



Flouting Maxim Analysis in *Transformer One* Movie

MUHAMMAD THORIQULHAQ WIRAYUDHA

Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: blitzgrdn7x@gmail.com

DONA RAHAYU SUGIHARTI

Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: donarahayu@untag-sby.ac.id

Abstract. This research investigates the phenomenon of flouting conversational maxims in the animated science fiction movie *Transformers One*, directed by Josh Cooley. Grounded in H. P. Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975), the study identifies how characters intentionally flout the four conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner to create implied meanings within dialogue. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, the researcher manually transcribed and analyzed dialogue from the movie, focusing on utterances that deviate from literal meaning to fulfill pragmatic functions such as sarcasm, irony, deception, and humor. A total of 25 instances of maxim flouting were found. The maxim of quality flouted (12 times), maxim of relation flouted (5 times), maxim of quantity flouted (4 times), and maxim of manner flouted (4 times). The most frequently flouted maxim was the maxim of quality. The study reveals that flouting maxim of quality often emerges in situations involving tension, rebellion, or character conflict underscoring sarcasm, exaggeration, or strategic misdirection. Characters such as Orion Pax, D-16, and B-127 flouted the maxim in the conversation not only to manipulate conversation but also to express emotional subtext, defiance, and humor. Unlike previous studies that focus on live-action dramas or comedies, this research provides insight into the pragmatic of animated science fiction dialogue. The findings suggest that flouting maxim enhances characters dialogue and supports the narrative to infer deeper meanings.

Keywords: Conversational Maxim, Cooperative Principle, Flouting Maxim, Grice's Maxims, Pragmatics.

INTRODUCTION

Language is more than a set of symbols, it's a dynamic communication tool. In spoken discourse, like speeches and movie dialogues, language conveys both literal and implied meanings. In films, especially through voiceover narration, language reveals characters' inner thoughts, motivations, and attitudes beyond what is directly said.

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies implied and contextual meanings in communication. Yule (1996) describes it as focusing on what people mean rather than just what they say, while Levinson (1983) defines it as the study of the relationship between language and context. Mey (2001) emphasizes that pragmatics helps us understand how people use language to achieve communicative goals, particularly in socially complex settings like cinematic storytelling.

Grice's Cooperative Principle outlines the fundamental expectations that conversational participants typically follow to communicate effectively. According to Grice (1989),

speakers are expected to make contributions that are suitable for the context and purpose of the interaction. This principle is elaborated through four conversational maxims, as described by Cook (1989): the maxim of quantity (providing sufficient but not excessive information), quality (ensuring truthfulness and substantiation), relation (maintaining relevance), and manner (communicating in a clear, organized, and unambiguous way). These maxims serve as guidelines for interpreting and constructing meaning in discourse. In both real-life and scripted dialogue, Grice's maxims are not always strictly followed. Flouting occurs when a speaker appears to flout a maxim not to deceive, but to suggest deeper or alternative meanings. This prompts the listener to look beyond the literal message, often uncovering irony, sarcasm, or humor (Grice, 1975). By flouting a maxim, speakers engage listeners to infer their true intentions, adding depth and nuance to communication.

In cinematic dialogue, flouting conversational maxims is a common stylistic device used to enhance storytelling, express emotions, or create dramatic or comedic effects. This is particularly evident in animated films or movies where voiceover narration often conveys meanings beyond the literal words. Through pragmatic analysis, especially of maxim flouting, we see how characters use language to imply sarcasm, irony, or to avoid unpleasant topics and emphasize certain messages (Cook, 1989). This strategic use of language adds depth and complexity to the dialogue and overall narrative.

This research seeks to address two main research questions. What types of Gricean maxims are flouted in the dialogues of the movie *Transformers One*? and which maxim is most frequently flouted by the characters? The primary objective is to identify the specific maxims that are flouted and to analyze the frequency of their occurrence. This research aims to explore the pragmatic functions behind the flouting of these maxims within the context of a sci-fi animated film.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are several discussions of previous research related to the current study, aimed at avoiding duplication and identifying gaps in existing literature. Two journal articles were selected for comparison.

The first, by Putri (2015), titled “A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting of the Main Character in Jason Reitman’s *Thank You for Smoking*,” focused on identifying the types of flouted maxims, the strategies used, and the contextual background. Using Grice’s Cooperative Principle and a qualitative-quantitative descriptive method, the study analyzed movie dialogues as primary data. The findings showed all four maxims were flouted, with the maxim of manner being the most frequently violated, often through obscurity.

