Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Theoretical framework

In this study, the writer needs a tool to achieve the purpose of the study itself. The tool is a theory of Grice’s maxims cooperative principle which is used to identify the dialogue conversation produced by the main characters in Fast Furious movie.

Therefore, this chapter presents the theory of Grice’s maxims cooperative principle. In addition, there is also related previous study to show the differences and similarities between this study and another study.

2.1. Pragmatic

Communication clearly depends on not only recognizing the meaning of words in an utterance, but recognizing what speakers mean by their utterance. The study of what speakers mean, or “speaker meaning,” is called pragmatic (Yule 2010:127).

These are the four areas that pragmatics is concerned with. The first is pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. It means that pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). The second is pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. This type of study necessarily the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. The third is
pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said. This approach also necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning. This type of study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. The last area of pragmatics is pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much needs to be said (Yule 1996:3).

There are advantages of studying language by pragmatic. The advantages are the one can talk about people’s intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of actions (for example, request) that they are performing when they speak (Yule 1996:4).

2.2 The cooperative principle

Grice’s theory of meaning is construed as a theory of communication; it has the interesting consequence that it gives an account of how communication might be achieved in the absence of any conventional means for expressing the intended message (Levinson 1983:101). Sometimes people do not apply Grice’s theory of meaning to construct good communication. They talk irrelevantly such as they do not answer the question by stating something that is inappropriate with the question. This phenomenon is called a conversational implicature. Grice’s second theory, in which he develops the concept of implicature, is essentially a theory about how people use language (Levinson 1983:101). Considering the fact
above, Grice formulated a general principle of language use called the cooperative principle which is very helpful for efficient and effective use language in conversation. Grice divided the cooperative principle into four kinds. They are maxim of quantity, quality, relevance and manner.

2.2.1 Maxim of quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The statement above is means that if one wants to say something, just say it directly and do not make the contribution more informative than is required.

Example:

Brian : Dom here yet?
Vince : No

Brian asks to Vince about Dom position because Brian does not know where Dom is. From Vince utterance, he gives information as is Brian required. In the dialogue above, Vince make the contribution as informative as is required.

2.2.2 Maxim of quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.

2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The statement above is means that speakers are expected to be sincere, to be saying something that they believe corresponds to reality. Example:
Dom : One thing we know for sure is that they wanted this car.
Brian : Because something is in it.
Dom : If we find out what it is, we’ll know what we’re up against.

Based on dialogue above, Dom and Brian are curious what the special from this car is. This car make Reyes asks all of people in Rio to find it. Dom and Brian believe that there is something in this car. In dialogue above, Dom and Brian say something that they believe corresponds to reality.

2.2.3 Maxim of relation

Make your contributions relevant.

The statement above is means that speakers are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been said before. Example:

Chief of police : Is all this really necessary to apprehend two men?
Hobbs : Let me tell you something about these two men. One is a former federal officer, been in deep cover for five years. He knows every way you're going to come for him. The other one is a professional criminal, escaped prison twice, spent half his life on the run avoiding folks like you.

Based on dialogue above, chief of police does not know about two men who will hunt by Hobbs. So Hobbs explains more detail about two men. In dialogue above, Hobbs say something that is relevant to what has been said before.

2.2.4 Maxim of manner
Be perspicuous and specifically

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.

2. Avoid ambiguity.

3. Be brief.

4. Be orderly.

The statement above is means that we should be brief and orderly, and avoid obscurity and ambiguity. Example:

Brian : All right, so our target's name is Hernan Reyes. And he runs the drug scene down here. He's never been busted because he doesn't leave a paper trail.

Gisele : No paper trail means no banks. And no banks means cash houses.

Brian : That's right

Brian introduces Hernan Reyes to Gisele. Brian tells about what Reyes business is and how Reyes business is. Based on dialogue above, Brian be perspicuous and specifically to tell about Reyes. So it makes Gisele easy to understand who Hernan Reyes is.

2.2.5 Non-observance of the maxims

According to Elizabeth (2006:24), there are four ways of failing to observe the maxims. The four ways of failing to observe the maxims are *flouting a maxim*, *violating a maxim*, *opting out of a maxim* and *a clash maxim*. The writer will explain one by one the four ways of failing to observe the maxim.

1. Flouting
One makes clear to the hearer that one is aware of the co-operative principle and the maxims, so that the audience is led to consider why the principle or a maxim was broken. The assumption, in other words, is not that communication has broken down, but that the speaker has chosen an indirect way of achieving it (Elizabeth 2006:25). A participant in a conversation chooses to ignore one or more of the maxims by using a conversational implicature. Ignoring maxims by using conversational implicatures means that the participant adds meaning to the literal meaning of the utterance. The conversational implicature that is added when flouting is not intended to deceive the recipient of the conversation, but the purpose is to make the recipient look for other meaning. It is explain by Andresen cited in Thomas 1995:65.

2. Violating

Violating a maxim often with the intention to mislead, this is often a quiet act, also known as lying (Elizabeth 2006:24). It means that someone in a conversation fails to observe one or more maxims with the intention to deceive the recipient, often using an implicature with the intention to mislead. Since the information is untrue and misleading, the person is violating the maxim of quality.

3. A clash

Elizabeth (2006:24) stated that arises when one cannot be fully co-operative. For instance, to fulfil one maxim (say, of quantity) might require one to break another (of quality), in a situation where one is not
certain of the accuracy of some information, and hence uncertain whether to say something which may be helpful, but where one’s evidence is inadequate. It means that participants in a conversation are not expecting the maxims to be fully fulfilled, since the participants are withholding information that is to them culturally necessary.

