

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1. Review of Related Theory

The writer applied the theory of Cooperative Principle issued by Paul Grice in doing this study. The theory focused on the maxim found in chat log.

##### 2.1.1. Cooperative Principle

The Cooperative Principle was first proposed by Paul Grice in 1975, based on the idea about the conversation develops according to a principle which is identified and applied by human. According to Grice (1975:45), communication is managed by a set of rational, universal principles and sub-principles, called maxim, which systematize the process of inference and ensure its success.

In Grice's word, in any talk exchange interlocutors assume that the entire participant in communication will make their contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange. To ensure the efficient of communication, the participant stand for the four maxims (Blum – Kulka, 1989:39):

- Maxim of quantity
- Maxim of quality
- Maxim of manner
- Maxim of relevance

Grice recommends five ways where the conversationalists can deal with those maxims (Fasold, 1990, p. 130):

- The participant is demanded to follow those maxims. In this section, the participant is straightforwardly following the rules. They can speak the truth, gives clear information, and so on according to the sub maxim of each maxim.
- The participant may violate the maxim. In this section, the participant is deliberately breaking the rules of Grice. They are totally acted out of the rules. The participant can give unclear informations, ambiguous, prolix, vague, or even randomly informations. They also can be laid in giving informations. The purpose is often to mislead the interlocutor, for instance by lying.
- The participant can “opt-out” of a maxim. Here, the participant has required information to contribute, but they have an obligation not to divulge it. For example, “I cannot say more, my lips are sealed.” In this section, the participant does not mean to give less information, but they demanded to keep the information secretly.
- The participant can do “maxim clash”. Here, the participant would have to violate a maxim in order to fulfill another. The violating in maxim occurs because of some coincidences.
- The participant can flout the maxim. When the participant flouts the maxim, they do not observe the maxim.

The existence of maxim makes conversational implicature possible. Grice (1975), in Brown and Yule (1983:31), uses the term of “implicature” to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says. It means when a speaker say something, it does not always consist of its literal meaning, but it might be another meaning from the conversation. The speaker does not mean to be untrue or give some complicated statement, but there are particular reasons and it occurs in the different way. Here are the reviews of the maxims (Brown & Yule, 1983:32).

#### 2.1.1. Maxim of Quantity

Characteristics of this maxim:

- Make your contribution as informative as is required
- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

In this maxim, the speaker should inform the contributions as informative as is required. The speaker should tell us everything we need to know, not too much and not too less. The information should be quite clear enough to the hearer.

In maxim of quantity, the speaker is not allowed to repeat the same word or phrase in informing something, to avoid the flout of this maxim. Here is the example how the speaker violating the maxim of quantity:

- X* : “*How did Harry fare in court the other day?*”  
*Y* : “*Oh, he got fine*” (*But Harry also got a death sentence*)

In this conversation, speaker X asks to Y about Harry in court. The information given by Y is too little, and incomplete information. Harry did not only get fare in court, but he also got the death sentence in court. Speaker Y does not insert the following information in his answer to give clear information to the X. To avoid the violating, Y should give information as follow:

X : *“How did Harry fare in court the other day?”*  
 Y : *“Oh, he got his death sentence”*

As the writer stated above, in maxim of quantity, speaker should give information clearly, not too much and not too little or less. The example above is noted as information which is given too little, and it will cause different perception from the receiver. The following example is another kind of violating the quantity maxim:

X : *“What can you tell me about Catherine’s ability to concentrate on a task?”*  
 Y : *“Catherine is a butterfly flitting from flower to flower”*

In the conversation above, speaker X asks to Y about Catherine’s ability to concentrate on her task. The response given by Y is not clear information, and it leads to the metaphorical interpretation. Speaker X expects the “real” answer from Y about Catherine, but in a fact, speaker Y gives an unexpected answer to X by using some kind of metaphorical term. From the statement, Y’s answer means that Catherine has a bad level in concentrate. She is hard to put her full attention to a task or job. She might be always having many things to do in the same time.

Those two examples are the examples of violating the maxim of quantity by giving less information and also by giving the metaphorical response. The less

information given by the speaker will give the receiver less information and it will lead the misunderstanding in a conversation.

### 2.1.2. Maxim of Quality

Characteristics of this maxim:

- Do not say what you believe to be false
- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

In this maxim, the speaker is demanded to be truthful in any kind of conversation. Means he or she must give only true informations. Speaker should not tell the lie about the information given. Here are some of the examples of violating the maxim of quality. The first example taken from Cook (1989:32):

*X : "How does it taste?"*  
*Y : "This meal is delicious" (The food is disgusting)*

Here, the violating maxim caused by the second speaker, Y. The speaker or the guest does not tell the truth about the answer. The owner of the house served some meals for the guest, and the taste might be not delicious or under the standardization. Then, when X asks Y about the taste of the meal, Y does not tell the truth. He lies about the taste by saying it is delicious which is in fact, the taste is not delicious at all.

In this situation, speaker Y violated the maxim of quality by saying the lie because for some reasons. He did it because he respect to the owner of the house. He did not want to make bad impression by saying that the meals are not delicious.

