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ABSTRACT


This thesis discusses the non-observance of maxim in *Yes Man* movie directed by Peyton Reed and distributed by Warner Home Video, 2008. The main objective of the research is to know the kinds of non-observance of maxim and the reasons of using them in *Yes Man* movie.

This research uses qualitative method. The writer uses Gricean Maxim theory and other relevant references. He uses the movie’s scripts that initialized in the movie as the unit of analysis, and then he also uses the background and setting of the movie to make the reasons of the characters why they are using the non-observance of maxim in their conversation.

Through this paper, the writer finds the research findings that there are three kinds of Cooperative Principle that initialized in the movie; they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality and maxim of relevance. However, he only focuses on describing the setting of conversation, categorizing of non-observing maxim and their implicature meaning.

Finally, the writer hopes that this research will be useful for future improvement, especially for English Department’s students who want to know deeply regarding Cooperative Principle.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

One of essence of language is to communicate and interact with each other\(^1\). Consciously or not, in communication every people tries to make effort in order that whatever that people tell can be understood by other participant so that the purpose of that conversation can be achieved and not suffered to other participant. Suffering means it does not make other participant confused and wasting their time. That is why, in other that communication can occur fluently and efficiently. So the speaker and participant have to observe or obey the rules of conversation. The rules that coined by Grice is Cooperative Principle. Grice urges in his journal *Logic and Conversation*, in the communication speaker has to make effort a contribution by giving proper information as enough, which is needed by other participant or on the other hand, make your contribution such as required. That contribution information must be equivalent with place, purpose and shift of conversation that occurred by conversation context\(^2\).

That Grice’s cooperative principles are divided to be four maxims or bidal, the equivalent that is used by Asim Gunarwan in his book *Pragmatik: Teori dan Kajian Nusantara*. There are Maxim of Quality, Maxim of

---


Quantity, Maxim of Relevant and the last one is Maxim of Manner. If the participant can obey those rules, therefore expressing and sending information will be effective and efficient, at least potentially. Because, the speaker gives information which is unless and also exaggerate (as needed); the information is correct, appropriate with the fact; synchrony with the topic of conversation; and the delivery of information is well-performed, easy to be understood, clearly, not beating on the bushes, directly and consecutively\(^3\).

But usually, every rule that made will be possible to be faulted, deliberately or not. So what is the background of Cooperative Principles is faulted? One of the reason is the communication that is done by the people is not only purpose to deliver the message and the information. As said by Holmes that quoted by Asim Gunarwan communication is covered two functions, there are the referential function and effective function. The referential function is purpose to deliver the information (message), whereas effective function purpose to conserve social relationship\(^4\).

The existences of those functions are not meant to be yes or no in some utterance. Generally, the high of degree of utterance depends on their functions. More informative the utteranceis so the functions of degree of that utterance will be high. On the contrary, if that utterance is less informative, so the function of degree will be low. But sometimes there is the utterance that has both functions. Besides it, there is the non-observance of maxims that will

---

\(^3\) Ibid p. 47

\(^4\) Asim Gunarwan, Pragmatik: Teori dan Kajian Nusantara (Jakarta: Universitas Atmajaya, 2007) p. 246
cause strange impression in conversation\textsuperscript{5}. Exactly, because of this queerness a comedian benefitted to make the audience be peals of laughter\textsuperscript{6}.

A participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill a maxim in various ways, which include the following:

1. He may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim.
2. He may opt out from the operation both of the maxim and of the cooperatives principles.
3. He may be faced by clash.
4. He may flout a maxim, it means he blatantly fail to fulfill the maxims\textsuperscript{7}.

Furthermore, in this opportunity the writer wants to research one part study of pragmatics. And the corpora that the writer chooses are the dialogues of Yes Man movie. This movie is stared by Jim Carrey, one of famous Hollywood comedians. The writer will observe the non-observance of maxims that occur in this movie. There are some examples said by Carl (Jim Carrey) at the beginning of the movie.

