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ABSTRACT

Khotibul Umam, Flouting Maxim’s Analysis on the Dialogues of Yes Man Movie. A thesis: English Letters Department, Faculty of Adab and Humanities, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, Jakarta 2014.

This Thesis discusses the meanings, kinds and the reason of using Cooperative Principle in Non-Observation of flouting maxims in YES MAN Movie directed by Peyton Read and distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, 2008. The main objective of research is to know the kinds of Cooperative Principle which has been flouted and the reasons of using them in Yes Man movie.

This research uses qualitative method. The writer uses Grice’s maxim theory and other relevant references. He uses the movie’s scripts that initialized in the movie as the unit analysis, and then he also uses the background and setting in the movie to interpret the implicature of the conversation that needs to be delivered to the hearer, and likewise to know the meaning of conversation when it suits the principles or flouts it.

Through this paper, in the research finding the writer finds four kinds of maxims of Cooperative Principle which has been initialized in the movie; they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. Specifically, he only discusses on the process of maxim, the process of flouting and the implicature.

Finally, the writer hopes this research will be useful for a brighter future in developing people interpretation of the conversation in order to fix with the aim of its talk. Especially for English Department’s students who want to know deeply regarding the Cooperative Principle.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

When speakers utter a sentence, in many situations, they do not mean just what they literally say, but they mean something which is different from what they literally say. Anyway, context is taking a part in explaining their meaning.

According to Jenny Thomas’s book meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics explains about study the context, which is, in the early 1980s when it first became common to discuss pragmatics in general textbooks on linguistics, the most common definition of pragmatics is: meaning is use or meaning in context.¹

Context is most important thing in studying pragmatics which is helping the listeners to define the meaning of utterance from the speakers based on their background knowledge, including when a person communicates.

Human being and communication are two things that cannot be separated each other. Human being as social creature can’t live in this world without other. Therefore, he needs to communicate as a part of social interaction. Meanwhile, communication only can be done if the people involved in.

Communication is a system that used by human being to interact each other. The person who utters his idea or information is called the speaker and the person who hears the speaker’s idea or information is called the hearer. Communication

between individuals can be done through some media such as a common system of symbols, signs, or behavior.

To make a good communication, speaker and hearer have to know that there are some cooperative principles of communication which will arrange their action, the language which is used, and a meaning from their attitude. They are responsible for what they do and what they contravene from communication principle.²

Therefore, they have to adhere to the rule of communication, which are clarity, consciousness, and directness, by giving their contribution to communication as informative and effective as it is required and going in line with the context. For indicating an utterance of a sentence containing an element that has more meaning than what people said and we call it an implicature.

Any element of a natural language, it can be literally used as conventional implicature which is provides implicit explanations about how an utterance includes in implicature or always put meaning into word on the context and non literal as conversation implicature provides explicit explanations about how an utterance have more implication than a speaker said.

The example from conventional conversation which is depending on four list, they are; but, even, therefore and yet, "his body is big but weak". This sentence applies big and weak is not compatible but in spite of this his body is still big. The conventional Interpretation of the word “but” will always Produce the

implicature of a sense of contrast. So *his body is big but weak* will always necessarily imply “surprisingly is his body is big in spite of it is weak.

For understanding speaker's meaning, the cooperative principle is helping us to comprehend what they said. The cooperative principle is useful, to know what it is rational and cooperative.

Toward the explanation above, then, it can be assumed that there is underlying principle which determines the way in which language is used with a maximum efficiency and effectiveness. Those principles called cooperative principle which is introduced by Herbert Paul Grice. He classifies that to be four maxims in order to build good communication.\(^3\) If the speaker violates cooperative principle, it can be suggested that there are some possibilities why he violates it.

Grice introduces four series of conversation maxims, they are: the maxim of quality, quantity, relevance and manner. The maxims are describing the criteria; participants of communication are quite informative, relevant, clear, and honest. For example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \emph{A}: What time is it now?
  \item \emph{B}: Well, it is raining
\end{itemize}

B’s response is not informative as it needs to be the purpose of the Conversation; he flouts the maxim of quality. And also he flouts the maxim relevance that B is not attempting to answer A’s question.

\[^3\textit{Ibid.}, \text{p. 25}\]
There are many ways of problematical and frequently misunderstood from the speaker’s utterance. Here, Grice is also aware of it. There are many occasions when people fail to observe the maxim because of they are incapable of speaking clearly, deliberately choose to lie, and blatantly fails to observe a maxim intention of deceiving because the speakers wish the hearer to look for meaning which is different from what their utterance.

In this research, the writer puts his interest in the last term, dialogue of movie. Dialogue is a conversation which is written for a book, play, or film. Yes Man is a 2008 romantic comedy film directed by Peyton Read, written by Nicholas Stoller, Jarrad Paul, and Andrew Mogel and starring Jim Carrey, Zooey Deschanel, Bradley Cooper, John Michael Higgins, Rhys Darby, Maile Flanagan, Danny Masterson, and Terence Stamp. The film is based loosely on the 2005 book Yes Man by British humorist Danny Wallace, who also makes a cameo appearance in the film. The film was a box office success, despite receiving mixed reviews from critics. It was released on 19 December 2008 and was then released on 26 December 2008 in the United Kingdom going straight to the top of the box office in its first weekend after release. Production for the film began on October 2007 at Los Angeles.

Genre of this movie is Comedy, with the result that the dialogues inside are being uttered by the speaker with excessive utterances. This matter emerges misapprehension for the hearer until he asks the speaker to tell him again about

---

what was the speaker said. This is one of the factors why the writer is interested to analyze the dialogue in this movie.

In this movie, there are some conversations which don’t need any theory to be understood. As in the example:

Wiri :  *Is this your first time at one of Terrence’s lectures?*
Carl :  *Uh, yeah.*

A conversation between Wiri and Carl can be understood by everyone, and this topic would be the limitation of my discussion. In real life, the conversations between human are not as simple as we thought. There are some complex things to be understood and it takes effort to understand it. As in the example:

Carl :  *What are you doing here?*
Peter :  *This is an intervention. You’ve missed your last event.*

In the conversation above, Peter’s answer doesn’t coherent with the question. If we don’t learn about linguistics, it would be a mistake made by the script writer, but in the cooperative principle we got different concepts. Peter’s answer is one of the ways to state something that break the maxim. Peter is upset and asking about Carl’s absence in the last event which held by Peter. And it’s not a mistake, it is a statement. The other example:

Carl :  *Where’ve you been? Norman’s been heartbroken since you quit.*
Nick Line :  *where’ve I been? You mean, where haven’t I been? This year, Dude. I have lived. I climbed Mt. Kilimanjaro. I ate bat in Laos. I shot a cow with a bazooka. I’m not proud of that last one but I did it. How’s the bank?*
Nick Line’s answer is exaggerated because Carl is only asking about where Nick Line has been. What is done by Nick Line is a strategy to show how busy he has been. If only Nick Line would answer with the word ‘in lost’, so that the goal will not be accomplished.

According to the explanation above, the writer is attracted in analyzing the flouting of cooperative principle in the dialogue of Yes Man movie. This topic becomes interesting for the writer because there are many flouting occur in the dialogue, there are some dialogues flouting the cooperative principle of communication with the result that make an incongruity

B. Focus of the Study

Based on the previous background of the study, the writer focuses his research to analyze the dialogue of Yes Man movie through pragmatic approach which focuses on flouting the cooperative principle by Grice’s maxim theory.

C. Research Question

To be more convenient and simply in the research, the research is formulated through the following questions:

1. What are the flouted maxims of Cooperative Principles in the dialogue of Yes Man movie?

2. What is the process of implicature in the flouted maxims in the dialogue of Yes Man Movie?
D. Significances of the study

With this existence of research, the writer hopes that people know how to make a good communication with other people in order to avoid misunderstanding in interpreting the meaning that is intended by the speaker. Then, the people will be aware about the situation which occurs among them especially when the speaker tries creating some complex things to be understood and it takes effort to understand it.

