Violet. Violet and Finch were not close because this scene showed how they met for the first time. It is indicated by the context -P and +D, which means they have no power but a positive distance between them. At this scene, Finch was following Violet to stand on the ledge. Knowing that Finch stood beside her on the bridge ledge, Violet asked him that question.

b. Data Interpretation

In this utterance, Finch is the one who flouted the maxim of relevance because he did not precisely answer Violet's question. Violet asked Finch what he was doing after knowing that he followed to stand on the ledge and stood beside her. In response to Violet's question, Finch did not answer what Violet intended to hear, but he countered the question by saying that he had asked before what Violet was doing. Finch planned to know why Violet was standing on the bridge's ledge, but he did not get an answer from Violet. Therefore, Finch stood up in Violet's position as if he knew what Violet was feeling. Finch's action would also indicate asking Violet to come down because he feared Violet would do something dangerous, risking Violet's life.

Finch's utterance flouted the maxim of relevance is categorized as a competitive reason. Finch's social goal was to follow and stand up beside Violet on the bridge's ledge. However, his intention or his illocutionary goal was that he wanted to ask Violet to come down since standing on the ledge of the bridge was dangerous. Therefore, the illocutionary goal competed with his social goal as in asking. This relates to the reason for flouting maxim that is competitive.

DATUM 08/00:37:18/-P+D/RL/IL/CFL

Roamer: *Maybe you should give her some space.*

Finch: *Nice sweater. What's that, a cotton blend?*

a. Context of Situation

Roamer and Finch are schoolmates and know each other even though they are not close. Therefore, the context is written as -P and +D, which means there is no power between them, but they have a positive distance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The conversation above occurred when Roamer interrupted the conversation between Finch and Violet discussing the progress of their school project. Roamer told Finch not to bother Violet throughout the conversation by asking to give space to Violet. Meanwhile, Finch responded to Roamer's request by changing the topic and complimenting Roamer's clothes.

b. Data Interpretation

In this situation, the conversation between Roamer and Finch has flouted the maxim of relevance, particularly in Finch's statement. It is not in accordance with what has been said by Roamer as the first speaker. Roamer asked Finch to keep distance from Violet, supported by his utterance "...give her some space". Finch was bothered that his conversation with Violet was interrupted by Roamer. In response to Roamer's utterance, Finch changed the topic and praised the clothes Roamer was wearing. In his utterance, Finch did not want to compliment Roamer's appearance. He just wanted to tell Roamer not to interfere with what was happening between him and Violet. Finch also simply wanted to put an end to the conversation. His intention is defined as flouting the maxim of relevance based on Cutting theory (2002).

The reason Finch flouted the maxim of relevance is categorized as a conflictive reason because the social goal is accepting Roamer's request and finishing the conversation with Violet. Still, the illocutionary goal is to reprimand Roamer, not interfering with the conversation between

him and Violet. Therefore, the illocutionary goal conflicted with the social goal, as in reprimanding. In conclusion, the reason for flouting the maxim found in this utterance is conflictive.

DATUM 13/01:01:38/-P-D/RL/IL/CTV

Violet: How'd you get that?

Finch: I'm going in search of the bottom.

a. Context of Situation

Based on the movie, the conversation happened after Violet and Finch were swimming at the Blue Hole, a large lake in Indiana. This scene is categorized in the complication part of the movie. Therefore, the relationship between Finch and Violet is classified as -P and -D, which means that they have no power, and the distance between them is slight because they are becoming closer as the story goes by. Violet unintentionally saw a long scar on Finch's stomach, and thus she asked him how he got that scar while touching it.

b. Data Interpretation

In this scene, Finch flouted the maxim of relevance because he did not give answers as what as Violet expected to hear. Violet asked how he got the scar, but he answered that he just wanted to look for the bottom and then jumped into the lake. Finch hid something from Violet, so he did not want to discuss his scar. His action relates to the definition of flouting the maxim of relevance that is frequently used when a speaker does not want to say anything or wants to end the conversation (Cutting, 2002). Finch's action proves this after he said the dialogue. He jumps into the lake as if he wants to end the conversation.

Finch's utterance is inferred as a competitive reason. Finch's social goal was to jump and swim into the lake because he was ready on the edge of a stone wearing only underwear. However, his intention or his illocutionary goal was that he wanted to refuse to answer Violet's question and demanded to end the conversation. Therefore, the illocutionary goal competed with his social goal of ordering. This relates to the reason for flouting maxim that is competitive.

3.2. Discussion

Some researchers have conducted several studies analyzing Grice's Cooperative Principle theory. The previous studies conducted by Kurniati and Hanidar (2018), Wahyuni et al. (2019), Marlisa and Hidayat (2020), Al-Shboul (2022), and Hamidah et al. (2022) are only focused on analyzing the types of flouting maxims without going into detail about the strategy to flout the maxims. Studying the strategy used in all types of flouting the maxims is also essential since both are intertwined. The speaker cannot flout the maxim without employing a particular strategy.