\textit{Pete : what are you doing?}

\textit{Carl : just hanging out on my apartment.}

\textit{(Conversation via mobile phone)}

Normally, there is no fault in conversation above. This conversation between Carl and Pete obey the cooperative principle that is called maxim of relevance. But actually, this conversation disobey the maxim of quality,
because when Pete asks Carl “what are you doing?” and Carl answers “just hanging out on my apartment” He is lying! actually he is on video store at that time. This fault can be categorized as violating, because if a speaker violates a maxim, he/she will be liable to mislead. And Carl has already done it.

On another opportunity, Carl does opt out or unwilling to cooperate with another participant. For example, when Carl’s friend asked him to carries on a homeless who need a ride.

*Homeless*: could you like to drive me to Elysian Park?

*Carl*: (pause for awhile) why not!

“Pause” that done by Carl implicate that actually, he does not want or unwilling to cooperate with the homeless. But forcedly, he wants to pick him up.

This movie is very interested to be researched. Besides entertaining, this movie gives some examples non-observance of maxim in some categories. So it can make the people who is watching it can be laugh when sees what Carl have done. Examples above just little bit utterance in this movie.

**B. Focus of the Research**

The writer is going to analyze and focusing on the pragmatics study which is through the implicature of non-observance that happens on *Yes Man* movie.

---

C. Research Question

1. How does the non-observance of maxim in conversation of *Yes Man* movie occur?

2. What is the implicature that occur from each non-observance conversation of *Yes Man* movie?

D. Significance of the Research

Through this research, the writer hopes to share knowledge to the readers. Especially to the people who are interested to know pragmatics. Moreover, the study itself is about cooperative principles and non-observance of maxim.

E. Research Methodology

1. The Objective of the Research

   This research is purposed to know the kinds of non-observance of maxims in conversation in *Yes Man* movie and the implicature of each non-observance.

2. The Method of the Research

   The writer uses qualitative approach in this research. By using discourse analysis, He is watching, reading, and identifying the movie. Because the data that gotten is the description about kinds of non-observance of maxim in the utterance of *Yes Man* movie.

3. The Technique of Data Analysis

   In this step, the writer needs to consider which one the conversation that belongs to non-observance of maxim. The writer uses
technique of data analysis in several steps, first the writer watches the movie and reads the script too. And then selects the non-observance of maxims from the script, analyzes the data to know the category of non-observance of maxim, makes clarification and writes a report of the study.

4. The Instrument of the Research

In this research, the writer compares with journals, articles and other research that have been before. And he uses himself as main instrument to obtain required data variously. Like reading, marking, identifying and grouping the dialogue and making it as data to analysis by using pragmatic approach and theory of Grice concerning the cooperative principles as guidance.

5. The Unit of Analysis

The unit analysis is *Yes Man* film. The film is produced by Warner Bros and directed by Peyton Reed. This film was released on 2008. The writer uses a digital copy format.
A. Implicature

Talking is social activity. Whenever and wherever someone, he/she absolutely needs to communicate with another one. In communication, speaker and hearer have to cooperate with each other so that the communication can run smoothly. For example:

A: Where is my child?

B: Your child is playing in the garden.

But sometimes, the utterance can be confusing to understand. For example:

_The example_:

_A and B are talking about C, Their friend who get a new job in the Bank._

A: How is C?

B: Oh quite well, I think he likes his colleagues, and he has not been to prison yet.

B’s replay about C who said “He has not been to prison yet” is exaggerated and not commutative, but actually B tries to say something more than just he said. It means there is an additional conveyed meaning or another meaning from B. an additional conveyed meaning is called an implicature⁹.

Implicature can be meant imply to the hearer who is communicated, but there is no spoken (or written) by speaker. On the other hand, it is simply

⁹ George Yule, _Pragmatics_ (Oxford University Press, 1996) p. 35
to conceal meaning from the utterance. There are two theories of implicature that is used as reference by the time\textsuperscript{10}.