The second study, by Hasan (2015), titled “A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Performed by the Main Character in *Philomena*,” aimed to identify the types and strategies of maxim flouting. It also employed Grice’s framework, along with Cutting’s classification of flouting strategies, using a qualitative-quantitative approach. Hasan’s findings revealed that all four maxims were flouted, with the maxim of relation being the most frequently violated, typically through irrelevance.

There are both similarities and differences between these studies and the current research. All studies, including this one, share a common theoretical foundation in Grice's Cooperative Principle and utilize qualitative or descriptive qualitative methods. However, the key difference lies in the context and genre. While previous research focused on live-action films in genres such as drama, comedy, or crime, this study explores an animated sci-fi movie, *Transformers One*.

By analyzing *Transformers One* through the lens of Grice's (1975) flouting maxim theory. It not only identifies the types of flouted maxims but also determines which maxim is most frequently flouted by characters, offering insight into pragmatic expression in animated cinematic dialogue.

Flouting Maxim

According to Grice (1975), maxims are four specific guidelines designed to explain how effective communication is achieved within the framework of the Cooperative Principle. This principle assumes that interlocutors generally aim to contribute to conversations in a cooperative, efficient, and mutually intelligible manner. Each maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner represents a key aspect of how language should ideally function to promote mutual understanding.

A crucial concept within this framework is flouting, which occurs when a speaker deliberately disregards a maxim not to deceive, but to convey an implied meaning. As Grice (1975) explains, such flouting is done overtly, with the expectation that the listener will recognize the deviation and infer the speaker's actual intention. Unlike violations, which aim to mislead, flouting invites the listener to "read between the lines."

Cutting (2002) notes that this overt noncompliance often results in figurative language, sarcasm, irony, or humor, thereby enriching communication beyond its literal content. Levinson (2017) emphasizes that flouting plays a vital role in pragmatic competence, as it encourages inferential communication and deeper engagement with meaning.

METHOD

This research uses a qualitative descriptive approach to analyze pragmatic phenomena, specifically the flouting of Grice's conversational maxims, in the animated movie *Transformers One*. Guided by Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975), the study aims to identify and interpret the types and functions of flouted maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner within the characters' dialogue. Data were collected through documentary analysis by watching the movie, reading its transcript, and selecting dialogues that clearly demonstrate maxim flouting. The primary data source is the official movie transcript obtained online, and the researcher serves as the main instrument in analyzing the dialogues, supported by a coding sheet for consistency. Each flouting instance is categorized and analyzed contextually, with attention to speaker intent and situational context. The analysis involves identifying the types of flouted maxims, counting their occurrences, and explaining their pragmatic functions. The ultimate goal is to determine which maxims are most frequently flouted and how they contribute to character interaction and meaning in the film's narrative.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the flouting maxims in the *Transformers One* movie, the researcher identified a total of 25 instances. The most frequently flouted maxim was the Maxim of

Quality, appearing 12 times, indicating frequent use of sarcasm, irony, or exaggeration by the characters. This was followed by the Maxim of Relation, flouted 5 times, and the Maxim of Quantity, which appeared 4 times. The Maxim of Manner was the least flouted, also occurring 4 times, suggesting that while ambiguity and obscurity were present, they were less prominent compared to the manipulation of truth and relevance in the dialogue.

A. Flouting Maxim of Quality

Grice (1975) states that the Maxim of Quality obliges speakers to avoid making statements they know to be false or for which they lack sufficient evidence. When this maxim is deliberately violated, it is typically not to mislead but to hint at a deeper or implied meaning. Such flouting often appears in the form of sarcasm, irony, exaggeration, or deliberate falsehoods, enabling speakers to express emotions, attitudes, or indirect messages that extend beyond the literal content of their utterances.

QL1

GUARD #1: “Freeze!”

GUARD #2: “Get down!”

ORION: *“Oh, hello, guys, yeah I'm so glad you're here -- which way's the exit? I must've taken a wrong turn--”*

In this dialogue from *Transformers One*, the character clearly flouts the Maxim of Quality as outlined by Grice (1975), which emphasizes the importance of truthfulness and evidential support in communication. Orion Pax's statements delivered in a light, humorous tone are intentionally false and insincere, used strategically to defuse a tense situation. His casual greeting, false enthusiasm and fabricated excuse all serve to mask the reality of his illegal infiltration. Rather than deceiving the guards in a literal sense, Orion uses sarcasm and irony to downplay the seriousness of his actions, inviting the hearer (and the audience) to recognize the truth behind his false narrative. This instance reflects how flouting the Maxim of Quality can be used for humorous or disarming effect in moments of conflict, aligning with the film's tone and Orion's character.

