CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consist of many important aspects in finishing this thesis. They are cooperative principle and the maxims (maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner), the concept of flouting maxims, synopsis of "Carrie" movie and some previous studies which are similar to the research.

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1.1 Cooperative Principle and the Maxims

An underlying assumption in most conversational exchanges seems to be that the participants are co-operating with each other. This principle, together with four maxims that we expect our conversational partners to obey, was first described by the philosopher Paul Grice (Yule, 2006:129). The philosopher Paul Grice (1975) has proposed that when people converse they tacitly subscribe to what he calls the cooperative principle although he has conversation in mind, one can, as we shall see later, apply the same principle to all kinds of communication, whether this takes the form of conversation or not. Grice suggests that the cooperative principle can be expressed in terms of four maxims that parties in an interaction will subscribe to, on condition that both of them also recognize the purpose for which they are communicating in the first place. (Widdowson, 2007:56).

The co-operative principle is stated in the following way: "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". Supporting this principle are four maxims, often called the "Gricean maxims" (Grice, 1975:45, in Yule, 2006:129). There are theories of "conversational implicature" associated with H. P. Grice (1975). Grice suggested that people interpret indirectness by orienting to a set of broad shared conversations about what to expect from others in conversation. The overarching principle is the cooperative principle (CP) and four maxims describe the particular expectations that shape how efficient, cooperative meaning-making is achieved. Grice"s cooperative principle and the four maxims are maxims of quantity, maxims of quality, maxims of relation, and maxims of manner. (Johnstone, 2008:234). H. P. Grice (1975) defines implicature as a term to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest or mean as distinct from what the speaker literally says. Of much greatest interest to discourse analysis is the notion of conversation implicature, which is derived from a general principle of conversational plus a number of maxims, which the normally obeyed by the speakers. The general principles are called Cooperative Principle. In Grice"s observation, the sender of a language obeys the four maxims: quantity, quality, relation and manner.

The cooperative principle makes the relation between the speaker and the hearer in a conversation become related well and the contribution

of conversational such as is required, by the accepted purpose or direction

of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. Conversation is a social

activity, which always involves two or more participants. Conversation

cannot emerge if one is talking to oneself and once the conversation has

emerged, it needs some efforts from the participants to make it working

good and running smoothly.

2.1.1.1 The Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of Quantity means that the participants" contribution

in a corversation is as informative as it is required (for the current

purposes of the exchange). In this case, the participants should not

contribute on saying something to the hearer more tha its required.

For example:

Obeying case of a maxim of quantity:

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

B: Oh, he got fine.

(Levinson, 1983)

If later transpirates that Harry got a live sentence too, then

B would certainly be guilty of misleading A, for he has failed to

provide all the information that might reasonably be required. Then

here is the example of disobeying (flouting) case of a maxim of

quantity:

A: I've lost a diamond ring.

B: Well, Julie was wearing one this morning.

(Leech, 1983, p. 93)

By using indefinite article, B refuses to commit himself to whether the ring be sees in the same one that A loses. B, in this case is not being informative at all.

2.1.1.2 The Maxim of Quality

Maxim of Quality indicates that participants should not say what they believe to be false. And of course they may not say that for which they lack adequate evidence.

For example:

Obeying case of a maxim of quality:

A: Does your farm contain 400 acres?

B: I do not know that it does.

(Levinson, 1983. P. 105)

This example simply extends the scope of quality by viewing the truth as a special sub-case of sincerety applied to assertions. And here is the example of disobeying (flouting) case of a maxim of quality:

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

B: And London's in America I supposed.

(Levinson, 1983. P. 110)

B"s utterance serves to suggest that A is absurdly incorrect

or flouting the maxim of quality.

2.1.1.3 The Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation is used when the participants just the

convey in a relevant information. The participant should not reply or

saying something that does not relevant from the other participants"

dialogue.

For example:

Obeying case of a maxim of relation:

A: Where is my box of chocolate?

B: It is in your room.

(Leech, 1983, p. 94)

B"s remark is relevant to A's question since B knows the

answer and his answer relates to the question, not talking about

something else that does not relevant with A's question. And here

is the example of disobeying (flouting) case of a maxim of relation:

Johnny: Hay Sally, lets play marbles.

Mother: How is your homework getting along, John?

(Levinson, 1983. P. 111)

Johnny"s mother can remind him that he may not yet be free

to play. She should be relevant, tell to Johnny to not going to play

yet till his homework is getting done.

2.1.1.4 The Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner means that the participants have to be

perspicuous and also they have to avoid obscurity of expression and

also avoid the ambiguity when reacted to the other participants. The

utterances of the participant produces are brief (Avoid unnecessary

prolixity) and must be orderly.

For example:

Obeying case of a maxim of manner:

Friend: Where was Alfred yesterday?