E. Research Methodology

1. The Objective of Research

The aim of this research is to:

a. To identify the cooperative principle and categorize the maxims that happens in the dialogues of Yes man Movie.

b. To find out how the process of maxim’s flouts happen and analyze the discourse implicature from the dialogue when it is flouted.

2. The Method of Research

Subroto explains cultural study or humanity study (kultuurwissenschaft) tends to use qualitative method to describe and interpret the phenomenon in order to catch the meaning of it.\(^6\) Based on the definition above, this research uses descriptive qualitative method in which the data of selected dialogue transcription

---

of *Yes-man* movie is described and analyzed through Cooperative Principles theory proposed by Grice. In general, qualitative method is a research method that does not use any statistical procedures in serving the data.\(^7\)

3. Data Collecting Technique and Data Analysis

In this research, bibliography study is used as the technique of data collecting. According to Subroto, bibliography study is using written sources to get data.\(^8\) The steps to collecting the data are:

1. Watching movie the *Yes man* movie carefully.
2. Reading the whole dialogues transcription of *Yes man* movie carefully.
3. Giving mark (✓) the dialogues that assumed contain implicature.
4. Compiling into data card the dialogues. So the data card contains the dialogue and page that refer to the transcription.
5. Giving number the data card.
6. Analyzing the data after the data has been collected.

4. Technique Analysis

In this research, non-statistical analysis is used as technique of the data analysis. Descriptive is nature of qualitative research data. Shape of data form a description of the object of research. In other words, a form of qualitative research data are words, images, and numbers that are not generated through statistical

\(^{7}\)Ibid.
\(^{8}\)Ibid.p.42
processing⁹. It means by reading and observing the data that has been collected, I do the analysis process.

5. Unit of the Analysis

The unit of analysis that is researched by the writer is the dialogue of *Yes Man* movie released on December 19\textsuperscript{th}, 2008 and downloaded through internet access www.Ganool.com\textsuperscript{10}.

\textsuperscript{10} http://ganool.com/yes-man-2008-bluray-720p-750mb-ganool accessed on May 10\textsuperscript{th} 2012
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Defining Pragmatics

According to Yule, pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker or a writer and interpreted by a listener or a reader. He said there are four definitions about pragmatics, i.e.: (1) the study of speaker meaning, (2) the study of contextual meaning, (3) the study of how more gets communicated that is said, and (4) the study of the expression of relative distance.  

According to Jacob. Mey, ‘Pragmatics is the study of the condition of human language uses as these are determined by the context of society,’ while according to Levinson, pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammatically, or encoded in the structure of a language.

Leech expresses that pragmatics was henceforth on the linguistics map. Its colonization was only the last stage of a wave by wave expansion of linguistics from a narrow discipline dealing with the physical data of speech, to a broad discipline taking in form, meaning, and context. Leech sees pragmatics as study of linguistics having relevant with semantics. This relevant mentioned as semanticism that is seeing pragmatics as part of semantics; pragmaticism, that is

---

seeing semantics as part of pragmatics; and complementarism, or see semantics and pragmatics as two studies which were equipping each other.\textsuperscript{14}

From some explanations above, the writer can draw a conclusion that pragmatics is the study of meaning in communication of human which has relation with speech situations.

### B. Implicature

Grice introduce the verb “implicate” and the related nouns “implicature” (cf. implying) and implicatum (cf. what is implied). The point of this maneuver is to avoid, on each occasion, to choose between this or that member of the family of verbs for which “implicate” is to do general duty. For example, that A and B are talking about a mutual friend C who is now working in a bank. A ask B how C is getting on in his job, and B replies, “oh quite well”, at this point A might well inquire what B was implying, what his was suggesting or even what he meant by saying that C is the sort of person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation that C’s colleagues are really very unpleasant and treacherous people, and so forth. It might, of course, be quite necessary for A to make such an inquiry of B, the answer to it being, in the context clear, it advance. It is clear that whatever B implied, suggested, meant, etc.\textsuperscript{15}

According to Mey, the word “implicature” is derived from the verb ‘to imply’, as is its cognate “implication”. Originally, ‘to imply’ means ‘to fold

something into something else’ (from the Latin verb *plicare* ‘to fold’); hence, that which is implied is ‘folded in’, and has to be ‘unfolded’ in order to be understood. A conversational implicature is, therefore, something which is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use.16

Fromkin explain in his book, An Introduction to Language Sixth Edition. Implicature is a technical term in the linguistics branch of pragmatics. It refers to what is suggested in an utterance, even though not expressed or strictly implied that is entailed by the utterance.17

It’s not different from leech’s opinion: interpreting an utterance is ultimately a matter of guesswork, or (to use a more dignified term) hypothesis formation. Guessing depend on context, including problems of conversational participant and background of speaker and hearer. Progressively in a context comprehended, gain strength guess base. Example, “It’s sometime in April” it is the answer to the question “When’s Aunt Rose’s birthday?” implication that “the only thing the speaker remembered about Auntie’s birthday was the month it occurred, and the speaker honestly didn’t know whether it was at the beginning, the middle or the end of the month”.18

Review from the explanation above is another form of conventional implicature is also known as a scalar implicature. Which is it requires more informative as it is needed from the utterance. It includes, none, some, and all are form an implicational scale. For the example, “some the girls swam in the beach”

This concerns the conventional uses of words like “all”, “some”, and “none” in conversation. In which the use of one type implicates that the exploit of stronger form is unlikely.

C. Cooperative Principles

Paul H. Portner in his book gives definition of cooperative principle, it is, speaker’s meaning should be calculable on the basis of the assumption that speakers are behaving rationally and cooperatively.\textsuperscript{19}

Louise Cummings in his book Pragmatics A Multidisciplinary Perspective, it speaks about the cooperative principle states are make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchanges in which you are engaged.\textsuperscript{20}

Levinson in his book Pragmatics describes four maxims are follows:

1. The maxim of quantity

The first maxim of the cooperative principle is the maxim of quantity, which says:

a. Make your contribution as informative is required for the current purpose of the exchange.

b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.\textsuperscript{21}


People who give too little information risk their hearer not being able to identify what they are talking about because they are not explicit enough; those who give more information than the hearer need risk boring them.

For example:

a. As you probably know, I am terrified of bugs.

b. So, to cut a long story short, we grabbed our stuff and ran.22

2. The maxim of quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true:

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

b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.23

For example:

a. As far as I know, they’re married.

b. He couldn’t live without her, I guess.24

3. The maxim of relation

Make your contribution relevant.25

For example:

a. I don’t know if this is important, but some of the files are missing.

b. Not to change the subject, but is this related to the budget?26

4. The maxim of manner

Be perspicuous, and specially:27

a. Avoid obscurity of expression
b. Avoid ambiguity
c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
d. Be orderly

It is obvious that when going off record and in a great number of instances in which the speaker chooses verbal irony as a strategy he does not avoid obscurity and ambiguity. Especially if he is using irony with the intention of criticising, he may tend to be ambiguous and obscure in order to minimize the Face Threatening Act or to avoid responsibility.

In the example, two female secretaries are talking about another woman. By saying that "she's not of the most helpful variety" they are being ambiguous (because they do not say that she is unhelpful) and at the same time they are ironically criticizing her (the intonation with a falling tone on "helpful" and a rising one on "variety" as well as the laughing also help decipher the ironic interpretation). If we consider the majority of the cases of verbal irony, which, according to the major study named in the introduction, seem to have an off record nature, it could be said that all these cases are ambiguous in some way or another, and that they consequently violate the Maxim of Manner

For other example:

a. This may be a bit confused, but I remember being in a car.

b. I’m not sure if this makes sense, but the car had no lights.\textsuperscript{28}

Grice said that hearers assume that speakers observe the cooperative principle, and that it is the knowledge of the four maxims that allows hearers to draw inferences about the speakers’ intentions and implied meaning.