The strategy that is used to flout the maxims depends on the maxim that is being flouted. In line with the statement, the characters in "All The Bright Places" movie mostly flouted the maxim of quality by using irony, banter, metaphor, and sarcasm strategy. Flouting the maxim of quality happens when the speaker might express an utterance that completely contradicts the point they are attempting to make. When the speaker's response is untrue and lacks evidence, the quality maxim is flouted. This is coherent with the findings of the study conducted by Anindita (2018) during the presidential election campaign 2019 on online billboard advertisements. The results revealed that the speakers flouted the maxim of quality, for which they did not provide convincing evidence.

In this research, the researcher has implemented the theory of relevant circumstances that influence the speaker's choice of words in executing a conversation proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Each data analysis identifies the characters' power and distance, which stand for P and D, as the factors influencing why the characters flout the maxims. The dynamics of the

relationship between the characters can be deduced by using power and distance analysis to analyze the context.

Additionally, the reason to flout the maxims has nothing to do with the type of flouting maxims and strategy to flout the maxims. The reason to flout the maxims depends on the context and the aim of the conversation. By recognizing the reason for the characters to flout the maxims, it is easier to understand and comprehend the implied meaning behind the utterances stated by the characters in the movie.

Research analyzing the flouting maxims conducted by Aziz et al. (2019) revealed that the collaborative reason was the most frequent reason for flouting the maxims. However, in this research, competitive reason becomes the most commonly used reason for flouting the maxims. According to Leech (1983), competitive reason occurs when the illocutionary goal is frequently employed by characters who are more focused on furthering their interests than the interests of others. In comparison, the social goal aims to help or give an advantage to other people. As a result, the social goal and the illocutionary goal are competing. The result of competitive reason becoming the most frequently used also aligns with the flouting maxim of quality that is also being the most frequently used by the characters.

CONCLUSION

According to the findings mentioned above, it can be concluded that the characters in the movie flout all types of flouting maxims delivered in 18 utterances. The flouting maxim of quality is executed seven times, the flouting maxim of quantity occurred four times, flouting the manner appeared three times, and the flouting the relevance happened four times. The results showed that the maxim of quality becomes the one that is used frequently. Flouting the maxim of quality is used when the speaker makes an utterance that directly opposes the point they are attempting to make. Regarding the reasons for flouting the maxims, only three of the four types of reasons are examined. There are 10 data for competitive reason, 6 for collaborative reason, and 2 for conflictive reason, where the competitive reason becomes the most frequently used by the characters. The convivial reason is absent from the conversation throughout the movie. The result of competitive reason becoming the most commonly used is aligned with the flouting maxim of quality that is also the most frequently used by the characters. It happened because the flouting maxim of quality and competitive reason is used to express the hidden intention of the speaker.

REFERENCES

- Al-Shboul, O. K. (2022). Flouting of Grice's maxims by Jordanian speakers in everyday communication. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 11.
- Anindita, W. K. (2018). The Analysis of Implicature in the Presidential Election Campaign 2019 on Online Billboard Advertisement. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 1(1).
<https://ejournal.unsa.ac.id/index.php/selju/article/view/203/136>
- Aziz, Z. A., Mustafa, F., & A'la, P. N. (2019). Flouting Maxims as a Sense of Humor in Indonesian Speech Acts. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 4(2), 169.
<https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v4i2.156>
- Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (1997). *Film Art: An Introduction* (Fifth Edition). McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of Qualitative Research* (Fourth Edition). SAGE Publications.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (10th ed). Pearson.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing Pragmatics* (Fourth Edition). Arnold.
- Hamidah, N., Arifin, M. B., & Ariani, S. (2022). Analysis of Flouting of Conversational Maxims by Characters in The Help Movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Budaya*, 6(1), 14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v6i1.5100>
- Kurniati, M., & Hanidar, S. (2018). The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims in the Movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*. *Lexicon*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v5i1.41282>

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.

Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) Talkshow. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 7(2), 137.
<https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630>

Maulida, F., Rozi, F., & Pratama, H. (2022). Creation of Humorous Situation By Flouting Conversational Maxims Accompanied By Facial Expression in “Friends.” *English Education Journal*, 12(1), 76–86. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v12i1.51956>

Mehok, J. (2020, March 23). Review: All the Bright Places. *Lake Central News*.
<https://lakecentralnews.com/44773/top-stories/review-all-the-bright-places/>

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (Second Edition). Blackwell Publishing.

Nurjannah, J., Daud, B., & Fata, I. A. (2020). A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Committed by The Characters in Avengers: Infinity War Movie. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 5(1), 26–38.

Santosa, R. (2021). *Dasar-dasar Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. UNS Press.

Subslikescript. (n.d.). *All The Bright Places (2020)—Full Transcript*.
https://subslikescript.com/movie/All_the_Bright_Places-3907584

Wahyuni, M., Arifin, M. B., & Lubis, I. S. (2019). An Analysis of Flouting of Maxims Done by Main Characters in La La Land Movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Budaya*, 3(3), 9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v3i3.2212>