QL2

D-16: “Hey, watch where you're going...!”

GUARD #2: “What did you say, no-cog?”

D-16: *“Sorry sir, I didn't mean you, I was referring to the bot who was behind you.”*

The dialogue evidently flouts the Maxim of Quality, which, as Grice (1975) explains, obliges speakers to communicate only what they believe to be true and have sufficient evidence for. When D-16 tells the guards to watch where they're going, it is a genuine reaction to being bumped. However, when confronted and insulted, he quickly fabricates a false explanation, claiming he was referring to a bot behind them—someone who doesn't exist. This intentional lie is not meant to deceive for personal gain but to defuse tension and redirect the guards' attention, allowing Orion to escape. By flouting the Maxim of Quality through a strategic falsehood, D-16 accomplishes two goals: he calms the situation and subtly manipulates the guards' focus, illustrating how deliberate untruths can serve pragmatic and narrative functions within dialogue.

QL3

GUARD #2: “Where is he?!”

D-16: “*He went that way.*”

This dialogue flouts the Gricean Maxim of Quality, which asserts that speakers ought to avoid making claims they believe are false or cannot adequately support with evidence (Grice, 1975). When D-16 tells the guards, he is knowingly providing false information, as Orion is actually hiding in his cart. Unlike previous instances where flouting is used for sarcasm or irony, this example involves a deliberate lie, intended to deceive the guards and protect Orion. Though deceptive, this kind of flouting still functions within the broader cooperative framework, as the speaker has a strategic purpose and expects the hearers (the guards) to accept the falsehood at face value.

OL4

ELITA: “If I get fired because of you--”

ORION: “*Oh please, they're not gonna fire you.*”

DARKWING: “Elita-1, you’re fired.”

This dialogue clearly flouts the Gricean Maxim of Quality, which requires speakers to say only what they believe to be true and have sufficient evidence for (Grice, 1975). Orion’s confident reassurance is an assertion without evidence, made purely from his hopeful, idealistic outlook. He has no authority to make such a claim and no insight into the actual decision-making of their superiors. The irony is immediately exposed when Darkwing arrives and bluntly states directly contradicting Orion’s claim. This moment highlights not only Orion’s tendency to speak optimistically without basis but also how flouting the Maxim of Quality can produce dramatic or comedic irony by setting up false expectations that are quickly overturned.

OL5

ELITA: “Pax, what's happening?”

ORION: “*Nothing much, just normal protocol-following stuff, it's all good.*”

This dialogue clearly flouts Grice’s Maxim of Quality, which holds that speakers should refrain from making statements they consider untrue or cannot sufficiently support with evidence. Orion’s response is clearly false. He is, in fact, disobeying orders and engaging in risky, unauthorized rescue efforts during a tunnel collapse. His words are an attempt to downplay a serious and chaotic situation, presenting a misleading narrative that directly contradicts reality. This deliberate deception couched in casual, dismissive language serves both to evade accountability and to maintain his usual playful persona, even in a life-threatening moment. In short, Orion knowingly provides false information with the intent to mislead Elita and soften the consequences of his actions, thereby flouting the Maxim of Quality.

B. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

According to Grice’s Maxim of Quantity, speakers are expected to contribute information that is sufficient for the conversational context without offering more detail than is needed. Flouting this maxim occurs when a speaker deliberately gives too little or too much information, prompting the listener to infer additional meaning or question the relevance or intent behind the utterance (Grice, 1975).

ON1**GUARD #1:** “Wha -- Where'd he go?!”**D-16:** “You mean the filthy red and blue bot? Has a big mouth, squeaky joints, gives off a corroded metallic stench?”

This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quantity, which, according to Grice (1975), requires speakers to provide information that is as informative as necessary no more, no less. In this case, D-16 gives an excessively detailed and exaggerated description of Orion Pax. These vivid, sarcastic details go well beyond what is required to identify someone and are clearly intended to mislead the guards while maintaining a façade of hostility toward Orion. By overloading the response with unnecessary and insulting specifics, D-16 not only distracts from the truth but also strengthens the illusion that he is not aiding Orion. This deliberate overstatement prompts the hearers to infer that he couldn't possibly be an accomplice, making the flouting a strategic use of excessive information to misdirect.