The second example of violating this maxim is:

*X : "Where does John spend his holiday?"*

*Y : "Somewhere in Germany"*

From this context, the violating of maxim happened in the second sentence done by speaker Y. He answered the question given by X about the place where John spent his holiday. The answer given is kind of simple answer but it does not explain anything. "Somewhere in Germany" means that Y does not know where is exactly John spent his holiday. One point here, Y only knows that John spent his holiday in German but he does not have ideas in which part of German John spent his holiday in.

The main idea of maxim of quality is the informant should be truthful. It also pays attention to how the speaker say his or her knowledge concerning certain facts that his or her talking about. The informant should be honest in giving informations. Therefore, he or she is prohibited to lie and give entrusted information or even informations with lack adequate evidence. The example above showed us that the informant gives entrusted information. That is, he tells something that might not be true. To avoid the violating, the informant is demanded to answer the question or gave information by saying "I don't know" or else, but by saying "somewhere in Germany" only makes other people keep asking.

Another example of violating this maxim:

*X : "Mom, where is my new orange shirt?"*

*Y : "Well, I think I saw your sister using orange shirt this morning"*

In this conversation, speaker Y, who is identified as X's mom, is violating the maxim of quality. She assumes that X's sister is wearing the shirt which is X looking for, but she is still doubt about it. The lack of adequate evidence, as what X's mom done, makes people assume about something, which is brought them to flout the maxim. To avoid the violating of maxim, the conversation might be come as followed:

*X : "Mom, where is my new orange shirt?"*  
*Y : "It is in the washing machine"*

### 2.1.3. Maxim of Manner

Characteristics of this maxim:

- Be perspicuous
- Avoid obscurity of expression
- Avoid ambiguity
- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
- Be orderly

In this maxim, the speaker should be brief and give clear information. In uttering the message, the speaker should avoid from being vague, prolix, and unorderedly. To be in order, the message should be uttered clearly, so the hearer can fully understand the message and get the same understanding as the speaker. Here is the example:

*X : "Shall we get something for the kids?"*  
*Y : "Yes. But I veto I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M"*

This conversation is a kind of violating maxim of manner in obscurity part. In this conversation, in a fact, both X and Y has no difficulty in pronouncing the word “ice cream”. Y violated the maxim of manner because the utterance means that Y does not want the kids know their plan about getting them some ice cream.

Another example of violating the maxim of manner:

*X : “I hear you went to the opera last night. How was the lead singer?”*

*Y : “The singer produced a series of sounds corresponding closely to the score of an aria from Rigoletto”*

Here, the speaker X and Y talking about the singer who had concert a night before. In fact, X asked to Y about the performance of the lead singer in the concert last night; how it was. But Y indeed had different sight. In his opinion, Y answered the question prolixity or flowery, not to the point. He answered the question far from what the X’s means. X’s asked about the performance of the lead singer, while Y’s responded him with the works of the lead singer, and he never said anything about the performance of the lead singer.

This conversation is such kind of violating of maxim of manner in prolixity.

#### 2.1.4. Maxim of Relevance

Characteristics of this maxim:

- Be relevant



In this maxim, the speaker should say things that are relevant to the topic under discussion. It is allowed the speaker to make the conversation relevant to each other. This maxim expects the speaker who joins the conversation to stay in the line. For example:

*X : "Is Gail dating anyone these days?"*  
*Y : "Well, she goes to Cleveland every weekend"*

Here, Y answered the X's question with irrelevant sentence. X actually asked whether Gail dating any men over the day or not, but Y answered it by telling that Gail is always go to the Cleveland every weekend. However the answer made, indicates that Gail does not have any dates. Here, speaker Y violating the maxim of relevant because the information or response is irrelevant with the question asked by the X.

To avoid the violating, the conversation supposed to be:

*X : "Is Gail dating anyone these days?"*  
*Y : "No"*

Another example is taken from Brown and Yule (1983 : 32):

*X : "I'm out of petrol"*  
*Y : "there is a garage round the corner"*

From the conversation above, speaker Y is violating the maxim. Y has an understanding that the garage that is located not far from the place is open and sells petrol. Meanwhile, in denotative meaning or from the literally meaning, garage refers to the place for car parking in a house. This knowledge brought the ambiguity in the conversation, and it caused violating of maxim of relevance. To avoid the violating, the conversation supposed to be:

X : *“I’m out of petrol”*

Y : *“You can go to the garage near from here, and you can buy petrol there.”*

### 2.3. Related Studies

The writer finds that there are several studies using the Cooperative Principle as their theory. Nevertheless, the writer only takes two of them as the related studies that can help to analyze the writer’s study because both of these studies are related to the writer’s topic. First is the study of Cooperative Principle done by Rizki Karunianti (2008) entitled “An Analysis Of The Violating Of The Maxims To Cause Humorous Effects In Training Activity (A Study Of Jokes In One Day Quantum Parenting Training Conducted By Konsorsium Pendidikan Islam Surabaya). In her study, Rizki found that during the training, the trainer sometimes did the violating maxim in the way he talks to the trainees, and it caused a humorous effect during the training.

The second study is done by Khukuh A. Yuda (2006) entitled “The Underlying Intentions In The Violating Of Conversational Maxim On The Use Of Slang Language In The British Movie ‘Lock, Stock, And Two Smoking Barrels’ By Guy Ritchie”. In his study, the writer focused on the violating maxim occurs in the movie conversation. In his study, he also find out about in what maxim does the conversation flouts, which one of the maxim flouts the most, and what is the purpose of the participant doing the violating in their conversation.