D. Non observance of Maxims

Jenny Thomas is making list of five the categories of non-observance of the conversational maxims, they are: the speaker may flout a maxim, violate a maxim or opt out of a maxim, infringing a maxim and suspending a maxim.\textsuperscript{29}

1. Violation the maxims

Meanwhile, Joan Cutting also explains in his book \textit{Pragmatics and discourse}, a speaker can be said to ‘violate’ a maxim when they know the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words.\textsuperscript{30}

If speaker violates the maxim of quantity, they do not provide the hearer sufficient information to know what is they are talking about, because they do not want the hearer to recognize their implication. It means, the implicature of them is insufficient information, insincere, irrelevant and ambiguous so that the hearer has wrongly assumes that they are cooperating.

Let us take example; two girls are sitting together on the seaside:

\textsuperscript{28}George Yule, (1996), \textit{Loc.cit.}
\textsuperscript{30}Joan Cutting, \textit{Pragmatic and Discourse} (London and New York: Roadledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group:2002), p. 36
A: Does your cat bite?

B: No.

A: (surprisingly she shouts loudly because of getting bitten of the cat after gave it a fish) ow! You said your dog does not bite!

B: that is not my cat because it is in my house.

A knows that she is talking about the cat in front of her and not the cat at her house. Obviously, she is intentionally does not give her wrong information that she needed. It means, she is being sincere or honest.

Needless to say, not all violation of the maxim quality is blameworthy. In many cultures it is perfectly acceptable to say a child of five, ‘Mummy’s gone on little holiday because she needs a rest’, rather than ‘Mummy’s gone away to decide whether she wants a divorce or not.’ A lie that protect is a lie with good intention, what we call a white lie. If Sir Maurice knew that the young man neither did nor realized that he had failed the interview, and that he would be divested to be told that, than he is telling a white lie, and covering up the truth to be kind.

In answer to “How much did that the new dress cost, darling?” the wife could have answers violating the maxim relation, in order to distract him and change the topic: ‘I know, let’s go out tonight. Now, where would you like to go?’ she could have violated the maxim of manner, and she said, ‘a tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the women that sold it to me’, in the hope that could be taken as an answer and the matter could be dropped. In the sheltered home example, the old lady answer the interviewer’s question in a
way that could be said to be violating the maxim of manner, in that she say
everything expect what the interviewer wants to know:

X: what would the other people say?

Y: oh well I don’t know. I wouldn’t like to repeat it because I don’t really believe
half of what they are saying. They just get a fixed thing into their mind.

Her ‘half of what they are saying’ is an obscure reference to the other
people’s opinion, and ‘a fixed thing’ contains a general noun containing vague
reference. She may be using these expressions to avoid giving a brief and orderly
answer, for the moment.\(^{31}\)

2. Flouting the maxims

Jacob L. Mey’s book, concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics is talking about
flouting a maxim, a ‘flout’ occurs when speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim
at the level of what is said.\(^{32}\)

For the example, one can flout the maxim of quality to tell a clumsy friend
who has just taken a bad fall, told that her live is impressive and obviously intends
to mean that her utterance is different from the fact. She will most likely
understand that the speaker is not offering a compliment.

Speakers who deliberately flout the maxims usually intend for their
listener to understand their implication. Therefore, cooperation is still taking
place, the Grice’s a maxim serves a principle in which they are followed and
flouted it.

\(^{31}\)Joan Cutting, 2002 Op cit. p.40
\(^{32}\)Jacob L.Mey, Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics (UK: Elsevier Science Ltd, 1998),
p.171
Let us look at examples, now, of maxims not being observed:

a) Flouting quantity

The speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information.\textsuperscript{33} Such as:

\textit{Wife:} how do I look?

\textit{Husband:} your shoes are nice…..

Her husband does not say that her gown does not look good, but he knows that his wife asks about her whole appearance and it is only gets told about part of it.

b) Flouting quality

The maxim of quality is flouted when a speaker deliberately something that is untrue or for which the speaker has inadequate evidence. An implicature is generated when the speaker deliberately says something that is false. The speaker is not trying to deceive the recipient in any way, which leads the listener to look for another set of meanings of the utterance.\textsuperscript{34} The speaker flouting the maxim of quality may it in several ways; first, they may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think.\textsuperscript{35} For example is a rich man live in one of the excellent residences interviews another man who living in the same residence with him, he utters, “\textit{I think you would be happier in a larger a smaller residence}”.

\textsuperscript{33}Joan Cutting, 2002 \textit{Op cit.} p.37
\textsuperscript{34}Jenny Thomas, 1995 \textit{Op cit.} p.67
\textsuperscript{35}Joan Cutting, 2002 \textit{Op cit.} p.36
Explanation an example above is Sir Maurice’s sentence: “I think you would be happier in a larger or a smaller residence”, it is obviously, he flouts the maxim of quality because if the knows that another man will understand that he is getting at, and hears the message behind his words.

c) Flouting relation

The maxim of relation is flouted when a speaker is giving a response or making an observation that is deliberately not relevant to topic that is being discussed. They expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make the connection between their utterance and he proceeding one(s).\textsuperscript{36} And the example is:

*Lucy: we expected a better journey.\*  
*Angel: I expected better manners.*

We can say that the second comment looks irrelevant to the first statement: Lucy is talking about the journey, and Angel’s comment is about the manners. However, Angel intends him to infer that she more like manners than driving and flight in journey. So that, Lucy understands that Angel brings her as well as it is not just bad manners, but it is also impolite and disgusting.

d) Flouting Manner

The maxim of manner is flouted when a speaker deliberately fails to observe the maxim by not being brief, using obscure language not being orderly or using ambiguity. Those who flout the maxim of manner, appearing to be

---
\textsuperscript{36}Joan Cutting, 2002 *Op cit.* p.39
obscure, are often trying to exclude a third party.\textsuperscript{37} This creates an implicature which makes the participants look for an additional set of meanings.\textsuperscript{38} This is the example between mother and her son:

\textit{Mother:} where are you off to?

\textit{Son:} I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.

\textit{Mother:} OK, but don’t be long honey, after moment lunch is nearly ready.

Son implies ambiguous way, he is saying “…that funny white stuff for somebody”. Actually, he just simply answers, he will buy ‘ice cream’ for his sister ‘Michelle’, so that his little sister does not excited and asks for the ice-cream before her meal.

Another example that flouts the maxim of manner is when speaker is intentionally ambiguous, Jhon Flowerdew \textsuperscript{39} provides the example “Go to work on an egg” which means either that ‘an egg should be eaten before work’ or that the hearer ‘should start eating an egg’.

\textbf{3. Infringing a maxim}

Jacob L. Mey tries to gives a meaning about infringing a maxim, which is, a speaker who with no intention of generating an implicature and deceiving, fails to observe a maxim is said to ‘infringe’ the maxim. The type of non-observance could occur because the speaker has an imperfect command of the language (a

\textsuperscript{37}Joan Cutting, 2002 \textit{Op cit.} p.39
\textsuperscript{38}Jenny Thomas, 1995 \textit{Op cit.} p.71
young child or a foreign learner), because the speaker’s performance is impaired in some way (nervousness, drunkenness, excitement), because of some cognitive impairment, or simply because the speaker is constitutionally incapable of speaking clearly, to the point, etc.\textsuperscript{40}

The explanation from the paragraph above, it is difficult to understand the examples of a speaker infringing a maxim because of imperfect in their performance. So that, their information is ambiguous, but it is can be accepted for the moral reasons. It means, they are not flouted, violated, infringed or opted out of cooperative maxims.

This is the example:

Rachel : \textit{Yeah, and also we need more umm, drinks. Hold on a second.} (Gets up but stumbles a little bit.) \textit{Whup, okay.} (She makes it to the phone and picks it up, without dialing). \textit{Hello! Vegas? Yeah, we would like some more alcohol, and you know what else? We would like some more beers. Hello? Oh, I forgot to dial!}

(They both start laughing. There’s a knock on the door.)

Ross : \textit{That must be our alcohol and beers!} (Gets up to answer it)

Joey : \textit{Hey!}

Ross : \textit{Oh, it’s Joey! I love Joey!} (Hugs him)

Rachel : \textit{Oh, I love Joey! Joey lives with a duck!} (Goes and hugs Joey.)

