

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Communication is a process of exchanging ideas between individuals or groups of people and it is something that can not be separated from human life. Connecting with other people is essential to be able to survive in community in the environment around the house, the school, the workplace, and even playground. In communication, a conversation is a tool to connect with other people. Conversation is a human need in which two or more participants perform or use linguistic forms and nonverbal signals interactively to communicate with each other. (Brennan, 2010). The existence of dialogue between participants is expected to achieve a result. Through conversation there are many ideas, information and even emotions can be conveyed, be it happiness, sadness, humour and others. Therefore, a conversation that goes well can be seen from the results, namely the agreement or action obtained, therefore it is very crucial to know how a conversation can go well and what things support a conversation to run effectively.

Language acts as a communication tool and plays an essential role in social activities. Understanding of language structure is a long process that humans have undergone since childhood. In reality, misunderstanding often occurs in social life so that sometimes it causes serious problems. There are many debates that occur because

of the inaccurate process of receiving information and conveying it. When the speaker conveys something, it is expected that all facts will be understood by the listener. Therefore, it is essential for speakers and listeners to have the same background knowledge. Tsutsui (2008) concludes that without shared knowledge the communication is most likely to be misinterpreted when conveying our thoughts or ideas to others. However, it's clear that misinterpretation may cause chaos in communication and has become problem in social relation for a long times.

Based on this social phenomenon, misunderstanding or misinterpretation becomes a barrier to the effectiveness of communication. Therefore, it is essential to research and know the cause of its occurrence. Maxim is one part of this science and needed whether the speaker can be cooperative or not in terms of providing the information and able to contribute to this phenomenon. Grice (1975) concludes that there are four maxims that occur in conversation. They are: Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Relation, and Maxim of Manner. Quality in a conversation is required to provide information that has proof of its truth, not adding anything else just because personal opinions are not necessarily correct. The appropriate quantity of information exchanged in a conversation depends on if the information provided matches what is requested or needed. There is no need to add other information that is not related to the thing being discussed. A good relationship in a conversation is when the talk is relevant to the things being discussed. When the speaker discusses fruit, it is expected that the interlocutor will also discuss the fruit so that the information received

is relevant in two directions. And the last Maxim of Manner in a conversation can be known when the conversation is clear and there is no ambiguity information between the speaker and the listener.

This study analyzed the flouted maxim that was found in “*Friends*” Movie. This movie was aired in 1994-2004 and was created and directed by David Crane and Marta Kauffman. *Friends* movie is an American sitcom with the comedy-drama genre and played by Jennifer Aniston, Courteney Cox, Lisa Kudrow, Mat LeBlanc, Matthew Perry, and David Schwimmer. This movie revolves around the friendship of six adults who face the realities of life, finding true love, work-life, and family problems wrapped in comedy. This movie was chosen as research data because the movie is suitable to be used as learning material since the movie has helped many people around the world to learn English language, and culture through the witty communication that they have shown in the movie makes the learning process enjoyable to go through. In addition to that, there are a lot of flouting maxim that occurs in the conversation. The existence of this flouting of maxim can be a perfect source to be used as data for analysis so that it can be used as a reference or lesson to avoid the occurrence of similar flouting maxim.

Based on the phenomena above, the flouting maxim as a topic was chosen to be analyzed since misunderstanding often occurs in everyday life and sometimes causes serious problems. There are many debates that occur because of the inaccurate process of receiving information and conveying it. When the speaker conveys something, it is expected that the listener will understand all the fact. Therefore, it is essential for

speakers and listeners have the same background knowledge. It is necessary to make sure that the things under discussion are the same.

1.2 Problems of the Study

Based on the background of this study, there are two problems proposed in this study. They are as below:

1. What maxims are flouted in *Friends* movie?
2. Why are those maxim flouted by the characters in *Friends* movie?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

In relation of the problem mentioned, the aim of this study are as below :

1. The study intends to find out the maxims that are flouted in the conversation in *Friends* movie.
2. To identify the reason of flouting maxim in utterances based on the context of situation in *Friends* movie.

1.4 Limitation of the Study

This study examine the flouting of cooperative principle which is more specifically about the flouting maxims found in the movie entitled: *Friends* and then concern about the kinds of flouting maxim and why are those maxim flouted by the characters in *Friends* movie? Considering that this video has 10 with many episodes, this research

limit the data source so that it used season 1, episodes 1-10 as the data source of this research.

