

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

This chapter considers about the writer's explanation of the theory which uses for analyzing the cooperative principle maxims and violation toward them. In analyzing of "LOGAN", the writer uses the pragmatic approaches about the human language usage and Yule maxim theory of cooperative principle.

The writer uses pragmatic approaches due to pragmatic is the branch of linguistic that focusing on the structure of a language as communication tool. Moreover, the writer uses cooperative principle and its component; maxim of quality, quantity, relevance and manner, as the framework theory, because they focus on the communication in which the process of interaction is to follow this principle to achieve purpose of the speaker's utterance and the deviation toward them violated the principle.

##### **2.1.1 Pragmatic**

Pragmatic is the systematic study of meaning (Yule, 1996). Many experts of pragmatic define the term differently. (Yule, 1996) classifies the meaning of pragmatic into four kinds as follows: (1) pragmatic is the study of speaker

meaning, (2) pragmatic is the study of contextual meaning, (3) pragmatic is the study of more get communicated than is said, (4) pragmatic is the study of the expression of relative distance.

In line with Yule, (Rowe, 2006) states pragmatic as “the study of the effect of context in meaning.” It studies the practical use of language to obtain certain purposes. Then, the meaning of a speaker can be interpreted more accurately and know the meanings of utterances depend not only on general linguistic knowledge like grammar and lexicon but also depend on the context.

Moreover, in pragmatic, keeping one is face by paying attention to politeness is really concerned. Then, politeness itself is an interaction to show awareness of another person’s face (Yule, 1996). Some aspects that the participants of the conversation have to be taken note of are face saving act, face threatening act, and face wants. In addition, speakers sometimes give implicit meaning beyond their utterances namely implicature in the conversation they are involved. Grice uses the term implicature to refer to what speakers can imply, suggest, or mean as distinct from the speakers literary say (George, 1996).

In the other hand, (Peccei, 1999) the focus of pragmatic analysis is on the meaning of speaker’s utterances rather than the meaning of words or sentences. It concentrates on aspect of meaning that cannot be predicted by linguistics knowledge about physical and social world. Thus, pragmatic has different meaning and it focuses and connects to the speech situations.

Pragmatic is the study of “invisible” meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it is not actually said or written (Yule, 1996). In addition,

Griffith says pragmatic is concerned with the use of tools in meaningful communication (Griffiths, 2006). So, pragmatic is study about how people understand of meaning not only by what said or written but also by interpreting the situation and context which hides another meaning. Those words mean pragmatic plays more in context and situation than just in what said and written by the first party.

Based on all explanations about pragmatic from the experts above, the researcher conclude that pragmatic is the study of how to make meaningful communication by interpreting speaker's utterances and intentions which has invisible meaning and not only about what is said or written, but it focuses in contextual and situational to get the intended meaning.

### **2.1.2 Cooperative Principle**

Cooperative Principle is one of the significant theories in Pragmatic. (Grice, 1975) explains that Cooperative Principle leads the participants to make a contribution as is required in a conversation. The aim and the direction of talk exchange determine the requirement. Grice in (Wardhaugh, 2006) also states that, conversation is a cooperative activity. That is when speakers and listeners can understand each other in a conversation. People can share what is the intend to share smoothly, also can accept each other's, meaning despite the status close friends, parents, teachers, sellers and buyers, and others. The speakers behave in a particular way to lead the listeners to understand the speakers' utterances so the listeners are able to give appropriate responses to the speakers' utterances. The

concept of cooperative activity leads the listeners to assume that all speakers are always cooperative.

Cooperative Principle is a predominant principle in pragmatic that was developed by an English philosopher, H.P. Grice. It is a kind of agreement by both the speakers and listeners to be cooperative in verbal communication. Hence, this principle is the ground rules in which they need to be observed when the participants in the conversation are speaking and also interpreting utterance in conversation. As a cooperative activity, (Grice, 1975) proposes some rules that should be obeyed in doing a conversation. These rules are formulated in a principle of cooperating called Cooperative Principle. Cooperative Principle has four sub principles called maxims; maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. These maxims determine what participants have to do to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, and cooperative way (Levinson, 1983).