Joey : \textit{Hi!}

Rachel : \textit{Hey!}

\textsuperscript{40}Jacob L. Mey, 1998 \textit{Op cit.} p.174
Joey: Look-look-look you guys, I need some help! Okay? Someone is going to have to convince my hand twin to cooperate!

Ross: I'll do it. Hey, whatever you need me to do, I'm your man. (He starts to sit down on the bed. There's one problem though, he's about two feet to the left of it. Needless to say, he misses and falls on his butt.) (Looking up at Joey.) Whoa-oh-whoa! Are you, are you okay?41

4. Opting out a maxim

Jenny is also gives the meaning of opting out, a speaker opts out of observing a maxim by indicating unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. Examples of opting out occur frequently in the public life, when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, reply in the way normally expected. Examples of such cases could include a priest, counselor or even an investigative journalist refusing to relay information given in confidence, or a police officer refusing to release the name of an accident victim until the victim's relatives have been informed.42

When a speaker explicitly opts out of observing a maxim, she or he provide advantages way in which speakers normally attend to the maxims, which go rounds propose data for Grice’s argument on the part of interact ants a strong expectation that, and unless indication is given to the contrary, the cooperative principles and the maxims will be observed. This happens when a suspect exerts

---


42Jenny Thomas, 1995 Op cit, p.74
their right to remain silent or when a witness chooses not to impart information that may prove detrimental to the defendant.

This is the example between Detective and Shrink:

Detective: Has the defendant ever told you she hated her father and wanted him dead?

Shrink: Such information is confidential and it would be unethical to share it with you.\(^{43}\)

5. Suspending a maxim

He also gives the explanation in suspending a maxim, which is, several writers have suggested that are occasions when there is no need to opt out of observing the maxim because there are certain events in which there is no expectation on the party of any participants that they will be fulfilled (hence the non-fulfillment does not generate any implicatures). This category is necessary to respond to criticism of the type made by Keenan who proposed as a counter-example to Grice’s theory of conversational implicature the fact that in the Malagasy Republic participants in talk exchanges:

…regularly provide less information than is required by their conversational partner, even though they have access to the necessary information.\(^{44}\)

(Keenan 1976:70)

Keenan’s example above is doing not fix Grice’s theory because the maxim of quantity is suspended. The speaker is not giving the accurate information about their relatives and friends but they notice of evil spirits to them. Although the Malagasy is uninformative on what it is said because it is not systematic, motivated, and produces implicatures which are readily interpretable by the member of community.

\(^{43}\)Jenny Thomas, 1995 Op cit, p.74
\(^{44}\)Jenny Thomas, 1995 Op cit, p.76
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

In the data description, the writer tabulates the collected data from the film script and the note results of watching film as described below:

Table. 1. The types of cooperative principle maxims in the movie Yes Man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Maxims</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Corpses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Quantity   | 1.1. The contribution should be as informative as required.  
               | 1.2. Neither too little nor too much answer.          | 1. **Carl**: Lee, What do you need?  
                                                        |                                                      | **Lee**: It may be my last loan.  
                                                        |                                                      | It’s a Ducati. I’m thinking it will get people off my back  
                                                        |                                                      | about the male nurse thing.  
                                                        |                                                      | See what I mean?  
                                                        |                                                      | **Carl**: Yeah, Nice ride. |
|               |            | 2. **Rooney**: Hey Pete. Mind putting that on a coaster?  
                                                        |                                                      | **Peter**: What do you live here now?  
                                                        |                                                      | **Rooney**: Yeah, I asked Carl and he had to say ‘yes’. |
                                                        |                                                      | **Carl**: Pleasure to meet you. |
| 2. Quality    | 2.1. Speaker should not say something he believes to be false  
               | 2.2. Speaker should not be truthful or true.  
               | 2.3. There should adequate evidence.                  | 1. **Stephanie**: So, where are you headed?  
                                                        |                                                      | **Carl**: meeting my girlfriend here. We don’t know where  
                                                        |                                                      | we’re going.  
                                                        |                                                      | **Stephanie**: Really?  
                                                        |                                                      | **Carl**: Yeah, we’re just going to pick a place. Kind of  
                                                        |                                                      | an ‘eeny, meeny, miny’ thing. Keep it fresh.  
                                                        |                                                      | I’ll see you guys. |
|               |            | 2. **Peter**: You all right?  
                                                        |                                                      | **Carl**: Yes. |
In the dialog of *Yes Man* movie, the writer finds some flouts of cooperative principle which can create the incongruity of their implicature. The dialogues are identified below:

| 1. Wesley: Carl, this bank traditionally has never given out small loans. |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Norman: I can explain…. |
| Wesley: Sit down, Norman. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Terrence: What is your name?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl: Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence: Let me guess, Carl. Someone talked you into coming here, didn’t they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl: Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Relevance</th>
<th>3.1. The contribution should be relevant to the interaction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2. The response of utterance must be relevant to the prior utterance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Avoid ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. Be orderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Peter: Any more beers in the fridge?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rooney: Sorry, this was the last one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Rooney: Yo, Carl. We’re hitting the clubs. We have a case of Red Bull. Gonna pull an all-nighter, you down?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl: Yeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Peter: till not calling you back?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter: What are you going to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl: I don’t know, I guess I’ll just stick with the program. Keep saying ‘yes’ to everything. I know it sounds silly but maybe all that bad stuff leads to something good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. The flouts of cooperative principle maxims in the movie Yes Man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Flouts of Maxims</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Corpuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quantity</td>
<td>1.1. The speaker is unable to fulfill the first maxim without flouting the second maxim. 1.2. The speaker doesn’t give the information as required.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Flyer guy</strong>: A good show tonight. Come check us out. Hey man, want to rock out tonight? Oh, it’s you. Let me guess, no? <strong>Carl</strong>: Yes. <strong>Flyer guy</strong>: Yes? <strong>Carl</strong>: No, I meant ‘yes’ to your ‘no’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Peter</strong>: Do you even know my fiance’s last name? <strong>Carl</strong>: Yeah, Fisher. Fishman. Wait… Fish wall?. <strong>Peter</strong>: You think her name is Lucy Fish Wall? <strong>Carl</strong>: No, that’s wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Carl</strong>: What have you been doing? <strong>Nick Line</strong>: I’ve been all over the map man. I have lived, I climbed Mt. Kilimanjaro, I ate a bat in Laos, I shot a cow with a bazooka, I’m not proud of that last one, but I did it, man. <strong>Carl</strong>: wow that sounds wild.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Allison</strong>: It’s so crazy. Are you stalking me? <strong>Carl</strong>: No, I would never do that. By the way, your new LR furniture, it looks great from the yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality</td>
<td>2.1. Quietly deceiving. 2.2. The speaker obviously flouts the maxims by giving untruth.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Peter</strong>: So, what are you doing? <strong>Carl</strong>: Oh, Just hanging out in my apartment. <strong>Peter</strong>: You did get my text right? <strong>Carl</strong>: What? Text, what?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. The speaker says something without adequate evidence.

Peter: We’re all going out tonight.
Carl: oh, man that sounds great. I wish I could join you.
I’m just so jammed up.
I’m totally off the grid. Know what I mean?
Peter: uh, no I don’t at all.

2. Carl: I was missing you I guess. Wired, huh?
Stephanie: Yes, Carl. I have to go. Ted and I are taking a little boat ride.
Carl: oh, that’s great. Good for you.

3. Carl: Good evening, Los Angeles. Please welcome to the Hollywood Bowl, "Munchausen by Proxy" I'm your biggest fan. I killed her. I'm a somebody.
Allison: I don't know about that.

4. Allison: What the hell, Carl? Are you serious, you just say 'Yes' to everything? Even if you don't like it?
Carl: No, of course not. Sometimes.

3. Relevance
3.1. Uttering something insincerely, irrelevant or ambiguous.
3.2. Internationally generates a misleading implicature.

1. Norman: Carl Allen has reported for duty?
Carl: I’m not a soldier, Norman.
Norman: You are a soldier on the front line of finance.

