

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Previous Studies

The first previous study comes from Purwaningsih (2015) with her thesis entitled *The Pragmatics Analysis of The Cooperative Principle in A Comedy Movie Entitled "Meet the Parents"*. The findings of this study are the writer found 62 conversations in maxim and 39 conversations violated maxim. Purwaningsih also found some socio cultural background of American society. The writer presented an important thing in this movie is "Everything we done, tried to be honest" as the moral value of this movie.

The second previous study comes from Astuti (2017) with her thesis entitled *Flouting Maxims in Visual Novel Products of SPARRING Program at IAIN Surakarta in 2015*. The writer used SPARRING (Students Pair Assistance on Reading and Writing) program is the activity between upperclassmen and underclassmen to improve students' reading and writing skill quality. The data she used came from visual novels that are collected through documentation or library research. The writer used descriptive qualitative method to conduct her research. The findings of this study are stated that 40 data flouting maxim of quantity, 2 data in flouting maxim of quality, 21 data in flouting maxim of relevance, and 29 data in flouting maxim of manner. The totals of data are 92 data. The researcher found all types of maxims that are flouted by the characters in visual novel products and it contained implicatures. Her findings support other research which analysis about flouting maxims that the dominant types is flouting maxim of quantity.

The last previous study comes from A. Naim (2019) with her thesis entitled *"Violation of Grice's Maxims on Henrik Ibsen's Hedda Gabler"*. The focus in this study is violation of maxim in the drama by the characters. The writer found the maxims that are violated in the play. And the writer also found the reason of violating the maxims such as repeating the question, prestige, shyness, convincing the listener, caring, stressing something, covering something and etc.

2.2 Pragmatics

One of branch of linguistics which studies of the language is Pragmatics. Yule (1996: 3) has four depiction of pragmatics. First, pragmatics is the study

concerned with meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and deciphered by a hearer (or reader). It implies pragmatics is a study of what the speaker means. Second, pragmatics also means the study of contextual meaning, it includes the decipherment of what the participant implies in a specific context and how the context impacts what is being said. Third, pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said. It explores how hearers can make inferences about what is said or what the speaker intends to say. Lastly, pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance, it implies that how close or distant the participants, the speaker decides how much is need to be said.

It can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of meaning from the utterance by a speaker or a writer and deciphered by a listener or a reader, and it includes the context of conversation as a consideration of how the speaker or the writer arranges what he wants to say.

2.3 Cooperative Principle

In Cooperative principle, Grice (in Leech: 1993) argues that in order to implement the cooperative principles, each participant must obey four conversational maxims. They are maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Participant has to be cooperative with the maxims if participant wants to make the process of interactions and communication between the speaker and the listener going well. These maxims' function is as guidelines on how the participants should behave in order to conduct a conversation. According to Grice in Yule (1996, p.37) these maxims are:

1. Maxim of Quantity means that participant's contribution is as informative as it required (for the current purposes of the exchange information). The participant does not contribute more than required, because if not the communication between the addresser(s) and the addressee(s) will be misunderstood. For example, B will show the utterance that fulfilled the maxim of quantity.

A: How did Harry fare in court the other day?

B: Oh he got a fine.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 106)

In the example, Harry got a life sentence too, because he failed to provide all the information that might be required thus B would certainly be guilty of misled A. Therefore, B has already given the informative situation.

2. Maxim of Quality indicates that participants' do not say what they believe to be false and they may not say if they have lack adequate evidence. Example:

A: Does your farm contain 500 acres?

B: I don't know that it does, and I want to know if it does.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 105)

The sentence showed that it simply extended the scope of quality by reviewing truth as a special sub-case of sincerity applied to assertions. A answered B about the B's farm. Yet actually, B did not deny that B has farm, and B can prove it when B said that he/she would want to measure his/her farm. This case can be proved that B can give contribution to what addressor believes to be true.

