CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL BASES

This chapter describes and explains the theoretical review of research. This theory regards the pragmatics, cooperative principles, conversational maxims, flouting conversational maxims, why people flout the maxims, “IN TIME” movie, and previous studies.

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies language from the aspect of actual usage. Levinson (1983) in Tarigan (1990 : 33) states that “Pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and context that is the basis for a record or report language understanding, in other words; study of the language user's ability to connect and harmonize their sentences and contexts appropriately”.

In relation to pragmatics, Leech (1983:5-6) explains that the purpose of pragmatic is studying the speech (what is it for); ask what someone means by a speech act, and associate meaning with someone who talks to, where, when and how. Thomas (1995: 2) named the two tendencies in pragmatics is divided into two parts, first, using a social perspective, connecting with the pragmatic meaning of the speaker (speaker meaning), and second, using a cognitive perspective, connecting with a pragmatic interpretation of utterances (utterance interpretation).

In language studies, pragmatics is a very wide field. It examines our use and our understanding of the language we speak and hear, read and write. Pragmatics also
examines the importance in language studies of our general knowledge, and the importance of common-sense knowledge of our world.

Because of the range of pragmatics is so wide, so the author is focusing on the Cooperative Principle which is proposed by Paul Grice.

**2.2. Cooperative Principles**

| The Cooperative Principle: Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Grice, 1989: 26). |

In Cooperative principle, Grice (in Leech: 1993) argues that in order to implement the cooperative principles, each element must obey four conversational maxims. They are maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and Manner.

These conversational maxims above explain that the success of a conversation depends on the various speaker' approach to the interaction. Thus, if you want to make the process of interactions and communication between the speaker and the listener is going well, you have to be cooperative with the maxims.

Grice proposes that in ordinary conversation, speaker and listener share a cooperative principle. Speaker shapes their utterances to be understood by listener and the listener is expected to give an expected answer to the speaker. So, in order to create a good conversation, there will be a conversational maxim which make a good conversation is going well.
2.3. Conversational Maxims

A good conversation is developed by the cooperation they make. They have to obey some rules that are called as conversational maxims which are mentioned above. They are also sometimes named Grice's or Gricean maxims. They are as follows:

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. Relation Be relevant.

d. Manner Be perspicuous
1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

The Cooperative principle (following Grice 1975) (in Yule, 1996: 37)

1. The Maxim of Quantity

Rahardi (2003:27) described that in the quantity maxim, a speaker is expected to deliver a message or information that is truly adequate, enough, and give the information to the listener as informative as required. In the other words, it can be interpreted that the information or message which is given by the speaker or partners should not be excessive and should be in accordance with what is being asked or required for partners.
2. The Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality is a maxim which describes that the speaker has to provide the information in accordance with the facts. In the other words, speaker should be truthful. They should not say what they think is false, or make statements for which they have no evidence.

By applying the maxim of quality on Grice cooperation principle, a speaker is expected to deliver something truly real, and in accordance with the real facts in communication event (Rahardi, 2003:31).

3. The Maxim of Relation

In maxim of relation, it is obviously stated that in order to make a good cooperation between the speaker and the listener, they should give a relevance contribution about something which is being on their conversation. Rahardi (2003:31). The speaker’ contributions should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange. A speech can be said to carry out the maxim of relevance when the speech which is given to the listener is an appropriate response.

4. The Maxim Of Manner

The maxim of manner in the cooperative principle of Grice requires that each participant are always greeted speak directly, clearly and the message should not be ambiguous or obscure it (Rahardi, 2003:31). So, the contribution should be giving clear message to the hearer, not contain an ambiguous message, be brief and be orderly.
In order to make a clear interpretation about these maxims, Grice lists briefly one such analogue for each conversational category and give relevant contribution to what Grice regards as a fundamental question about the Cooperative Principle and its attendant maxim (Grice, 1989: 28).

a. Quantity. If you are assisting me to mend a car, I expect your contribution to be neither more nor less than is required. If, for example, at particular stage I need four screws, I expect you to hand me four, rather than two or six.

b. Quality. I expect your contributions to be genuine and not spurious. If I need a 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.

c. Relation. I expect a partner’s contribution to be appropriate to the immediate needs at 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 later stage).

d. Manner. I expect a partner to make it clear what contribution he is making and execute his performance with reasonable dispatch. (Grice, 1989: 28)