2. Tillie: How about some toast?
Carl: I have to go to work, but thanks.

3. Carl: Are you Crazy?
Nick Line: Go to this reunion, Carl.
| 4. Manner | 4.1. The speaker utters the sentences unbriefly and ambiguously.  
4.2. The hearer is faced with minor problem to understand the deep meaning of the speaker’s utterance. |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
Carl: Oh no. Oh shoot. You are kidding?  
That was tonight? I am so sorry. I totally gapped it.  
Listen, I’ll make it up to you. I promise, I swear. You pick the day. Any day you want. We’ll go out. We’ll swashbuckle.  
Peter: What does that even mean?  
Carl: I don’t know. |
| 2. Carl: Hey Carl? Do you want to give all your money away to homeless guy? Yes, yes I do.  
How about letting him burn out your phone battery  
So you can’t call ‘Triple A’ when you run out of gas?  
You know what? That sounds like a fucking great idea!  
Why not take a late night stroll through the hills and get killed by the Manson Family?  
Don’t mind if I do! |
| 3. Nick lane: So, are you going to do it?  
Carl: I do not know, maybe.  
Nick lane: This is weird, I didn’t realize we just stepped out of a ‘Maybe’ seminar. |
| 4. Lucy: No, I’m not doing bridal Bingo. I do not want anything complicated.  
Carl: you gotta squeeze every drop of juice out of this experience.  
Soo-mi: Are you going to be asking a lot of question?  
I don’t got all day. |
In the movie “Yes Man”, the writer discovers 24 corpuses based on four basic maxims of cooperative principles. To be informed there are three maxims of quantity, two maxims of quality, two maxims of relevance and two maxims of manner and there are fifteen data non-observance of flouting maxims.

B. Data Analysis

To analyze, the writer uses the data from the dialogue of Yes Man movie. First, he writes the text of dialogues, explains the flouts and disobedience of maxim of conversation which is on the dialogue and already divided into two groups. Then, he gives reason and further exploration in explaining it by using Grice theory of maxim conversation. In analyzing the data, the writer describes context of situation, process of maxim, process of flouts and implicature in each datum. Therefore, the data will be analyzed as follows:

1. The Maxim of Cooperative Principles
   a. The maxim of quantity

   Datum 1

   Carl: Lee, What do you need?

   Lee: It may be my last loan. It’s a Ducati. I’m thinking it will get people off my back about the male nurse thing. See what I mean?

   Carl: Yeah, Nice ride.
1) **Context of situation**

In the morning, when Carl, a staff in BREA Federal savings and loan, arrived there were a lot of people who were waiting for him. When entering the room Carl saw his friend as a nurse was waiting for him. Lee showed one of the images in the magazine he was carrying. He wanted to have a bike for daily transportation to the place of work, so he borrowed the company where Carl worked.

2) **Process of maxim of quantity**

Carl seemed to understand the meaning of Lee’s arrival, by asking "Lee, What do you need?" And by aiming the magazine in hand, Lee explained he had come, saying, "It may be my last loan. It's a Ducati. I'm thinking it will get people off my back about the male nurse thing. See what I mean?" And Carl replied" Yeah, Nice ride ". Carl answered with sufficient and meant he does not violate the maxim. Listening to Carl, Lee seemed happy. Such information can be received by either Carl give a contribution as informative as required without making it more or less informative, based on some facts above, the writer concludes that Carl has fulfilled the maxim of quantity all the way.

**Datum II**

**Rooney:** Hey Pete. Mind putting that on a coaster?

**Peter:** What do you live here now?
Rooney: Yeah, I asked Carl and he had to say 'yes'.

1) Context of situation

Friends of Carl, Rooney is living and maintaining apartments Carl, when Carl goes. Rooney held a public viewing Baseball game between Nebraska vs. Oklahoma with his friends. When Peter put the bottle is not in place, Rooney had rebuked Peter. But Peter questioned the warning.

2) Process of maxim of quantity

Rooney rebuked when Peter put something out of place then, Peter asks “What do you live here now?” He utters his question sufficiently. Hearing Peter's question, Rooney gives information for the question was asked by Peter. He said, "Yeah, I asked Carl and he had to say 'yes'. Based on Rooney's statement when he asked Carl and he had to say yes, the writer Identifies that Rooney gives his informative contribution sufficiently for the current purpose of the conversation and he does not mean to violate the maxim, the writer concludes that the speakers obey this maxim well.

Datum III

Wesley: Carl. Wesley T. Parker. V.P. Brea Fed Savings.

Carl: Pleasure to meet you.
1) **Context of situation**

Wesley was on duty, came to the branch of bank he managed. He met Carl to have business meeting which this was the first time they met. Carl came into the waiting room, afterwards Wesley introduced himself to Carl with shaking hands.

2) **Process of maxim of quantity**

Wesley was warmly welcomed by Carl and said "*Carl, Wesley T. Parker. V.P. Saving Brea Fed Saving*", the information presented was quite understandable and appropriate about the context, Carl just said "*Pleasure to meet you*" to show his understand about the greeting he said so. Carl expressed a simple response to answer Wesley. The writer assumes the information conveyed by Wesley contributed to Carl, this is in line with Grice’s principles of cooperation.

b. **The maxim of quality**

**Datum I**

**Stephanie:** So, where are you headed?

**Carl:** *meeting my girlfriend here. We don’t know where we’re going.*

**Stephanie:** Really?

**Carl:** Yeah, we’re just going to pick a place. Kind of an ‘eeny, meeny, miny’ thing. Keep it fresh. I’ll see you guys.
1) **Context of situation**

When Carl wanted to meet her love at the airport, he met with Stephanie and her love. Carl was surprised because Stephanie was his ex-wife. Stephanie really wanted to know where Carl went until he looked very happy.

2) **Process of maxim of quality**

In this maxim, the speaker is not required to say what he believes to be false or lack of evidence. The maxim of quality in the datum 1 is seen in the information contributed by Stephanie and Carl. Stephanie was shocked to see Carl was in the airport, asked Carl "So, where are you headed?" After hearing that his ex-wife’s question, Carl responded quickly and decisively "meeting my girlfriend here. We do not know where we're going." What Carl said about meeting and his plan is right because his girlfriend was waiting in the airport, but Stephanie was less convinced by this, but Carl clarified many times that he has changed from his old habits. The writer argues that conversation can be received well because of what Carl said is true. In sum, the maxim has been well-fulfilled.

---
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Datum II

Peter: You all right?

Carl: Yes.

Peter: Still not calling you back?

Carl: No.

Peter: What are you going to do?

Carl: I don’t know, I guess I’ll just stick with the program. Keep saying ‘yes’ to everything. I know it sounds silly but maybe all that bad stuff leads to something good.

1) Context situation

Carl held a bachelorette party for his friend, Peter and his fiancée Lucy in Big Foot Lodge Café. Meanwhile in the middle of a great party Carl felt sad and disturbed because Allison didn’t come and not be in contact. Peter was getting closer to Carl because he was a pensive man in the middle of the party, so he was staying beside Carl to accompany him.

2) Process of maxim of quality

Carl was getting alone with his only phone, Peter came and said, "You all right?" Carl spiritless answered "Yes" It was caused by Allison’s losing contact. Accompanying Carl, Peter asked again what will him doing, with no expression he replied "I do not know, I guess
I'll just stick with the program. Keep saying 'yes' to everything. I know it sounds silly but maybe all that bad stuff leads to something good". That meant Carl was uncertain with what was being and would be done. Peter realized and justified it. The writer concludes that information given by Peter and Carl is true. Based on the situation speakers engaged in this conversational to this maxim.

c. The maxim of relevance

Datum I

Wesley: Carl, this bank traditionally has never given out small loans.

Norman: I can explain….

Wesley: Sit down, Norman.

Norman: Yes

1) Context Situation

In the morning a corporate officer came to the bank. Wesley was Vice President BREA Federal Savings Bank, he wanted to meet Carl and Norman. Wesley provided an explanation for Carl doing things out of the ordinary bank gives loans to others. Norman was Carl’s boss and he must be responsible for the performance of Carl.
2) Process of maxim of relevance

When Wesley gave an explanation to Carl for his actions, Wesley showed his anger, and Norman stood up and said "I can explain ... ". Saw and heard the response from Norman, Wesley directly cut him by saying "Sit down, Norman". Wesley has provided the relevant phrase, he understood that Norman would like to provide a defense for Carl. Observing the data, the writer identifies there is a relevant cooperation between Wesley and Norman to get the purpose of the conversation. It means that its maxim has been accorded.