The problems of this study use different expert's theories. The first problem is what are the maxims flouted in *Friends* movie that analyzed using Grice's theory, referred to as Gricean Maxim. The second problem of this study is why are those maxims flouted by the character in *Friends* movie, it analyzed using Leech's theory and Halliday's theory as the supporting theory.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study consist of two, they are theoretical significance ad practically significance.

1.5.1 Theoretical Significance

Theoretically, this study is expected to contribute greatly in providing an understanding of the types and the function of flouting maxim to readers. The reader can improve communication skills with good language accuracy during conversation. This research is also expected to help anyone doing research related to the flouting maxim in the future.

1.5.2 Practical Significance

Practically, the result of this study may provide suggestions in the form of recommendations for readers who are interested in studying and deepening the science of pragmatics. Get an understanding of how the flouting maxim occurs, its impact, and

how to overcome the flouting maxim that has already occurred in the conversation. Therefore, it is hoped that this study can help to create healthy communication in all conditions that occurred.



CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, CONCEPTS, AND THEORIES

2.1 Review of Related Literature

In accomplishing this study entitled “An Analysis of Flouting Maxim found in Friends Movie”, this study also raises three theses that discuss related research to become a guide and reference. The first thesis entitled “An Analysis of Cooperative Principles in *1 Mile To You* and It's Application in Teaching Speaking at Senior High School” was written by Wiji Lestari in 2017. The study analyzed the types of Cooperative Principles used in *1 Mile To You* movie, the most dominant maxim in *1 Mile To You* movie and the application of Cooperative Principles in teaching speaking of Senior High School. The result of the study is, to find out that there are 67 dialogues that contain 10 dialogues belong to maxim of quality with the percentage 14.71%, 32 dialogues belong to maxim of quantity with the percentage 47.06%, 18 dialogues belong to maxim of relevance with the percentage 26.47%, and 9 dialogues that belong to maxim of manner with the percentage 11.76%. At the end of discussion, the study tries to find an idea that can be used in senior high school to make the student's more competent and able to be proficient in communication using the Cooperative Principle because it is one of the essential principles that guide the running of community communication and the main goal of teaching spoken English. The similarity of this study with Lestari's study are both studies analyze about

cooperative principles. The differences, Lestary's Study explained about the maxim that obeys in *1 Mile To You* and the application in teaching speaking while this study intense to explain the types of flouting maxim and the reason behind the characters flouting the maxim based on the context of situation that occurs in *Friends* movie.

The second entitled “An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in K-POP Fanpage Interaction on Twitter” was written by Syarifita Ulia in 2020. The study analyzed the types of flouting maxim in K-POP fanpage interaction on Twitter and analyzed the reason why flouting maxim occurs in K-POP fanpage on Twitter based on their own opinion. The study used descriptive qualitative method. The result of the study, from the total data 60 replies or utterances found in the interaction found that the flouting maxim of quantity is done 36 times by K-Pop fans and the reason, the flouting maxim of quality is done by the K-pop fans 3 times, the flouting of maxim relation is done 5 times the flouting maxim of manner is done 9 times, and the reason of K-Pop fan flout the maxim of quantity are: to build one's belief, give an opinion, declare something, to make a joke, express their feeling, To confirm something, avoid the topic, state the fact, share their story, and not interested in the topic. The similarity of this study with Ulia's study are both studies analyzed the flouting maxim in the movie script. The differences, Ulia's Study analyzed about the flouting maxim in K-POP fan page interaction on Twitter. The previous study also analyzed the reasons for flouting of maxim based on researcher's own opinion while this study intense to explain the reason behind the

characters flouting the maxim by Leech's theories and used Halliday's theory as a supporting theory to analyze the context of situation that occurs in *Friends* Movie.

The third previous study was an article entitled "Maxim Flouting in Brooklyn Nine-Nine" was written by Michelia Kanzha Novera in 2021. The study analyzed the types of flouting maxim of Cooperative Principles that flouted by the main character in Brooklyn Nine-Nine movie. This study used descriptive qualitative method. Data collection is done with the documentation method. The result of this study was, the researcher found the total 32 data and found all types of flouting maxim by Grice they were, flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim relation, flouting maxim of manner. The researcher concluded that the flouting maxims occurred because the participant did not convey the idea or information in their mind directly so that there was an implied meaning in their conversation. The similarity of this study with Novera's study are both studies analyzed the flouting maxim by Grice's theory. The differences, Novera's study analyzed the context behind the flouting maxim based on Theory of Context by Cutting (2002) while this study focused on analyzing the reason behind the characters flouting the maxim by Leech's theoris. that occurs in *Friends* movie.