2.4. Flouting Cooperative Principle

In communications, a speaker tries to say something to the listener and hopes the listener can understand what will be said by the speaker, and then gives an expected respond for the speaker. But, when the listener does not give the answer of what the speaker expected or maybe the listener gives the answer more than the speaker expected, it means that the maxim is exploited. It can be said as a flouting of utterance. Meyer (2009: 56) stated, “When a maxim is violated (or “flouted”), a conversational implicature results, i.e., the utterance receives an interpretation that goes beyond the word are spoken”.
As Grundy (2000:78) strengthens it in his theory, “Flouting a maxim is a particular salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicature”. So, based on some statements above, I can say that the flouting of maxim is when the utterance violates or flouts the conversational maxim which is known as the maxim of cooperative principle and result the implicature. But here, I am not talking about the Implicature raise on the conversation. I am just talking about the flouting of maxim conversation which exists on the movie’s conversation.

a. The Flouting of Quantity Maxim

Rahardi (2003:27) described that in the quantity maxim, a speaker is expected to deliver a message or information that is truly adequate, enough, and give the information to the listener as informative as required. In other words, it can be interpreted that the information or message which is given by the speaker or partners should not be excessive and should be in accordance with what is being asked or required for partners. The sections that did not contain the information which is needed by the partners can be said as “a flouting of quantity maxim” in the Grice’s cooperative principle. For example:

a. My neighbor is pregnant.

b. My neighbor girl is pregnant.

Utterance A is concise and it does not break the value of the truth because everyone knows that pregnant is a girl. The word “girl” in utterances B is explaining something which is clear. So, in this case, the word “girl” in utterance B breaks the rules of maxim quantity.
b. The Flouting of Quality Maxim

The maxim of quality is a maxim which describes that the speaker has to provide the information in accordance with the facts. In the other word, speaker should be truthful. They should not say what they think is false, or make statements for which they have no evidence.

By applying the maxim of quality on Grice cooperation principle, a speaker is expected to deliver something truly real, and in accordance with the real facts in communication event (Rahardi, 2003:31). The utterance which is not based on reality and unclear data support, concrete, and cannot be accounted for, and then it can be said as “a flouting of quality maxim”. For example:

Teacher : Rudi, what is the capital city of Gorontalo?
Rudi : Makassar, Sir!
Teacher : Great, then the capital city of South Sulawesi is Limboto.

The example above shows that the teacher gives a contribution which broke the maxim of quality. The teacher said that the capital city of South Sulawesi is Limboto, not Makassar. The answer which is not appropriate with the maxim of quality was told as a reaction for Rudi’s answer. It is because he gives a wrong answer to the teacher. The word “Great” which is said by the teacher is not conventional. It is because it does not use to praise Rudi, but for twitting him. For the explanation above, it can be concluded that in this conversation, the utterance is not based on reality and it can be said as a “flouting of quality maxim”. So, try to tell something based on the fact.
c. The Flouting of Relation Maxim

In maxim of relation, it is obviously stated that in order to make a good cooperation between the speaker and the listener, they should give a relevance contribution about something which is being on their conversation. Rahardi (2003:31). In the other words, speaker' contributions should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange. A speech can be said to carry out the maxim of relevance when the speech which is given to the listener is an appropriate response. Therefore, if a speaker or partner does not give a relevance contribution, it means that the speaker break the rules of the relevance maxim. For example:

Visitor : What time is it?
Librarian : The library will be close in a minute.

The librarian’s answer seems like has no relationship with the question which is asked by the visitor. However, it has an implication which can be explained if you give more attention to the answer. The librarian’s answer does not answer the visitor’s questions directly, but by looking at the librarian’s schedule when he opens and closes the library, it shows us what time it is in that time. On the explanation above, it can be concluded that do not say something unclear. You should give a good relevance contribution to the listener.
d. The Flouting of Manner Maxim

The maxim of manner in the cooperative principle of Grice requires that each participant are always greeted speak directly, clearly and the message should not be ambiguous or obscure it (Rahardi, 2003:31). For example:

A : Let’s stop and get something to eat.
B : Okay, but not H – o – t – d – o – g.

Take a look the example above, the utterance B answers the utterance A indirectly by elaborated the answer one by one the word “hotdog”. The example above violates the maxim of manner, because the B produces a more elaborate, spelled out (i.e. less brief) version of his message, implicating that B does not want A understand what he meant. By looking the explanation above, it can be concluded that clarity of expression is highly valued in what we say and write (Meyer, 2009:59).