ON2**ORION:** “How long have you been here?”**B:** “How long have I been here? (chuckles) Let's see, uh, somewhere between a long time and forever? I mean, I had other jobs, but I kept getting reassigned, 'cause I'm so good at what I do. Oh! I'm B-127, by the way, but you can call me B. I'm actually working on some nicknames, the one I'm floatin' right now is um, Badass-a-tron, which is actually pronounced BADASSATRON. But if-- if you have any critiques--”

This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quantity, which, according to Grice (1975), requires speakers to be as informative as necessary no more, no less. When Orion asks a simple question B-127 responds with an exaggerated, vague time frame followed by a lengthy, unsolicited monologue about his past jobs, frequent reassignments, and his efforts to come up with a nickname, including the over-the-top suggestion and a pronunciation guide. Rather than providing a concise answer or basic introduction, B-127 overloads the conversation with excessive and humorous detail, turning a straightforward exchange into a character-driven performance. This intentional over-sharing not only flouts the Maxim of Quantity but also adds depth to B-127's quirky, attention-seeking personality while inviting the audience to infer his loneliness and desire for connection beneath the humor.

ON3**B:** “Hi there. Uh, Elita, right? Am I saying that right? Wanted to formally introduce myself, uh, I'm B-127, you kneed me in the face earlier, back there. Uh, you-- you can call me "B", or Badass-a-tron, it's a nickname some of the guys gave me, I don't know. I didn't give it to myself or anything it's just-- Actually, it's pronounced BADASSATRON... in case you were wondering. BADASSATRON. You like that, right? BADASSA--”**ELITA:** “I'm gonna need you to talk less.”

This dialogue flouts Grice's Maxim of Quantity, which advises speakers to provide only as much information as needed no more, no less (Grice, 1975). B-127's nervous, overly detailed introduction far exceeds what the situation requires. Rather than simply stating his name and greeting Elita, he repeats himself, recounts irrelevant past

interactions, awkwardly explains a nickname, and even provides a pronunciation guide. This excessive verbosity overwhelms Elita and disrupts the conversational flow. While the flouting reflects B-127's social anxiety and eagerness to connect, it also serves a comedic narrative purpose, highlighting the mismatch between his excited energy and Elita's no-nonsense demeanor. Elita's blunt retort draws attention to the violation, reinforcing the humor and emphasizing character contrast.

QN4

B: *"Look, look, look! That's Starscream... and you're Shockwave... and Soundwave. Gosh, raise your hand if 'wave' is in your name. There's a lotta 'waves'--"*

STARSCREAM: "SILENCE!"

This dialogue evidently flouts the Gricean Maxim of Quantity, which, as outlined by Grice (1975), requires speakers to give just the right amount of information—neither too much nor too little. B-127's excited commentary goes far beyond what the moment calls for. In the presence of dangerous enemies, B provides obvious, unnecessary identification of the Decepticons and continues with irrelevant, joking observations, all while failing to grasp the seriousness of the situation. His excessive and inappropriate chatter not only overwhelms the conversational context but also contributes to the tension, prompting Starscream's explosive command to this dialogue humorously underscores B's talkative nature while illustrating how flouting the Maxim of Quantity can result in conflict or miscommunication when social cues are ignored.

C. Flouting Maxim of Relation

The Maxim of Relation (also known as relevance) requires speakers to provide information that is directly related to the ongoing conversation. Flouting this maxim occurs when a speaker makes seemingly irrelevant statements that appear to derail or shift the topic. However, this is often done intentionally to imply a hidden meaning, avoid a sensitive topic, or redirect the listener's attention (Grice, 1975).

RL1

ORION: *"Why are we all yelling, guys?"*

GUARD #1: "I'm gonna smash you--"

This dialogue clearly flouts the Maxim of Relation, which, as Grice (1975) asserts, obliges speakers to ensure their contributions are pertinent to the conversational context. When Orion Pax, in a moment of high tension, casually asks and he is not genuinely seeking an answer but using sarcasm and irony to downplay the threat posed by the guards. His remark is deliberately irrelevant to the seriousness of the situation and serves as a rhetorical device to mock or lighten the mood. By ignoring the clear aggression directed at him, Orion's question deflects attention from the danger and reframes the moment with humor, revealing his sarcastic and composed personality. This deliberate irrelevance marks a strategic flouting of the Maxim of Relation, inviting the audience not the guards to recognize the irony and interpret the underlying tension.