Datum II

Terrence: What is your name?
Carl: Carl

Terrence: Let me guess, Carl. Someone talked to you to coming here, didn’t they?
Carl: Yes.

1) Context Situation

Carl was attending the seminar invited by his friend Nick lane, he was a new member therefore he was asked to come in to the stage by Terrence as a leader of seminar “YES MAN”. In order Carl refused the offer so Terrence came closer to him then he started the conversation by greeting.
2) **Process of maxim of manner**

Terrence was on chair face to face with Carl, he asked name and asked “*Let me guess, Carl. Someone talked to you to coming here, didn’t they?*” Carl answered definitely “*yes*”. The conversation between Terrence and Carl was a maxim of relevance because they talked related to the topic.

1) **Context Situation**

Carl was dreaming Peter and Rooney came into his apartment to see him but his appearance was just like nobody, he was there but his friend ignored him. His silence was making uncomfortable situation which made them hot and bored so that Peter asking beer to Rooney.

2) **Process of maxim of manner**

Peter was asking beer to Rooney because he was thirsty, then Rooney answered “*Sorry, this was the last one*” Rooney explained.
there were no beers in a fridge. This conversation cooperated between the speaker and the hearer because they said it briefly and orderly.

Datum II

**Rooney:** *Yo, Carl. We’re hitting the clubs. We have a case of Red Bull. Gonna pull an all-nighter, you down?*

**Carl:** Yeah

1) **Context Situation**

Carl was getting ready to sleep, after set the alarm and turned off the lights. Carl started to close his eyes and suddenly his cell phone rang and he immediately picked up the telephone.

2) **Process of maxim of manner**

The conversation was occurring between Rooney and Carl on phone. Rooney called Carl for something to do, immediately when Carl was ready on phone Rooney explained in detail, direct, clear, orderly and brief "*Yo, Carl. We're hitting the clubs. We have a case of Red Bull. Gonna pull an all-nighter, you down?*" Heard Rooney’s explanations Carl said no words just "*Yeah*" to show his agreement, at once he get out of bed to rush headed to Rooney. The writer considers that Rooney did the maxim of Manner from Grice’s principle of cooperation.
2. The flouts of Cooperative Principles

a. The maxim of quantity’s flouts

Datum I

Flyer guy: A good show tonight. Come check us out. Hey man, want to rock out tonight?

Flyer guy: Oh, it’s you. Let me guess, no?

Carl: Yes.

Flyer guy: Yes?

Carl: No, I meant ‘yes’ to your ‘no’

1) Context of situation

On the sidewalk a Flyer guy was yelling to promote and distributing flyers for a concert at the nearby café. Carl was coming out of a supermarket and went to his office, passing the flyer guy. Then, the flyer guy was offering him to join the concert.

2) Process of flouting

Carl's utterance above is considered as flouting the maxim of quantity. Carl, who flouted the maxim of quantity, seemed to give little information than was needed. Flyer guy invited Carl pessimistically. He said "oh, it's you. Let me guess, No?". Flyer guy handed out flyers and invited Carl to come in through the concert, Carl was being a little informative. According to the cooperative principle,
and if he was going to make-cooperative conversation, he did not just say "Yes". Because Carl provided lack of information, the flyer guy didn’t understand so he questioned from the word yes. Carl explained by saying "No, I meant 'yes' to your 'no'". In sum, this maxim has been flouted by Carl.

3) Implicature

When Carl flouted the maxim of quantity, there is an implicature inside it. Carl was in a hurry and he actually did want to come to the concert but Carl said so that he approved the statement of the flyer guy. Because of the delivery of Carl was unclear, the flyer guy was thinking Carl should come in to the concert.

### Datum II

**Peter** : Do you even know my fiance’s last name?

**Carl** : *Yeah, Fisher.*

*Fishman.*

*Wait... Fish wall?*

**Peter** : You think her name is Lucy Fish Wall?

**Carl** : No, that’s wrong.
1) Context of situation

Carl saw Peter was upset when he came to Carl’s apartment because Carl did not attend to Peter and Allison’s engagement party. Realizing his mistake, Carl tried to persuade Peter that he was not angry with him.

2) Process of flouting

Carl's utterance above is considered as flouting the maxim of quantity. Carl, who flouted the maxim of quantity, Seemed to give much information than was needed and not required. Peter was very upset with his friend, and then Peter asking questions hoped Carl could answer it. Peter asked Carl "Do you even know my fiance's last name?" And convincingly he answered "Yeah, Fisher. Fishman. Wait.... Fish wall?", By giving more information than he needed, it would not give the specific answer to Peter and it made Peter angry, he also Expressed her anger by saying "You think her name is Lucy Fish Wall?". In sum, this maxim has been violated by Carl.

3) Implicature

When Carl was violating the maxim of quantity, there was a hidden meaning in his words. Carl said that he knew and mentioned the name of Peter’s fiance family. Behind the context of the situation, Carl actually did not know the name of Peter’s fiance family, because
Carl was absent in Peter’s party he was upset with him so Peter was trying to avoid Carl.

Datum III

**Carl:** What have you been doing?

**Nick Lane:** *I’ve been all over the map man.*

*I have lived, I climbed Mt. Kilimanjaro, I ate a bat in Laos,*

*I shot a cow with a bazooka, I’m not proud of that last one,*

*but I did it, man*

**Carl:** wow that sounds wild.

1) **Context of situation**

When it was a break time Carl sit in the office’s terrace, suddenly Nick lane came over. Nick lane was a friend who had not been met for times ago. When looking at Carl, he approached and tried to tease Carl who work in his office till seemed so tired.

2) **Process of flouting**

Nick lane violates the maxim quantity of Grice’s cooperation principal because he provides more information than Carl needed. Nick lane was before Carl then he asked Nick lane, He said, *“What have you been doing?”* Nick lane was very proud of what had been doing, yes confidently replied *“I’ve been all over the map man. I have*
lived, I climbed Mt. Kilimanjaro, I ate a bat in Laos, I shot a cow with a bazooka, I'm not proud of that last one, but I did it, man”. In this speech contains redundant information than is needed by the hearer.

3) Implicature

This dialogue implicates Nick lane’s statement. Nick lane deliberately described his spectacular trips, he did that because he wanted Carl to follow things he did. He wanted Carl whom known as a selfish man to explore his self as what to do by common people. In this dialogue, the writer agrees that Nick lane flouts maxim of quantity

Datum IV

Allison: It’s so crazy. Are you stalking me?

Carl: No, I would never do that.

By the way, your new LR furniture, it looks great from the yard.

1) Context of situation

Carl was visiting a café which organized a local band’s single concert, it turned into the second meeting for Carl and Allison. Carl did not know that Allison was a vocalist in that band and they continued the unfinished conversation to know each other.
2) Process of flouting

In the café, Carl met and made the conversation with Allison with a flouted of the maxim of quantity. Allison felt surprised when met Carl, said "It's so crazy, are you stalking me?" Carl answered the question "No, I would never do that". Suddenly he changed the expression frightening Allison, saying “By the way, your new LR furniture, it looks great from the yard”. In the maxim of quantity, a speaker should not provide redundant information than what is required by a listener, therefore the writer considers that Carl flouted the maxim of quantity.

3) Implicature

Carl initiated a conversation and put some of humor, expressed an implicature to take a sympathetic from Allison. Carl was a new acquaintance for Allison, he tried to make her comfortable so he deliberately flouted the maxim of quantity to make her felt completely unstressed about.

b. The maxim of quality’s flouts

Datum I

Peter: So, what are you doing?
Carl: Oh, Just hanging out in my apartment.
Peter: You did get my text right?
Carl: what? Text, what?

Peter: We’re all going out tonight.

Carl: oh, man that sounds great. I wish I could join you.