2.2 Concepts

In conducting a study, theories can clearly explain every concept or term that appears in all forms of research. Therefore, this chapter discussed the theory related to

the flouting maxim itself as the basis for the analysis of this research. Some of the concepts that explained are Pragmatics, Flouting Maxim, and Movie.

2.2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is part of science that studies meaning by focusing on or emphasizing its context. Different contexts clearly produce different meanings. Levinson (1983: 21) concludes that pragmatics is a study that deals with the relationship between language itself, language usage and understanding which draws valid conclusions about what is assumed along with what is being discussed. The practice of language itself is distinctly different from the standpoints and contexts that emerge. Therefore, it is essential to know how we as social beings apply language as an appropriate communication in every interaction in order to present an understanding of the relationship of the language context itself.

2.2.2. Flouting Maxim

Thomas (1995: 65) concludes that the flouting maxim occurs when the interlocutor fails to understand and draw conclusions about what is being said, even deliberately producing implicatures. Flouting maxim occurs because the speaker's understanding background is different and gives the effect of misunderstanding by not giving the proper response in the conversation itself. In line with Cutting (2002: 37) when flouting a maxim, the speaker assumes that the listener knows that their conversation should not be taken face value and they might infer the implicit. The flouting maxim type is the same as the maxim type described above.

2.2.3. Movie

Movie is a form of literary work as a place to express art in the form of visual aids which displays a moving recording on a screen. Hornby (2006: 905) concludes that the movie is a collection of images that can move in a voice that serves to convey an idea or story shown in theatres. However, in today's era we no longer need to go to the cinema to be able to watch a movie. Advances in technology and film make it easy for us to access a film as entertainment and relieve boredom from our activities. Watching a movie has become a hobby for many people around the world and children and adults have made watching movie a fun activity. There are so many genres that we can watch according to our tastes such as *Documentary Movie*, *Fictional Movie*, and *Animated Movie*. Therefore, it can be concluded that humans are the most prominent connoisseurs of literary works because the development of the world of film continues to be of higher quality and more excellent.

2.3 Theories

There are 3 theories used in this study, The first theory is proposed by Grice (1975) in his book entitled *Logic and Conversation* and this theory is used to analyzing the types of flouting maxim found in *Friends* and the second theory is proposed by Leech (1983) in the book entitled *Principles of Pragmatics* is used to analyze the reason behind the characters flouting the maxim based on the context of situation. The context of situation by Halliday's theory (1985) used as a supporting theory to analyze the reasons of flouting maxim that occurs in *Friends* movie.

2.3.1 Cooperative Principle

Yule (1996: 37) says that Cooperative Principle is a principal term topic in pragmatic science that discusses and expects society to have cooperative conversations. Cooperative means having relationships with each other related to the discussion so that the conversation goes successfully without misunderstanding. without cooperation, interaction would be counterproductive. Cooperative Principle can occur when all parties who participate in a conversation can obey the rules in cooperative conversation where the conversation must be of quality, quantity, relevance. It is widely known as The Gricean Maxim, which means that the maxim is one way to analyze the link between utterances and what is understood from these utterances. Grice (1975: 45) states that *Cooperative Principle* contains fundamental basic maxims of conversation or general principles and concludes: *"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."*

The term Cooperative Principle is related to the conversational maxim discussed by Paul Grice (1975) in his book entitled *Logic and Conversation*. The cooperative principle is divided into four forms or parts known as flouting, violating, opting out and infringing (Yule 1966: 49). This study would focus discusses about flouting maxim which is divided into four parts; they are the flouting of the maxim of quantity, flouting of the maxim of quality, flouting of the maxim relation/relevance, and the flouting of

the maxim manner. In this subchapter, this study contain a more detailed explanation of the maxim forms and its flouting as below:

2.3.1.1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity expects the participant to contribute as much as needed to the conversation. Cutting (2002: 34) concludes that *"speakers should be as informative as is required, that they should give neither too little information nor too much"*. In the book of Yule (1996: 36), maxim of quantity has some point such as to making the contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange) or should not make the contribution more informative that is required.