Technically term of implicature is derivational word from *implicate*, which has meaning “accuse someone involve in action that break the law”. This meaning is changed by Grice become word *imply*. The differentiation between those words is implies mean “to imply generally”, meanwhile implicate means “to imply as lingual”\textsuperscript{11}. There are two kinds of implicature that was mention by Grice. There are Conventional Implicature and Conversational Implicature\textsuperscript{12}.

1. **Conventional Implicature**

   Generally, this implicature is used in an utterance by add conjunctions like: but, even, therefore and yet. But sometime, the word *for* may be used too\textsuperscript{13}. For example:

   She is a good driver *for* a girl.

   The sentence above is implicated that usually the great driver is a man and a girl who has this ability is so rarely.

2. **Conversational Implicature**

   As Grice said, this implicature is just be mate in special context of an utterance. Actually, the implicature of an utterance is opposite from what the speaker has said. For example, there is an ambulance man who still get job in Christmas Eve and he wants to pick up a man who has

---

\textsuperscript{10} Asim Gunarwan, Pragmatik: Teori dan Kajian Nusantara (Jakarta: Universitas Atmajaya, 2007) p. 246

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid, p. 246-247


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, p. 57
collapsed in New York City. The man is drunk and suddenly vomits all over the ambulance man who going to help him. The ambulance man says:

*Great, that was really great! That’s made my Christmas.*

The implicature of the utterance above is exactly opposite from what the ambulance man said. The speaker was so angry about what the drunken man has done to him. On the other opportunity, a person produce this utterance might be genuinely expressing delight over.

**B. Cooperative Principle**

In communication, people have to cooperate with the other participant in order that communication can be smoother and more effective. On the other hand, all of participant has to obedient these rules. These rules that are realized Grice one of famous linguist in twenty century become four maxims. There are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevant and maxim of manner.

1. **Maxim of Quantity**

This maxim is focus to make your contribution as informative as is required and do not make your contribution more informative than is required. It means between participants give enough information, not more or less. For example:

---

15 Ibid, p. 45
Obama’s wife is a woman who uses kerudung when she visits Istiqlal Mosque.

Obama’s wife uses kerudung when visits Istiqlal.

The speaker in sentence (1) gives exaggerates contribution than sentence (2). Word “wife” has meant woman. So the word woman in sentence (1) is not required or unuseful\(^\text{16}\). So that with phrase “Istiqlal Mosque” too. Just with word Istiqlal the hearer has known what building/place Istiqlal is (especially in Indonesia).

2. Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution to be right, exactly do not say what you believe to be false, do not say anything without evidence\(^\text{17}\). That means as participant, we are forbidden to be lying. But how can we know the information that we hear is absolutely right? Only the speaker knows the truth of that information. Therefore, it depends on the honesty from the speaker.

Example:

Adam: which team that be the champion in world cup 2010?
Pipit: Spain, because I watch the match last year.

We know that the participant have done the CP rightly. In that conversation the hearer gives information that is required and factual. But on other opportunity, sometimes someone has to break this maxim of quality with some reasons blatantly\(^\text{18}\). As the example bellow:

Adam : Where is the little Obama had stayed when he was in Indonesia?

Pipit : Hmm, he had stayed in Bandung.

Adam : Ouh really! I think he knows “peuyeum” very well. Hehe

The conversation above is quietly break the maxim of quality, neither Adam or Pipit are not cooperate each other very well. Pipt answers Adam’s question wrongly, but Adam gives statement that seem to be “mocking” from reaction of Pipit’s answer. So that, directly she knows that her answer is false or not corresponding to the fact.

3. Maxim of Relevance

This maxim obliges each participant gives relevance contribution with the topic of conversation. It means between speaker and hearer have understood the content of conversation each other. For example piece of talking by phone as the following:

Arif : Wan, where are you? Our friens and I are waiting for you in fourth floor.

Afwan : Ok wait the minutes, I have been Cangkir.

Arif : Oh Ok. Be faster guys.