### **2.1.3 Maxim**

According to (Grice, 1975), it is important to recognize these maxims as unstated assumptions we have in conversations. We assume that people are normally going to provide an appropriate amount of information. We assume that they are telling the truth, being relevant, and trying to be as clear as they can (as stated by George Yule, in his book “Pragmatics”). Moreover (Grice, 1975) said that there is general cooperative principle between speaker and hearer, which roughly, controls the way in which a conversation may proceed. He then

distinguishes four categories under each of which there are several maxims. These are:

### **2.1.3.1 Maxim of Quantity**

The participants make contribution as informatively as is required for the current purpose of the exchange. The people should not make the contribution more or less informative. It means that, the participant's contribution in talk exchange should be informative as it is needed. The participant also should not inform the information more informative than required. In other words, the point of this maxim is the speaker should give enough information. (Grice, 1975) clarifies that the maxim of quantity has sub-maxims, i.e.: "Make your contribution to the conversation as informative as necessary!" and "Do not make your contribution to the conversation more informative than necessary!"

(Grice, 1975) briefly gives the example of observance of the maxim of Quantity as in the following illustration: "If you are assisting me to mend a car, I expect your contribution to be neither more nor less than is required, at a particular stage I need four screws, I expect you to hand me four, rather than two or six".

Based on the illustration above, the researcher concludes that maxim of quantity must relate to the quantity of information which will be said by the speaker. If someone asks one question, the speaker is expected to answer it by one informative answer and as required and expected by the hearer. The observance of the maxim of quantity is exemplified in the following example

*A: Did you go to Bobby's party last night?*  
*B: Yes, I did*

The boy has given just the right amount of information. He has said precisely what he meant, no more and no less, and has generated no implicature (i.e. there is no distinction to be made here between what she says and what she means, there is no additional level of meaning). Thus, in usage of maxim of quantity, the amount of responses as required is the point. The second party is not expected to give less or more information than the first party as hearer expected.

### **2.1.3.2 Maxim of Quality**

Maxim of quality gives contribution to what the speaker believes to be true. It means that the speaker should tell the right information. (Grice, 1975) suggests that a conversation should be genuine and sincere and speak the “truth” or facts. He formulates this maxim as, “Do not say what you believe to be false!” and “Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence!”.

On the other words, both sub-maxims require the conversational members only say the truth. (Grice, 1975) briefly gives the example of observance of the maxim quality as in the following illustration: “I expect your contribution to be genuine and not spurious. If I need sugar as an ingredient in the cake you are assisting me to make, I do not expect you to hand me salt; if I need a spoon, I do not expect a trick spoon made of rubber”.

Based on the illustration above, the researcher concludes that maxim of quality is maxim which focuses on the truth and knowledge of the speaker is important thing in this maxim. The second party must say as the truth and facts of

the conditional. The first party is expected to get facts and truth from the second party. There is a following sentence of maxim of quality:

*A: Where is the Eiffel tower located?*  
*B: In Paris*

Here, contribution of the interlocutor is a truth of the answer. In responding A's question, B give a clearly answer. So, in maxim of quality, the speaker should say something or answer the questions based on what they really know, if they hesitate their answer would be false, they shouldn't do it.

In line with Grice, (Cutting, 2002) states that to fulfill the maxim, the speakers should be sincere and say anything that they believe match to reality. The speakers tend to observe the maxim of quality by using hedges such as 'as far as I know', 'I maybe mistaken, but...', 'I'm not sure if this is right, but...', or 'I guess' (Yule, 1996).

### **2.1.3.3 Maxim of Relation**

Maxim of relation is concerned with the relevancy of contribution made by speakers in communication exchange. In (Grice, 1975) outlines that, speakers should "be relevant", i.e. say things related to the current topic of the conversation. (Grice, 1975) briefly gives the example of observance of the maxim of relation as in the following illustration I expect a partner's contribution to be appropriate to immediate needs each stage of the transaction; if I am mixing ingredients for a cake, I do not expect to be handed a good book, or even an oven cloth (though this might be an appropriate contribution at a later stage)"

Based on the illustration above, maxim of Relation is maxim that just focused on relevant of the topic and the statement. The conversation exactly must be relevant, which can make the conversation run well. (Thomas, 1995) confirms that the maxim of Relation is exploited by making a response and observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand e.g. by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address the person's goal in asking a question. Here is the example of maxim of Relation:

*A: where you will go today?*  
*B: I will go to the market.*

In responding A's question, B was gave a relevant answer. This utterance is fulfilled the maxim of relevance cause the answer is relevant to the questions. Thus, the focus on the maxim of Relation is about the relevant from the statement when make a conversation.