2.5. Why People Flout The Maxims

When the people do not fulfill the Grice cooperative principle rules, it means that they flout or violate the maxims. It can be said as the flouting of cooperative principle. Flouting of maxim is the condition which takes place when the individuals deliberately cease to apply the maxims to persuade their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances, which the speaker employs implicature (Levinson, 1983).

There will be some purposes to flout a maxim such as avoiding hurting the hearer’s feelings, twitting someone by praising him or her, avoiding an interrogation, lies when avoiding unpleasant consequences such as punishment or to be forced to
study for the rest of the day. These reasons sometimes become their reason when they flout a maxim.

2.6. “IN TIME” Movie

In this research, I choose movie as the object of my research. It is because I think that the movie has some advantages than any objects of literature such as drama, poetry, prose and so on. When you choose one of literatures such as prose, it is hard to identify the context which occurred on the prose. You have to be careful to determine the context because sometimes it bias with the author’s mind. Sometimes it is hard to catch the context of prose which is conveyed by the authors, but on movie, it can give the context of utterance clearly. So you do not need to imagine the situation which occurred on context. That is the reason why I choose the movie as the object of my research.

In this case, I choose Andrew Niccol’s Movie “In Time” as my objective of research. It is because I believe that there are some characteristics of this movie have the data which I need to observe. When I watched this movie, I found some flouting of utterances occurred on this movie. That makes me feel so excited to take this movie as my object of research for conducting this research.

“IN TIME” is a Sci-fi movie which is produced by Andrew Niccol and released in 2011. This movie is talking about someone who has to face the reality that he has to work hard for collecting the time for living in daily life. Time is like money. Their life depends on the time they have. If they lose their time, it means that it is the end of their lives. Will Salas (Justin Timberlake) is a human being who lives in a
world that makes the time as the time of their lives in this world. In other words, they can live longer by the time they have on their left arm. Will works on the construction of the charging time and reward enough time for him to live each day. That time can also be exchanged for the goods they want such calls, buying drinks, and it feels like time is also considered money. However, the rich man always has much time. Thus, they can live for centuries for the rest of their lives.

That is why in the world, many people die because their time runs out. One night, Will sees a person who has very much time, and saves the person from the threat of thieves of time. The person later told Salas about him that he has been bored to live because of his original live also has reached the age of 100 years while the time owned by the person is also more than 100 years left. He told Will that it would not be fun if people live forever or immortal. Finally, the person gives all his time to Will until he died.

Will has a lot of time now. He gives his time to his best friends and also shares with the people he knew. Unfortunately, his mother runs out of time by the time he wants to meet her and share the time he got. It makes Will was so devastated. Therefore, he decided to go to Greenwich. This is a place of people who have a lot of time or the rich men. Will is so different among the rich man because he does things quickly and independently. He argues that Greenwich people are people who have been stealing the lives of people in his city.
2.7. Previous Studies

To give an evidence of originality of this study, I present the previous studies that have been conducted in the different study on the pragmatic analysis.

Lailatul Mukarromah (2008), with her study entitled A Discourse Analysis on Hedging and Flouting g Maxims Found in The Script of “RushHour 2” Movie”. This research is design to know The effectiveness and efficiency of delivering information are needed in communication. It is essential to use Grice’s maxims theory of cooperative principles to avoid misinterpretation and misunderstanding.

Yuanita Damayanti, English Language Education Study Program Postgraduate Program, Semarang State University (2011), with her study entitled Analysis on Flouting Maxims Found In Kungfu Panda Movie Script Written By Jonathan Aibel and Glenn Berger. Submitted for the completion of final test of Pragmatics, this study focuses on the flouting of conversational maxim found in the movie Kung Fu Panda. The purpose of this study is to find out the types and the frequencies of maxim flouted. This study is based on the theory of Cooperative Principle, proposed by Grice (1970), which establishes four maxims, that is Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Relevance, and Maxim of Manner.

The difference of my research and theirs is based on the content of research. My research discuss about the theory of the flouting. All of the theory of flouting is discussed more deeply than theirs. Every side of content is supporting by some experts. Their research just contains a little information about the flouting. They just have a little source to support their work and they do not discuss more deeply about
the theory they use, no enough source to support their work. in the other word, the theory which is used by them seems like just for the general knowledge about the research.