I’m Just so jammed up.

I’m totally off the grid. Know what I mean?

Peter: uh, no I don’t at all.

1) Context of situation

Carl was in the video store buying a DVD of his favorite recent movie. Carl’s phone rang and accidentally lifted, the phone call was from Peter. Here was a conversation between Carl and Peter on phone.

2) Process of flouting

In this case Carl intentionally flouted the maxim of quality. Flouting the maxim of quality is a condition when a participant does not convey something not in accordance with the actual facts in delivering the message. Carl and Peter were on phone; Peter asked "So, what are you doing?" Carl replied casually "Oh, Just hanging out in my apartment". The conversation was ongoing between Carl and Peter even Carl said something untrue. Peter invited Carl to present at his engagement party, but Carl said "oh, man that sounds great. I wish I could join you. I’m just so jammed up. I’m totally off the grid. Know what I mean?" Peter was there when Carl said so; Peter knew that
everything he said did not conform to the real. According to the process of conversation, the writer agrees that Carl flouted the maxim of quality

3) Implicature

Carl said that he was in apartment, he did not receive texts and was busy with his work. In fact he was feeling pleased with the solitude and did not want to be bothered by anyone, so he chose to lie. The implicature of his statement is he meant to be alone.

Datum II

Carl: I was missing you I guess. Wired, huh?
Stephanie: Yes, Carl. I have to go. Ted and I are taking a little boat ride.
Carl: oh, that's great. Good for you... Good for you...

1) Context of situation

In the middle of busy and tedious activities Carl chose to take a break and he also wanted to remove the longing for solitude by contacting Stephanie, but the timing was not right because Stephanie was busy.
2) **Process of flouting**

In the conversation Carl flouts the maxim of quality. He was missing his ex-wife. He was trying to contact Stephanie expressing his longing by phone, unfortunately Stephanie was busy and said to Carl “Yes, Carl. I have to go. Ted and I taking a little boat ride”. Hearing Stephanie’s statement Carl was feeling so disappointed, because it was not what he expected to say, then he answered forcedly "oh, that's great. Good for you ... Good for you...” The conversation was ongoing between Carl and Stephanie Carl even said something untrue. According to the process of conversation, the writer agrees that Carl flouts the maxim of quality.

3) **Implicature**

Carl’s answer flouted maxim quality and the implicature that he actually didn’t like Stephanie’s expression. He wanted to ask Stephanie’s time even a briefly moment to chat with to cure his missing but Stephanie ignored it, in fact he was jealous of Stephanie’s journey with her new lover. The writer concludes that Carl reveals something that is not in accordance with the facts occurred.
Datum III

Carl: *Good evening, Los Angeles. Please welcome to the Hollywood Bowl, 'Munchausen by Proxy' I’m your biggest fan. I killed her. I’m a somebody.*

Allison: I don't know about that.

1) **Context Situation**

Carl and Allison were in an open hall, the Hollywood Bowl, where various concerts held. They crept into the hall through that night and sat on a chair. Carl suddenly spoke as if he was a master of ceremonies and also as one of the big fan of Munchausen by Proxy.

2) **Process of flouting**

Carl said loudly *"Good evening, Los Angeles. Please welcome to the Hollywood Bowl, 'Munchausen by Proxy' I'm your biggest fan. I killed her. I'm a somebody."* Carl put his self as a host as well as a big Fans of Munchausen by Proxy, he made a joke trying to make funny moment. The writer assumes that Carl intentionally flouted the maxim of quality because he said a lie and provided information did not fit the facts.
3) **Implicature**

Words spoken by Carl implicated something, he intended to make a quality warm time with Allison then he tried to joke a lie about that moment which made Allison smile before they start the conversation.

**Datum IV**

**Allison:** What the hell, Carl? Are you serious, you just say 'Yes' to everything? Even if you don't like it?

**Carl:** *No, of course not. Sometimes.*

1) **Context Situation**

Carl and Allison were arrested and had been interrogated by the FBI, they were accused as terrorist. Carl asked his friend Peter to be his lawyer to fight the charges. Carl and Allison were waiting outside the room with hands handcuffed. While waiting, Allison asked the things she did not know about Carl. Allison was still shocked and confused, when she and Carl were suddenly forced to come into the FBI office.
2) Process of flouting

This shocking problem made Allison had a lot of questions for Carl, she asked "What the hell, Carl? Are you serious, you just say 'Yes' to everything? Even if you do not like it?" Carl instantly responded her question tried to convince her "No, of course not." He stop for a moment and then continued a slow response "Sometimes". Carl said something suspiciously did not fit the facts. For his expression, the writer assumes Carl flouted a maxim of quality.

3) Implicature

Carl tried to deliver an implicature in his statement, he tried to cover up what he had done in daily life. He could not explain in detail the program he joined to Allison because he thought it was a good thing that influenced his self, one thing he could do was liieg to Allison.

c. The maxim of relevance’s flouts

Datum I

Norman: Carl Allen has reported for duty?

Carl: I’m not a soldier, Norman.

Norman: You are a soldier, on the front line of finance.
1) **Context of situation**

Carl was at his desk, felt annoyed when saw his boss from a distance getting closer inevitably he accepted Norman’s attendance. Norman was making warm conversation between to please Carl because he intended to inform the fire of Carl’s Job. Carl was always feeling bored in a conversation with Norman, so he was answering bad to react Norman.

2) **Process of flouting**

In a conversation Carl deliberately flouted the maxim of relevance, in which he was required to say relevant thing to those were being spoken. This happened when his boss approached and said "Carl Allen has reported for duty?" unhappily, Carl replied "I'm not a soldier, Norman". In this case Carl pretended that he did not know what his boss intended to say. Thus, the writer concludes this conversation does not have a deal in conveying the cooperative principle in the maxims of relevance.

3) **Implicature**

Carl implicated he was not agreeing with Norman’s statement, he was feeling disturbed by the presence of Norman he considered it improper time and place so he indirectly was trying to get away from
him but Norman did not even understand instead he was saying annoying things.

Datum II

Tellie: How about some toast?
Carl: I have to go to work, but thanks.

1) Context of situation

When Carl came out of his apartment to go to work, his neighbor, Tellie was an old lady already waiting in front of his apartment to have breakfast together. She asked Carl to join with her but he softly denied.

2) Process of flouting

Carl deliberately flouted maxim of relevance when he refused Tellie’s offer. Tellie tried several times to persuade Carl to offer any breakfast, for more Tellie asked him again "How about some toast?" and Carl refused to do so by saying "I have to go to work, but thanks". In this context the writer considers Carl rejection flouts the maxim of relevance because the phrase has no contribution in accordance with what is being spoken.
3) **Implicature**

A sentence that had been spoken by Carl had an implicature that Carl actually felt uncomfortable as an old lady was in love with him and always trying to be with him, but he refused meanwhile tried to keep Tellie’s feeling he said something that unrelated to Tellie’s offer so he flouted the maxim of relevance.

Datum III

**Carl:** Are you Crazy?

**Nick Line:** *Go to this reunion, Carl.*

1) **Context of situation**

Nick lane accidentally saw Carl and he was immediately greeted Carl who was sitting in front of the park office. They had been friends for a long time but never met. Nick lane introduced a program that he had run and changed his way of life to persuade Carl to join the program then he prove it by throwing stones at the glass of office and he fled when security chasing him.

2) **Process of flouting**

The conversation between speaker and hearer flouted the maxim of relevance, because speakers and hearer conveyed irrelevant thing. When Carl was surprised seeing Nick lane threw a stone to the
glass office, saying "Are you Crazy?" As the security chasing Nick lane, he got ready to run holding Carl’s shoulder and said "Go to this reunion, Carl". The writer notes that Carl and Nick lane has flouted the principle of cooperation in the relevant maxims, as in the phrase they do not make any relevant contribution to the spoken sentence.

3) **Implicature**

Carl said “are you crazy?” to express his curiosity about the program Nick lane run it on in order he saw Nick lane did whatever he said so this sentence implicated Carl’s expression when he was shocked to see what was done by Nick lane, it was a way from Nick lane to persuade Carl joining the unusual seminar.