2.3.1.2 Maxim of Quality

Based on Maxim of Quality, the participant is expected only to reveal what actually happened and can be justified for the truth. There are no doubts, mistakes and un-connect utterances in the conversation. Cutting (2002: 35) concludes that *"speakers are expected to be sincere, to be saying something that they believe corresponds to reality. They are assumed not to say anything they believe to be false or anything they lack evidence"*. Based on Grice's theory that quoted in the book of Yule (1996: 36), maxim of quantity has some points such as do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

2.3.1.3 Maxim of Relation

Based on this maxim, the participant is expected to make a contribution that does not deviate from the thing being discussed or be relevant in the conversation. Covering

the same topic is at the heart of this maxim. Cutting (2002: 35) concludes that *"observing maxim of relation means that the contribution of the speakers should be relevant to what has been said before."*

2.3.1.4 Maxim of Manner

The maxim relates to the way things are conveyed. The participant is expected to be able to make a clear, unambiguous and concise contribution so that the information provided is easy to understand. Conveying an idea coherently is also imperative so that the idea is fully understood by the interlocutor. In the book of Yule (1996: 36), maxim of quantity has some points they are avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity) and be orderly.

2.3.2 Flouting Maxim

Grice (1975) concludes that people may flout a maxim and blatantly fail to fulfil. Flouting the maxim can occur if a participant does not follow or obey the rules of the maxim and it is possible to flout the maxim unconsciously. Syarifa (2020: 8) concludes that some people do not always obey the cooperative principle when they are performing utterances because its certain reason such as being polite, avoiding an unpleasant situations, and making jokes.

2.3.2.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Cutting (2002: 37) concludes that the speaker who flout the maxim of quantity seem to give too little or too much information. When the participant does not respond according to what is needed, it is considered a flouting of maxim quantity.

For the example:

A: *Well, how do I look?*

B: *Your shoes are nice.*

(Grice as cited in Cutting, 2002: 37)

Pursuant to the dialogue above, A asked B's opinion about his overall appearance. However, B answered not as a whole but only an opinion on some parts, namely only A's shoes. In this case, the speaker flouted maxim of quantity because it gives not good enough or less information than is required.

2.3.2.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

Flouting of Maxim Quantity occurs when the participant does not make a contribution that is not in accordance with the facts and cannot be justified for the truth. The participant may use hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter when committing the flouting of maxim quality.

For the example:

A: *Tehran's in Turkey isn't it, teacher?*

B: *And London's in Armenia I suppose.*

(Grice as cited in Levinson, 1983)

Pursuant to the dialogue above, B wanted to show that A's opinion through the question was incorrect. B avoids saying "wrong" or "no" by saying London is in Armenia and the fact or truth is that London is in England, is not in Armenia while Taheran is in Iran, is not in Turkey.

2.3.2.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

The Flouting of Relation occurs when the participant makes an irrelevant contribution and has a reason behind it. Cutting (2002: 39) concludes that the speakers who flout the maxim of relation expect listeners to imagine what the utterance did not say and build a relationship between the utterance and the previous utterance.

For the example:

A: *Where's Bill?*

B: *There's a yellow VW outside Sue's house.*

(Grice as cited in Levinson, 1883: 102)

Pursuant to the dialogue above, participant B seems fail to fulfill the rule to be relevant. A asks Bill's whereabouts but B says *there's a yellow VW outside Sue's house* and expect A knows the implied meaning that if a yellow VW is outside Sue's house, Bill most likely is in Sue's house. However, regardless of the implied meaning conveyed, B is considered to provide an irrelevant answer.

2.3.2.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

The Flouting maxim of manner occurs when the contribution made by the participant is obscure, not briefly, not orderly, and ambiguous in conveying information. Cutting (2002: 39) concludes that people who flout maxim of manner, emerging to be obscure and often trying to exclude a third party. This dialogue below is one example of flouting maxim of manner and as in this sort exchange between husband and wife.

A : *Where are you off to?*

B : *I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for*

somebody.

A : OK, but don't be long - dinner's nearly ready.

(Grice as cited in Cutting, 2002: 39)

Pursuant to the dialogue above, B gave an ambiguous explanation by mentioning "that white stuff" replaces to ice cream and "somebody" replaces to their daughter. The husband decided to give his wife an ambiguous answer so that her daughter would not understand that he was going to buy ice cream and so she would not eat it before dinner.

2.3.3 The Context of Situation

Yule (1996, 3) concludes that the pragmatic study analyzes the contextual meaning and the context is able to influence the utterances said by the participants. Therefore, context can describe a situation or circumstance and the specific setting of an event that occurs. That is why the context of the situation in this study is needed as the supporting theory to analyze whether the dialogue in the data source can be classified according to the type of the flouting maxim. Then, Halliday (1985) classifies the context of the situation into 3 parts; They are Field, Tenor, and Mode.