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

(Levinson, 1983. p. 108)

The mother's answer is obeying the maxim of manner. She is

being orderly when she answered Alfred's friend question since

she gives a clear explanation where alfred was. And here is the

example of disobeying (flouting) case of a maxim of manner:

A: Lets get the kids something.

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

(Levinson, 1983. p. 104)

B obviously breaks the maxim of manner (be perspicuous) by spelling out the word ice cream. B tells A that B would rather not say the word ice cream directly in front of the children, in case the kids will ask them (to A and B) to buy some ice cream, that is why B does not answer it perspicuously and spell it.

To summarize, Grice claimed that, in the default case, people expect one another to cooperate in conversation rather than contributing random utterances, and to say thing that are true, relevant to the ongoing conversation, clear and as concise as possible. When speakers do not follow one or more of these rules, then they are inviting hearers to figure out why. The elements of an utterance"s meaning that are determined with reference to these principles are called "implicatures." Even when someone is following the default rules, implicature is required. For example, if A says "I don"t have anything to write with," and B responds "I have a pen." A should be able to assume, based on the CP (cooperative principle) and maxims, that B"s contribution is relevant to what A has said. A might conclude, on this basis, that B is offering to lend A the pen. (Johnstone, 2008. P. 234-235).

2.1.2 The Concept of Flouting a Maxim

The flouting of maxims takes place when individual deliberately cease to apply the maxims to persuade their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances; that is, the speakers employ implicature (S.

C. Levinson, 1983). If one tells a lie in English, once breaks one of Grice"s

maxims (the maxim of quality, quantity, relation and manner), but this

does not mean that person fails to speak the English language (Leech,

1983:8-9). People conscious that they should follow those maxims of

Cooperative Principle (CP) to make a good communication, but they may

violate them. However, they violate the maxims sometimes because of

some reasons.

The flouting of the conversational maxims can happen is some

situations or occasions for some purposes. There are some occasions

which do not represent the obeying of maxims. Firstly, when the speaker

decides to quietly and simply flouting the maxim (flouting the maxim of

quantity):

A: I've lost a diamond ring.

B: Well, Julie was wearing one this morning.

(Leech, 1983, p. 93)

In this case, B thinks that Julie used the same ring as A's. He

simply flouts the maxim of quantity, because he is not being informative at

all. Secondly, when a speaker faces a clash between two maxims (flouting

maxim of quantity and manner):

A: My neighbor who is woman gets pregnant.

(Wijana, 1996. p. 46)

In this case, everybody must know that the person who gets

pregnant must be a woman. Actually, the word "woman" in A's utterance

should be eliminated. Here, A gives explanation that has been clear, the

clash appears when he tries to give informative information, but he is not

brief to say. Lastly, when a speaker has chosen to flout a maxim that is he

may conspicuous fail to fulfill the maxim (flouting the maxim of manner):

A: Lets get the kids something.

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

(Levinson, 1983. p. 104)

The flouting of maxim of manner here is on purpose. The parents

do not want their children to ask to buy ice cream. By spelling each letter

of ice cream, the children will not understand well so they do not want the

food.

In the case of flouting (exploitation) of cooperative maxims, the

speaker desires the greatest understanding in his/her recipient because it is

expected that the interlocutor is able to uncover the hidden meaning

behind the utterances. People may flout the maxim of quality so as to

deliver implicitly a sarcastic tone in what they state. As in: teacher to a

student who arrives late more than ten minutes to the class meeting:

Teacher: Wow! You are such a punctual fellow! Welcome to the

class.

Student: Sorry sir! It won't happen again.

It is obvious from what the teacher says that he is teasing the

student and his purpose is, by no means, praising him. He exploits the

maxim of quality (being truthful) to be sarcastic. Likewise, the student

seems to notice the purpose behind the teacher"s compliment and offers an

apology in return. (Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi, 2011)

Another example of flouting a maxim:

A: What an amazing football player Edric is!

This can be either a:

Positive comment on Edric's ability in playing football (maxim of

quality obeyed).

Negative comment on Edric's ability through irony (maxim of

quality disobeyed, clear to hearer, e.g. When said right after Edric

cannot operate the ball well. (Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi,

2011)

2.2 RELATED STUDIES

2.2.1 "Carrie" Movie (2013)

Carrie is a 2013 American supernatural horror movie produced by

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and Screen Gems. It is the third movie adaptation

of Stephen King"s 1974 novel under the same title. The first Carrie movie

was produced in 1976 with the same title; the iconic classis 1976 movie version directed by Brian De Palma, starring Sissy Spacek in the lead role and Piper Laurie as a supporting actress, Carrie's look is slightly change on the screen. Unlike Stephen King's envision of Carrie, in the movie she is not fat or chunky. Sissy is very skinny with long strawberry-blonde hair. Also in this movie only Carrie get pig's blood dumped on her. Tommy Ross however, whos was enraged because of this, does get hit in the head and knockes unconscious, maybe even killed with the empty bucket, but by Carrie's swinging bucket above, instead of two buckets with one as hiw own. Carrie does not destroy the entire town in this movie, but while Carrie is slowly walking home and in a catatonic state. But the last scene of the movie, it shows the viewer that Sue is forever haunted by Carrie in her nightmares and probably will never be the same again.