**Datum IV**

**Lucy**: No, I’m not doing bridal Bingo. I do not want anything complicated.

**Carl**: you gotta squeeze every drop of juice out of this experience.

**Soo-mi**: Are you going to be asking a lot of question?

*I don’t got all day.*
1) **Context Situation**

Peter asked for Carl’s help to accompany Lucy to go to the wedding organizer store to select concepts that will be used at his wedding. When Carl and Lucy were choosing and discussing, they stopped because there were things they did not understand. Finally, they asked the shopkeeper named Soo-mi.

2) **Process of flouting**

Soo-mi deliberately flouted the maxim of relevant when Carl asked her self. While discussing and giving advice to Lucy, Carl asked Soo-mi’s response by saying "you gotta squeeze every drop of juice out of this experience. It does not seem complicated. Is it complicated?", but Soo-mi responded sarcastically and said, "Are you going to be asking a lot of question? I do not got all day." The Information conveyed by Soo-mi was irrelevant to what was actually happening and the answer was not what Carl wanted to hear about. The writer assumes that Soo-mi flouted the maxim of relevant.

3) **Implicature**

The writer analyzes Soo-mi’s statement that flouted a maxim of relevant, she delivered an implicature to be understood. Actually Soo-mi felt jealous when the arrival of customers to the shop in pairs and
were talking about marriage, she felt annoyed by that condition instead she deliberately responded Carl’s question sarcasticly so she flouted the principle of cooperation.

d. The maxim of manner’s flouts

Datum I

Peter: You know what buddy?
You missed my engagement party tonight.

Carl: Oh no. Oh shoot. You are kidding?

That was tonight? I am so sorry. I totally gapped it.

Listen, I'll make it up to you. I promise. I swear. You pick the day. Any day you want. We'll go out. We'll swashbuckle.

Peter: What does that even mean?

Carl: I don't know.

1) Context of situation

Carl was relaxing while watching a DVD Movie, Carl felt disturbed because his phone rang several times then he immediately turned it off. A few minutes later his apartment bell rang and he opened the door. It turns out that Peter came to him upset and angry at Carl because he didn’t come to Peter’s engagement party.
2) **Process of flouting**

In this conversation Carl Flouted the maxim of manner, in which the maxim requires participants speak directly substitutions, clear and not blurred. It can be seen when Peter says to Carl "*You know what buddy? You missed my engagement party tonight*". With a feeling of panic, Carl responded by saying "*Oh no. Oh shoot. You are kidding? That was tonight? I am so sorry. I totally gapped it. Listen, I'll make it up to you. I promise. I swear. You pick the day. Any day you want. We'll go out. We'll Swashbuckler*". Writer considers, Carl’s statement didn’t express any clarity and briefly information instead it was confusing, redundant and indirectly. He did not know what Peter intended to say so he said something ambiguous to cover his guilty.

The writer concludes that Carl has flouted the maxim of manner.

3) **Implicature**

The writer analyses Carl implicated that he was aware of his mistake to Peter and tried to cover it up because Carl was still very traumatized by the term of engagement or marriage that caused his failure in a relationship. He did not want to engage in love affairs, though it was matter of his friend or the surrounding areas because he thought that love is painful.
Datum II

Carl: Hey Carl? Do you want to give all your money away to homeless guy? Yes, yes I do.

How about letting him burn out your phone battery

So you can’t call ‘Triple A’ when you run out of gas?

You know what? That sounds like a fucking great idea!

Why not take a late night stroll through the hills and get killed by the Manson Family?

Don’t mind if I do!

1) Context of situation

Returning from the seminar “Yes Man” Carl immediately forced to get his first test, he must always approve any good things he wants or not. First he gave a ride to a homeless man, and lent his phone to him till gone, then gave him his money. After that person was gone, he planned to go home to his apartment. Unfortunately, the vehicle ran out of gas and he was stuck in the middle of the forest in the night. So, he left the car for buying the gasoline and while walking to the gas station, he spoke to himself and was very upset.
2) **Process of flouting**

Carl flouted the maxim of Manner in reflecting his jar of heart. When Carl talking to himself. He said few rambling sentences, disorganized and addressed the vagueness of expression, he asked his own questions and answered by himself. Therefore the writer argues that Carl flouted the maxim of manner.

3) **Implicature**

The writer analyzes Carl’s expression had an implicature that he was actually still not convinced with the program, he still could not believe what he did before so he could only complain and got angry with himself.

Datum III

**Nick lane:** So, are you going to do it?

**Carl:** I do not know, maybe.

**Nick lane:** *This is weird, I didn’t realize we just stepped out of a ‘Maybe’ seminar.*

1) **Context of situation**

After the seminar, Nick lane accompanied Carl towards to the car park. Nick lane felt the seminar was very helpful for him and he wanted to know the feedback and the results of these activities for
Carl, it could be obtained and applied to daily life, as same as Nick lane had already done.

2) Process of flouting

Carl and Nick lane was having the conversation, one of them flouted the maxim of Manner. This happened when Carl answered questions from Nick lane by saying "I do not know, maybe". Then Nick lane responded and quipped "This is weird, I did not realize we just stepped out of a 'Maybe' seminar". The writer analyzes that Nick lane gave ambiguous and rambling statement though a clarification, he flouted the maxim of manner because he gave unclear clarification that lead to lack of clarity for the listener.

3) Implicature

Nick lane gave a humorous effect to deliver the implicature from his statement to make Carl understand about the seminar benefits for him. Nick lane hoped Carl should apply that seminar into his life to feel its benefits for life.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusions

Based on the research problem in the first chapter and the presentation of research findings from the data in the third chapter, the conclusion can be described as follows;

The first relates to the first question, concerning the type of flouted maxims in the film “Yes Man” as a comedy genre. The author concludes all of the data that has been analyzed flouting the maxims of Grice’s Cooperative Principle. There are four maxims classification; Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relevance, and Maxim of Manner. All of these maxims have been flouted well as an expression of the speakers to deliver what can not be said literary.

The second question is concerning on the way of flouting maxim occur in the dialogue. The difference between violation and flout of maxims is the intention to not obey the rule. The violation of maxim is used when the speaker breaks or act against some agreements, principles, or something that should be treated with respect but they are not which causes misunderstanding between the speaker and the listener. Meanwhile the flouting of maxims occur when the speaker intentionally not obey the principles to deliver the message to the listeners in a way to attract attention from other people or the speaker implicitly says something he / she can not clearly say in order to hide some truths or cover up the evidences
about something uttered by joking such a lie. Here the speaker uses an implicature to convey its meaning to deliver their intention.

Concerning on the implicature of the speaker needed to say. The Cooperative Principles are designed to make a bona fide conversation between the speaker and the listener, it has principles to deliver the messages to the listener. It facilitates the conversation to be well received but in some occasions the speaker flouts otherwise. The author concludes that the Maxims are flouted by the speaker in order to achieve certain goals. The implicature has its own meaning to be interpreted according to the context of situation that the speaker deliberately shows, the listener should give attention to the speaker’s intention in order to fit the conversation between them that delivered by an implicature made to show the speaker’s feelings or aims. Then the listener can decide what should be done to react the intention of the speaker’s implicature.

B. Suggestion

In this study, the writer analyzes some of the dialogues that include the type of flouted maxim of Grice’s Cooperative Principles, the processes and the occurrence of implicature of the dialogue in the movie. The author finds that types of flouted maxims occur as intentionally not to obey the cooperative principles to create funny stimulation somehow. This Grice’s Principles can be applied into our conversation and to implicitly say something we can not say in some cases of daily activities.
The writer suggests to another researcher to deeply explore about Grice’s Cooperative Principles because it is the tool of the conversation to be received. Some people do not understand how to express the feelings and to interpret the meanings of the speaker, here we need to know the implicature and why the speaker flouts or violates the maxims to deliver their aims. The writer hopes by this study, students and other researchers can sharpen their knowledge about Cooperative Principles especially its Flout of Maxims and other people can learn and develop more about it to apply in daily conversation and interact each other.
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