3. Maxim of Relation is used when the participants just convey in informative relevant to the subject of conversation. The communication messages should not be unmatched, yet it must relate to what has gone before. So, the conversation, which fulfilled the maxim of relevance, must relate with that the addresser(s) mean. In this case, the communication will flow fluently between the addresser(s) and the addressee(s). Below is example of maxim of relevance. Example:

A: Where's my box of chocolates?

B: It's in your room.

(Leech, 1983)

The example is interpreted as relevant to the present action. A is asking about 'where', and B answer about the place that is 'your room'. Thus, B's answer matches A's question.

4. Maxim of Manner means that the participants have to be perspicuous and to avoid obscurity of expression, unnecessary direction, be brief, be orderly. Example:

A: Where was Alfred last night?

B: Alfred went to the store and bought some whisky.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 108)

The above example has already obeyed the maxim of manner. B can give explanation orderly since he/she gives a clear explanation where Alfred was. The theory of maxims can give benefit for the addresser(s) and the addressee(s) who are obeying the instruction of cooperative principle. Then, if they follow these maxims, the communication becomes smooth and successful.

2.4 Flouting A Maxim

Flouting maxim is when the addresser intentionally disregards maxim. According to Grice (1975, p.49), this happens when the addresser intentionally fails to comply with the maxim. In addition, Thomas (1995, p.65) also said that "flouting can occur when the addresser fails to comply with the maxim on his/her speech that is done intentionally to create implicature in his speech." In this case, to find out the occurrence of flouting a maxim in a conversation, it can be seen from the context of the addresser's conversation.

1. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Thomas (1995:69) states that a flout of maxim of quantity happens when an addresser blatantly gives more or less information than is required. It means, the flout of the maxim quantity occurs when the addresser gives too brief or too much information to the addressee. Example:

A: I've lost a diamond ring.

B: Well Jenifer was wearing one this morning.

The conversation does not fulfill maxim of quantity. By using indefinite article, B refuses to commit himself to whether the ring he sees is the same one that A loses. B is not being informative in this case.

2. Flouting Maxim of Quality

Usually this flouting participant is the addresser because the addresser lies or says and denies something that is believed to be false in order not to get some consequence from someone. Secondly, addresser uses irony statement or being sarcastic when he/she flouts. Finally, speaker distorts information. It means that

addresser misrepresents his/her information in order to make addressee understand. The examples below will explain this violation. Example:

A: What is the capital of England?

B: Berlin.

A: Yeah, and Paris is the capital of Turkey.

A appears to be flouting the maxim quality because he/she knows that what he/she said is not true. There must be a reason for he/her saying something patently false. The inference can draw is that B's answer was false.

3. Flouting Maxim of Relevance

The participants flout this maxim because they make the conversation unmatched. Usually, the participants do the wrong causality. Besides they do not want to speak the same topic by changing the topic or avoiding talking about something. This violation is usually used to hide something. It means that the participants keep secret or something in order that nobody knows about it.

A: Where's my box of chocolates?

B: I've got a train to catch.

From the conversation B has flouted in maxim of relevance, which is not causality. When A asks B about 'where', actually B should answer the question about the place. However, B, here, changed the topic of conversation. A asks B about A's box of chocolates, but B answer A's question about his/her wanting to get a train. Therefore, B's utterance is unmatched.

4. Flouting Maxim of Manner

Addressor flouts the maxim of manner when he/she uses ambiguous language. He/she uses another language such as foreign language which makes the addressee does not understand. Sometimes, this flouting is used by the addresser to overstate things. It means that addresser represent as greater things. Moreover, addressor uses slang in front of people who do not understand. Lastly, if the addressor's voice is not loud enough, he/she will flout this maxim. Example:

A: Let's get the kids something.

B: Ok, but I veto I-C-E-R-E-A-M-S.

Addressor B obviously breaks the maxim of manner (be perspicuous) by spelling out the word ice cream, and tells A that B does not say the word ice cream in front of the children before they ask their parents to buy some.