#### **2.1.3.4 Maxim of Manner**

Maxim of manner suggests that speakers have to try presenting meaning clearly, concisely orderly, and avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression. (Grice, 1975), then, breaks it down into four subordinates:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression;
2. Avoid ambiguity;
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary wordiness) and;
4. Be orderly. Shortly, this manner requires the speakers to speak directly, orderly, not ambiguous and not exaggerating.

(Grice, 1975) briefly gives the example of observance of the maxim of manner as in the following illustration: "I expect partner to make it clear what



contribution he is making, and to execute his performance with reasonable dispatch". Based on the illustration, the researcher concludes that maxim of manner is maxim which is straight utterances without ambiguity. The speaker must say something without ambiguity which can make the conversation being obscurity. Here is the following for the maxim of manner:

*A: What do you think about our lecturer?*

*B: I really like the way he teaches us. Every his subject is always easy to understand after his explanation.*

In this example, the second party can answer the question of the first party about their lecturer clearly. In usage of maxim manner is focusing on the speaker or second party to response straightforwardly and clearly avoid ambiguity.

#### **2.1.4 Flouting Maxim**

Flouting maxims is the only way of breaking maxims which generates implicature. (Cutting, 2002) states that a speaker who flouts maxims expects the hearers to appreciate the meaning implied but he/she appears not to follow the maxims. Moreover, (Black, 2006) explains that a speaker who flouts maxims is actually aware of the Cooperative Principles and the maxims. In other words, it is not only about the maxims that are broken down but that the speaker chooses an indirect way to achieve the cooperation of the communication. In line with (Black & Curse, 2006) states that a speaker deliberately against one or more maxims and he/she can be said to be obeying the Cooperative Principles since he/she breaks the rules for some good communicative reasons.

On the other hand, Grice said that maxims are important, he realized that in some condition people have to do the deliberate violation or flouting as he calls them (Cook, 1992). The flouting maxim may have some effects such as misunderstanding if the hearer does not give respond to an implication (Gumperz, 1982:) or when the addresser fails to make an inference from the addressor's intention (Introduction, Chierchia, Press, & Semantics, 1990). Thus, it may be understood only if the hearer has the same background knowledge with the speaker. The knowledge includes not only the rules interpretation of linguistic items, but also the knowledge of the world, to which addressors can imply or refer (Coulthard, 1977)

Beside that Gazdar said that in something natural or normal that the speaker/hearer do not obey the cooperative principle (Mey L, 1993). If the speaker/hearer flouts their conversation, it does mean that communication will not be successful. In addition, the flouting of maxim can be many things, and there is no way of prescribing a particular violation as useful or detrimental. Then, the participant will understand the implication of the address or whether the addressees know the situation occasion. It means that the addresses have the same thinking to imply what the speaker said based on the situation.

#### **2.1.4.1 The Flouting Maxim of Quantity**

Quantity maxim flouting means that the speakers of a conversation fail to fulfill the maxim of quantity in the Cooperative Principle. It includes whether the speakers are not as informative as is required or more informative than is required.

Speakers become less informative or more informative when they flout maxim of quantity (Yule, 1996). Below is can be the example of flouting maxim of quantity.

*A : I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.*  
*B : Ah, I brought the bread.*

In this conversation, B tries to say that what is not mentioned is not brought. He intentionally gives too little information to respond to A's utterance so A as the hearer of A is expected to understand the unstated meaning of 'Ah, I brought the bread.' By saying that utterance, B has flouted maxim of quantity because he does not give the required information.

#### **2.1.4.2 The Flouting Maxim of Quality**

When a speaker flouts a maxim of quality, the speaker simply says something that does not represent what he or she actually thinks (Cutting, 2002). The speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quality; a maxim that requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, that is not saying what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks of adequate evidence. Here, the example of maxim flouting of quality:

*A: Teheran's in Turkey isn't it, teacher?*  
*B: And London's in Armenia I suppose.*

In the case presented through the dialogue, A's statement is false. Teheran is not in Turkey, so B states falsely that London is in Armenia to suggest that the statement of A is not correct.

#### **2.1.4.3 The Flouting Maxim of Relevance**

According to (Thomas, 1995), a statement is made to be irrelevant to the topic in maxim of relation flouting. Moreover, (Cutting, 2002) says that, the

speaker who flouts the maxim of relation expects the hearers to be able to imagine what the utterance did not say and make the connection between his/her utterance and the preceding one. Relevance maxim flouting happens when a speaker fails in conversation to be relevant when communicating. Commonly, the speakers are being irrelevant in flouting maxim of relevance. However, being irrelevant does not purely mean that the speakers do not want to be relevant. Sometimes, speakers are being irrelevant because they want to hide something or to say something to others indirectly (Yule, 1996). This is the example of flouting maxim of relevance.