Field is a context that contains what is happening, what choices participants should make. This context also contains the topic or content of the text. Tenor refers to the nature of the relationship between language users in the context, the nature of the participant, and also relates to the role and status held. Mode is a context related to the communication channel, what the participants expect will happen.

2.3.4 The Reason of Flouting Maxim

The flouting maxim of cooperative principle can occur when the meaning expressed by the speaker has another meaning or hidden meaning that is not spoken verbally to the interlocutor. Leech and Thomas remark in Mey (2001, 78) that people can consciously flout one of the maxims to hope that the interlocutor will understand the other meaning the speaker is talking about. Therefore, the flouting maxim can lead the speaker and the listener to get or assume more than one conversational implicature since flouting maxim can occur for several reasons and it depend on the situation.

In the book *Principles of Pragmatic* (1983), Leech concludes that the Illocutionary Function of Politeness contains hidden meaning because participants want to be polite to the interlocutor. The function is related to illocutionary goal and social goal, in which goal means the intended meaning. Illocutionary goal are everything that puts ourselves first, while social goal puts other people first. Somehow this illocutionary function is also related to the reason of the participants do the flouting maxim. So the reason for the flouting maxim will be the same as the Illocutionary Function of Politeness. The reasons of the flouting maxim are competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive.

2.3.4.1 Competitive

Competitive relates to illocutionary goal that competes with social goal as commanding, asking, demanding, begging, alleging (Leech, 1983: 104). This reason does not care about social goal because it only cares or satisfies the own desires. The following is an example of competitive reasons in a dialogue:

Annie : *Betty, the phone is ringing.*
 Betty : *I'm in the bath.*

Cutting (2008: 38)

Pursuant to the dialogue above, There is a competition between the illocutionary goal and the social goal. Annie said *the phone is ringing*, in hopes that Betty could help her by picking up or answering the phone and that is the social goal. While the illocutionary goal here is to stay in the bath. Despite knowing what Annie meant, Betty did not care and refused to help her. Then, she flouts maxim of relevance by saying *I'm in the bath* and eventually the illocutionary goal is over the social goal.

2.3.4.2 Convivial

Convivial is one of the reasons that the illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal as in offering, inviting, greeting, congratulating, and thanking (Leech, 1983: 104). After all, neither side is ignored since both goal can be met properly. The following is an example of convivial reasons in a dialogue:

Samira : *I can't imagine for sure. Perfect score for your grammar.*
 Julie : *It's also you in charge.*

Pursuant to the dialogue above, The illocutionary and social goal are mutually fulfilled. The illocutionary is that Julie responds to the compliments from Samira and thanks her while the social goal is to give compliments. However, Julie flouts maxim of relevance since she did not focus on the compliment and feel the need to thank her by saying Samira also took part in her perfect score. Then, both goal can eventually be met that is why the reason of the flouting maxim is convivial reason.

2.3.4.3 Collaborative

Collaborative is the reason that the illocutionary goal and social goal are indifferent as in asserting, reporting, announcing, and instructing that are included in this reason (Leech, 1983: 104). In a sense, the illocutionary goal does not completely ignore the social goal. Moreover, the illocutionary goal and social goal are expected to provide understanding. The following is an example of collaborative reasons in a dialogue:

Charlene : *I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.*
 Dexter : *Ah, I brought the bread.*

Yule (1996: 40)

Pursuant to the dialogue above, The social goal in the dialogue is that Dexter brings bread and cheese, while the illocutionary goal is that Dexter only brings bread. Then, the illocutionary goal is indifferent to social goal and flout maxim of quantity by giving too little information than is needed since Dexter said he only brought the bread. Because the social goal is not fully met eventually, the reason of flouting maxim is collaborative reason.

2.3.4.4 Conflictive

Conflictive is one of the reasons that the illocutionary goal and social goal are in conflict as in threatening, accusing, cursing, reprimanding, and others (Leech, 1983: 104). The following is an example of conflictive reasons in a dialogue:

Agatha : *How about the pizza?*
 Holman : *This is a lovely undercooked pizza which I don't like, as usual you give.*

The social goal in the dialogue is to give advice or complimenting for the food, while the illocutionary goal is to give honest feedback or opinions. Moreover, the two

goal are contradictory because the meaning of the word *lovely* that Holman said contradict to what he meant since he wanted to reprimand Agatha. That is why the reason of flouting maxim is conflictive reason.