The second adaptation was produced in the 2002 also using the same title with the previous one. In this second adaptation, is made for TV movie starring Angela Bettis in the lead role was not remake in a sense, but a far more faithful adaption of the novel. The theme of the school prom is kept "Spring Time in Venice" like Stephen King envisioned. Carrie was kept alive in this TV movie version because the movie was meant to have a Television series follow it, where Carrie helps other teenagers who are also have a telekinetic skill. The Television show pilot was never shot due to the TV movie having low ratings and the series was therefore eventually cancelled and never made.

The third adaptations of "Carrie" Movie tells about a youngbeautiful-shy girl named Carrie White (played by Chloe G. Moretz) who lives with her religious yet disturbed mother that almost of her life is depends on the holy bible. When Carrie experiences her first menstrual period, Carrie naively thinks that she is bleeding to death and her mother, Margareth (played by Julianne Moore) hits her using a bible and locks Carrie in the "Prayer Closet" inside their house. This movie ended up by a big accident when the Prom was held, caused by Chris Hargensen (played by Portia Doubleday) that make the school burns to the ground. Carrie walks away out of the prom venue with the blood pouring all over her body and gown. She is leaving trail of fire and destruction in her wake. At home, Margaret attacks Carrie, who attempts to flee but her mother tries to kill her using several sharp tools, such as knifes, scissors, needles, etc. At the end Carrie unconsciously using her supernatural power and kills her mother. She becomes hysterical and makes stones rain from the sky to crush the house down. The duration of "Carrie" Movie is about one hour, forty minutes and fifty sixth seconds.

2.2.2 Previous Studies

 The Flouting of Conversational Maxim in Javanese Short Story "Pacarku Ngandheg" by Veronica Erly Dwi Handayani (2005)

A thesis done by Veronica Erly Dwi Handayani in 2005, The Flouting of Conversational Maxim in Javanese Short Story "Pacarku Ngandheg".

Handayani (2005) was trying to find out the most frequently flouted maxim and the reasons behind the flouting by two main characters in "Pacarku Ngandheg" to shows that maxims are important in a conversation. The study has shown one sample of how the cooperative principles are flouted in the conversations.

In analyzing data, Handayani used descriptive approach to describe the reasons of flouting the maxim and uses table to make an easier analysis of the most frequent flouted maxim. After all of the analysis, she found out that the maxim of relevance is the most frequently flouted in the story. The characters have some reasons why they tend to flout some maxims, but she realized that the flouting of maxim does not bother and bring to an end of the conversation. For her, it makes a variation in the conversation, so the conversation will going smoothly and not boring. However, the characters try to ignore it, and just continue the conversation. They want to make some variations in their conversation, so the conversation will not be boring as the writer said.

2. The Flouting of Conversational Maxims by the Main Male Characters in Wedding Crashers Movie by Silvia Indra Dewi Susilo (2011)

The second thesis done by Silvia Indra Dewi Susilo in 2011, under the title: *The Flouting of Conversational Maxims by the Main Male Characters in Wedding Crashers Movie*. in this study, the writer found that Susilo had purposes to find out about the flouting of conversational maxims included in the humorous conversations of the male main characters (Jeremy and John)

in the "Wedding Crashers" movie, and she also aim to find out which maxim is mostly flouted. In analyzing the data, Susilo used Grice"s theory of conversational maxims. Susilo used qualitative approach to describe the flouting of conversational maxims by the male main characters in the "Wedding Crashers" movie.

From the analysis and findings, Susilo concluded that in conversations there are some conditions that the participants have to flout the maxims. Of course they have reasons on doing this, for instance, the speaker flouts the Maxim of Quality when he or she lies about something in order to hide something from the other person. Moreover, if the participants on the conversation flout the maxims, it does not mean that they fail to communicate with others or they have miscommunication.the fact is the conversation can still run well in the movie.

3. Flouting of Maxims Which Provokes Humor in The Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movies Series by Eka Agusliani (2012)

The third thesis done by Eka Agusliani in 2012, Flouting of Maxims Which Provokes Humor in The Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movies Series. In this research, Agusliani observed the differences and/or the similarities between the maxims flouted by the characters in "Big Bang Theory" and those flouted by the characters in "Office Boy" which provoke humor. The data were from the dialogue lines flouted by the characters in those two movie series. The main theories used were from Grice"s (1989).

Furthermore, Agusliani conducted this research in qualitative approach supported by quantitative data.

The writer gets some benefits from the previous studies, such as the research design that the other researchers used and there are many of previous studies found by the writer that has the same analysis with the writer's object of the research so it will make and help the writer do her