4. Opting out

Opting out of a maxim occurs when someone is indicating that they are unwilling to cooperate in the way a maxim operates. Elizabeth (2006:24) stated that making clear that one is aware of the maxim, but is prevented for some reason from observing it. It means that the opting out of a maxim often occurs when someone wants to withhold the truth for reasons that are ethical or private. In this case the non-observance is not designed to create a false implicature or to appear uncooperative. Opting out of the maxims is different from a flouting of the maxims since the person is signaling that she does not want to be cooperative. A flouting of the maxims is to deliberately fail to observe a maxim in order to create an implicature.

The focus of this thesis is flouting maxims, since flouting is one way a non-observes a maxims which participants can be understand the deep meaning of a speech or utterance. Flouting focus on the study about literal meaning of what speaker said, but the others not focus on literal meaning, we do not know what the meaning of speaker said. We can be misguided and we can be embarrassed.
2.2.6 Flouting the cooperative principle

Flouting the co-operative principle is happened on some occasions. The speakers do the flouting intend their hearer to understand what the speaker’s flouting about. Equally it may be socially acceptable, and indeed preferred, to flout a maxim (such as quality) for reasons of tact and politeness, such as when I ask someone if they like something I am wearing or the do not. Sometimes, the speakers do not observe the maxim inside his/her flouted, and it intend their hearer (of flouting) to be aware of this. For the following example:

Librarian: [raises his eyes, look at the student with no facial expression]
Student: Hi. Could you check for me whether I have any books to collect?
Librarian: [swipes the student’s card, clears his throat, glances at the computer screen, turns to the shelf to get some books]
Student: Any more?
Librarian: [turns and gets a third book, stamps them all with the return date]
Student: Is that all?
Librarian: Are you going to borrow all the books in the library?
Student: Ok.. I see.. thank you very much

When a student goes to the library to collect books she had asked to be put on hold for him. In the last line, the librarian knows what he is saying is not true (but it is possible), to intends the student to know what he means. Flouting that used by the librarian is use to convey and to make the student aware and intend that there is no book to collect anymore.

People may also flout about the maxim. It’s about when speakers are intends to use their maxim of relation, maxim of quantity, etc. For the following example is when an American student has asked a Chinese student direction to the station. As they are walking, the following conversation occurs:
Chinese student: What do you do in America?
American student: I work in a bank.
CS: It’s a good job, isn’t it?
AS: Well, just so so.
CS: Then, how much is your salary every month?
AS: Oh no... Why are you asking that kind of question?
AS: The station isn’t far, is it?

Here the question that come from Chinese student does not observe the
maxim of relation for an English conversation. The American student do the
flouting is to asking to the Chinese student to stop his asking about American
student’s salary. He is not aware of this, although the American student clearly is
(Brian 2006:64-65).

2.3 Previous studies

This study has analysis by some people. In previous study, as I know that
comedy or humor genre is become a favorite object for some researcher to
analysis flouting maxims. This is the some previous study in PETRA University,
and UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The first is from Petra University. There are two
people who analysis about flouting maxims. They are Veronica Erly Dwi H and
Silvia Indra Dewi Susilo. The first is Veronica Erly Dwi H (2005) discuss about
the flouting of conversational maxim in Javanese short story “Pacarku
Ngandheg”. She used the theory of the cooperative principle from H.P Grice
(1975), the concept of flouting. She used descriptive and quantity approach. She
used descriptive to describe systematically the object of the study factually and
accurately (cf. Stephen, I &William, B.M, 1981), while she uses quantity to know
frequently flouted maxim in her study. The data taken from conversation
produced by the main characters in short story entitle Pacarku ngandheg. She finds that there are 137 total of incidents of flouting the maxims, and the most flouted maxims is the maxim of relevance. She also find that The reason why they do it because the conversation not to go smoothly like uninformative, not well corresponding, changes topic, make obscurity, give too much information, avoid talking something, not brief.

The second is Silvia Indra Dewi Susilo (2011). She discuss about “The flouting of conversational maxims by the main male characters in wedding crashers movie”. Wedding crasher is the funniest movie whose characters have given many humorous impressions to the viewer. she used qualitative method to know what maxims are flouted in wedding crashers and which maxims is flouted the most in weeding crashers. She used the cooperative principle from Grice theory. In her study, She find that there are three maxims in wedding crasher movie and the most flouted is maxim of quality.

The third is Faulina Kurniati (2014) from UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. She discusses about an analysis of humorous elements in comedy show YKS “Yuk keep smile”. YKS is a comedy television program in TRANS TV. In her study she tries to find about what maxims are violated in YKS show and what maxims are flouted in YKS show. In her discussion, she finds that the type of humor in YKS can not only be applied in the free humor as those in a magazine or in a book of humor. In YKS, the dialogue contains humor that can be classified in to several kinds of maxims. Furthermore, the analysis of the Grice’s maxims shows that
each types of humor contain the deviation of the maxims. The utterances which indicate maxim violation in those comedy show script violates all kinds of maxim.

As the writer has explains before that some researcher has to analysis flouting maxims in various objects. The object is drama comedy TV series, comedy show, and short story. The previous study in Petra and UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya were conducted in same field as the writer’s study but there are still some differences that can be found between the writer’s study and the previous one. The difference is about object. Some researchers choose to analysis flouting maxims in comedy genre, but the writer chooses to analysis flouting maxims in thriller movie and she chooses fast five, movie. The writer hopes that the discussion of the previous study can act as a guidance to answer the research question.