RL2

INJURED RACER: *"...Did I win..."*

MECHANIC: *"You participated."*

This dialogue flouts the Gricean Maxim of Relation, which requires speakers to provide responses that are relevant to the conversational context (Grice, 1975). When the injured racer weakly asks and he is seeking a direct and honest answer about his performance. However, the mechanic responds with a remark that, while technically true, fails to address the specific question and instead offers an evasive, noncommittal comment. The response is deliberately irrelevant, likely intended to soften the emotional impact of the truth that the racer lost. This strategic flouting uses indirectness and implication to convey compassion or avoid discouragement, prompting the listener to infer the actual outcome through what is left unsaid.

RL3

ORION: *"Elita--I mean, captain, you are looking especially shiny this morning. New polish?"*

ELITA: *"Orion Pax, I'm sorry that I somehow gave you the impression that we're friends--"*

This dialogue clearly flouts Grice's Maxim of Relation, which states that conversational contributions should be relevant to the context (Grice, 1975). In a professional, task-oriented setting like the Energon mines, Orion Pax's flirtatious and sarcastic comment is inappropriate and irrelevant to the situation. Instead of acknowledging Elita's authority or the mission at hand, he redirects the interaction with personal and playful banter, disrupting the formal tone. His remark not only mocks the seriousness of the moment but also blurs professional boundaries. Elita's sharp response functions as a correction to this breach, reinforcing her role as a focused leader and underlining Orion's conversational misstep.

RL4

ORION: *"Okay, D-16, I may be a little dusty, but corroded? That is too far--"*

D-16: *"Let me guess. Chased out of the archives?"*

This dialogue flouts Grice's Maxim of Relation, which requires that conversational contributions be relevant to the preceding exchange. When Orion, mock-offended, responds to being called corroded, he is addressing a playful insult about his physical appearance. However, D-16 immediately shifts topics, D-16's sudden pivot disregards Orion's attempt to defend his condition and instead highlights D-16's suspicion about Orion's recent troublemaking. Though the new topic is contextually appropriate within the broader narrative, it is not directly relevant to Orion's prior comment, making D-16's line a clear case of maxim flouting for humorous and character-driven effect.

RL5

ORION: *"In order to save our captured friends, we have to act now."*

SHOCKWAVE: *"How about I blast you back to Iacon?"*

In the dialogue Shockwave flouts Grice's Maxim of Relation, which requires speakers to make relevant contributions to the ongoing conversation. Rather than engaging with Orion's urgent call to action or responding with any meaningful input about the rescue plan, Shockwave delivers a threatening and dismissive retort that derails the conversation.

His line is intentionally irrelevant, ignoring the topic of the captured allies and instead reasserting his dominance through aggression. This flouting of relevance reinforces Shockwave's role as an antagonist and highlights the hostile tension between him and Orion.

D. Flouting Maxim of Manner

Grice's Maxim of Manner emphasizes that speakers should communicate clearly by avoiding ambiguity, obscurity, and disorderly expression. When this maxim is flouted, the speaker deliberately uses vague, unclear, or disorganized language, often to create humor, conceal information, or force the listener to interpret a deeper or indirect meaning (Grice, 1975).

MN1

GUARD #2: *"It's not like he can transform."*

ORION: *"Oh, yeah? Well, watch... THIS."*

This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Manner, which, as Grice (1975) states, requires speakers to avoid ambiguity, be orderly, and communicate clearly. When Orion responds to the guard's taunt, his statement is intentionally ambiguous and dramatic, creating a false expectation that he is about to transform. Instead refers to an unexpected action his sudden escape which has nothing to do with transformation. The vagueness of the word combined with the performative delivery and lack of explicit meaning, forces the listener (and the audience) to fill in the gap or anticipate something that never arrives. This deliberate obscurity and misdirection serve a narrative purpose, creating suspense and surprise, and mark a clear flouting of the Maxim of Manner through intentional lack of clarity and misleading structure.