*Annie : Betty, the phone is ringing.*

*Betty : I am in the bath.*

In this exchange, Betty has flouted maxim of relevance by being irrelevant. Betty states an answer with a different topic. Here, Annie is expected to be able to receive Betty's unstated message. Since Betty is in the bath, Annie is expected to answer the phone.

#### **2.1.4.4 The Flouting Maxim of Manner**

To be clear in saying things is what all speakers try to do. However, in some occasion, ambiguity indeed happens whether the speaker intends to make it or not. Then, maxim of manner is not fulfilled as the result. Those who flout the maxim of manner are being obscure and often trying to exclude a third party (Cutting, 2002).

## 2.2 Review of Previous Research

Related to maxim flouting, there have been many researchers conducting the study of it. Fitria Nurhayati is one of the researchers focusing on the maxim flouting as her object of study in 2012. He used descriptive-qualitative method with the entitled “*A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Reflected in the Oprah Winfrey Show in the Exclusive Interview with J. K. Rowling*” aims to describe the types of maxim flouting in the talk show. Besides, it aims to identify politeness principle as maxim flouting in the talk show and explain the purposes of maxim flouting in the talk show. In this thesis Fitria relates maxim flouting to the politeness principle by Fitria. She argues that the most common reason for flouting maxims of Cooperative Principle is to be polite to the others. Therefore, in her thesis, the analysis is about maxim flouting and politeness principle.

The findings of her research are as follows. First, there are three types of maxim flouting in the interview; maxim of quantity, manner, and relevance. The highest rank is placed by quantity maxim flouting. Second, there are six maxims of politeness principle that are found in the interview; agreement maxim, modesty maxim, tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, and sympathy maxim. Finally, the purposes of maxim flouting in the interview based on the self-presentation of Rowling are found in four types. They are identity development, social approval, self-esteem, and social reward. Identity development and social approval place at the highest rank since Rowling shares much of her life experience and wishes that she is accepted, with her personality and thought, by the public.

Another research which focuses on the maxim flouting were conducted by Isasa Ali Umar Al-Qaderi in (2015) entitled *A Pragmatic Analysis of Applying Violating the Maxims to the Yemeni Dialect*. The prime aim of this research is to investigate Gricean Theory of Conversational Implicature and its application to the Arabic language. For the purpose of investigating such a theory, semi-structured interviews with 15 Yemeni participants were audio-recorded, transcribed, translated and then interpreted. There were four Ph.D. candidates, four M.A. candidates and seven B.A. candidates. Both a qualitative and a quantitative approach were adopted. The analysis focused on violating the conversational maxims. The findings showed that Gricean Theory of Conversational Implicature can be applied to Arabic language, particularly the Yemeni dialect. In addition, the results revealed that the maxim of Quality was most frequently violated. Then follow by the maxims of Quantity, Relation and Manner respectively.

The last of reference of this research is Jihan Achyun Kusuma is one of them who also focus on maxim flouting as the object of her study. His thesis was done in 2012 entitled *“A Socio- Pragmatic Analysis of the Flouting of Cooperative Principle Maxims Done by the Main Character in Cinderella Man”*. This research is aimed at investigating men’s linguistic features, analyzing the flouting maxims of cooperative principles and explaining the reasons why the male main character in Cinderella Man flouts certain maxims of cooperative principle. This research employed mainly descriptive qualitative method and quantitative method to support in interpreting and analyzing the data. The theories

that were used to explain the sociolinguistics aspects were language and gender by Wardaugh and also Wodak and Blanke. The theory of Cooperative Principles by Grice used 31 to explain the types of maxim flouting. In his thesis found the main character often break rules of communication. He flouts the maxim of cooperative principle in highly number. The result flouting maxim of quantity reached 23 (44%), flouting maxim of quality 5 (10%), flouting maxim of relation 16 (31%) and flouting maxim of manner 8(15%).

In addition, for the reason of maxim flouting, the researcher applied the theory by Wardaugh. The results of the research show that the main male character employed all the four kinds of men's linguistic features. On the other hand, the main male character flouted all the types of maxim flouting. She also found out that the reasons why the main male character flouted the maxim were to show power, give detail information, and express emotion and solidarity.