MN2

STARSCREAM: *"You think you can insult me and just walk away? No one leaves here unless I say so."*

D-16: *"Is that right? Well, how can you say so with my head in your teeth?"*

This dialogue between Starscream and D-16 clearly flouts the Gricean Maxim of Manner, which emphasizes clarity, orderliness, and avoidance of ambiguity (Grice, 1975). Starscream delivers a direct and threatening statement to assert dominance, but D-16 replies with a figurative and intentionally obscure metaphor rather than issuing a straightforward rebuttal or threat, D-16 uses vivid, indirect imagery that requires interpretation. The metaphor implies violent retaliation so intense that Starscream wouldn't be able to speak, but it avoids explicit clarity. This deliberate lack of straightforwardness, paired with the dramatic language, intensifies the emotional impact and reflects D-16's fearless, confrontational style.

MN3

ORION: *"Yeah I know I uh-- look a little different."*

JAZZ: *"Little? There's nothing little about you."*

This dialogue between Orion and Jazz clearly flouts the Gricean Maxim of Manner, which calls for clarity, brevity, and avoidance of ambiguity (Grice, 1975). Orion's

hesitant and vague comment understates what is likely a major transformation, using imprecise and minimizing language to avoid directly acknowledging the extent of the change. This ambiguity may reflect discomfort, modesty, or self-consciousness. Jazz's response exaggerates in the opposite direction, using sarcasm and emphatic contrast to draw attention to the understatement. His line intentionally distorts the conversational tone with irony, signaling that both speakers are avoiding straightforward, literal communication. This layered exchange shows how ambiguity and exaggeration can serve expressive and interpersonal functions, even when clarity is sacrificed.

MN4

ORION: "What has he done to you?"

D-16: *"This is nothing compared to what I'm gonna do to Sentinel."*

In the dialogue D-16 flouts Grice's Maxim of Manner, which emphasizes clarity, brevity, and avoidance of ambiguity. Rather than directly answering Orion's concerned question about what has been done to him physically or emotionally D-16 offers a vague, emotionally charged statement that redirects attention toward his future retaliation. His response is intentionally dramatic and indirect, leaving the nature of his transformation unclear while emphasizing his anger and thirst for revenge. This lack of clarity heightens the tension and signals a significant shift in D-16's character.

E. The Most Frequently Flouted Maxim

The findings of this research reveal that the most frequently flouted maxim in the *Transformers One* movie is the Maxim of Quality, which was flouted 12 times out of 25 total instances. This suggests that characters often make statements that are clearly false, exaggerated, sarcastic, or ironic to convey implied meanings beyond the literal content. The high frequency of Quality flouting aligns with the film's tone and narrative style, where sarcasm, misdirection, and humor are commonly used especially during scenes of conflict, tension, or rebellion. Key characters such as Orion Pax, D-16, Elita-1, and B-127 frequently flout this maxim for various purposes: Orion uses sarcasm to downplay danger, D-16 employs deception to mislead enemies or manipulate situations, and other characters flout to express resistance, inject humor, or protect others. These pragmatic strategies reflect indirect expression, encouraging viewers to interpret deeper meanings. This supports Grice's (1975) theory that even when maxims are flouted, communication remains cooperative, as the speaker relies on the listener's ability to infer the intended message through context and shared understanding.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the research of flouting maxims in *Transformers One* highlights the unique potential of animated science fiction to convey layered, inferential meaning through stylized dialogue. Unlike ordinary conversations, the film's script frequently employs creative language use particularly sarcasm, irony, exaggeration, and deception as intentional strategies to enrich communication. This supports Grice's (1975) theory that communication remains cooperative even when maxims are flouted, as listeners rely on context and shared understanding to interpret implied meanings. The analysis identified 25 instances of maxim flouting in the film, with the Maxim of Quality being the most frequently flouted (12 times), followed by Relation (5), Quantity (4), and Manner (4). The dominance of Quality flouting reflects the film's emotionally and

politically charged setting, where characters often express indirect meanings during moments of tension, rebellion, or identity conflict. Set on Cybertron, the story follows Orion Pax, D-16, Elita-1, and B-127 as they awaken to social injustice and evolve into the iconic figures of Optimus Prime and Megatron. In this context, flouting maxims especially the Maxim of Quality serves as a powerful narrative and pragmatic tool, deepening character interactions and advancing the film's thematic complexity.

REFERENCES

- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*. Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Hasan, R. (2015). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Performed by the Main Character in Philomena*. [Unpublished undergraduate thesis or journal article].
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2017). *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. MIT Press.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Putri, M. A. D. (2015). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting of the Main Character in Jason Reitman's Thank You for Smoking*. [Unpublished undergraduate thesis or journal article].
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.