The dialogue above is conversation between UIN Syarif Hidayatullah students. If we watch carefully, maybe Afwan’s answer is not relevant with Arif question. How can Afwan be in Cangkir? But both Afwan and Arif have known that cangkir in the topic is not cangkir as place of tea or coffee to be served but it is name of café in the campus that the building is like cangkir. So

---

19 Ibid, p.49
we can conclude that Afwan probably having lunch or just take drinking when the conversation going on. That is why the different topics in a conversation can be relevance if they have relation\textsuperscript{20}.

Compare whit this one:

Arif : Afwan where are you?
Afwan : Inter Milan won last night guys.

Directly, we know that the conversation above is having no relevance implication. But sometimes the participants’ sign that relevance of the speaker contribution is not only lay on the meaning of utterance but also for what is implicated by the utterances. And H.P Grice is told us about that explicitly\textsuperscript{21}.

For example:

Dad: mom, what is date today?
Mom: oh my God, Pak Budi asked you to send the money today.

In the conversation above, speaker and hearer have same assume, so just tell “Pak Budi asked you to send the money today” Dad have known what date today is.

Sperber and Wilson say that the cooperative principle theory of Grice with his four maxims is over all. They think, the most important of those maxims is maxim of relevance. So that they call this theory as relevance theory. The meaning of relevant in relevance theory is different with the meaning of relevant in daily language. In the daily language, relevant means related to something or on occasion of the thing that be talked. But in

\textsuperscript{20}Kushartanti dkk, Pesona Bahasa Langkah Awal Memahami Linguistik (Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, p.108

\textsuperscript{21}I Dewa Putu Wijana, Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik (Yogyakarta: ANDI, 1996) p. 50
relevance theory, it means that make a contextual effect; on the other hand the contribution is given by the participants (speaker) add *schemata* or contextual power of someone\(^22\). Sperber and Wilson think that contextual effect is a requirement of relevance. And the contextual effect is result interaction between update information and overtime information. It means the update information has to correlate with the information before.

There are two factors that influence relevance degree of an utterance (1) contextual effect and (2) processing effort. The most relevance is utterance that contents the most contextual effect and least effort to process the information. And the most irrelevance is an utterance that least contextual effect and most effort to process the information that sent by the speaker.

The success of communication can be decided by how to process this relevance optimally. That is why, the speaker has to applicant his/her utterance relevance to the hearer. A fact can be said good if the hearer can accept what does the speaker mean.

4. **Maxim of Manner**

This category is called by Grice as super maxim which have four rules\(^23\), there are:

a. Avoid obscurity

b. Avoid ambiguity

c. Be brief (not beating on the bushes)

d. Be orderly


Someone who talks not use this rules can be called he or she has broken the maxim of manner\textsuperscript{24}. Therefore, the next utterance can be used for the comparison:

Boy: “Come on, get in quickly!”

Girl: “Wait the minute, it is still hot.”

The dialogue above has high ambiguity. Boys statement “\textit{come on, get in quickly!}” is very confusing and hard to be understood. People will guess everything; therefore the meaning of the utterance will be unobvious. And so do for the girl statement “\textit{wait the minute, it is still hot.”} Have a low clarity. The word ‘hot’ in the statement causes a lot of perception from the hearer who heard the dialogue. Actually, what is still hot?

C. The Non-Observance of Maxim

There are many reasons why someone has to break the maxims in conversation that being done. Some of them has no ability to speak clearly or for many considerations they blatantly to lie to the hearer. Any way the non-observance of maxims is absolute, can not to be avoid. Because sometimes someone must to be confronted with situations that obligate him/her to break it out. Furthermore, there are five kinds of non-observance of maxims\textsuperscript{25}:

\textsuperscript{24}Kunjana Rahardi, \textit{Pragmatik: KesantunanImperatifBahasa Indonesia} (Jakarta: Erlangga 2005) p. 57

1. Flouting a Maxim

A flout occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading.

a. Flouts Necessitated by Clash between Maxims

A speaker flouts the maxim of quantity by blatantly giving either more or less information than the situation demands. For example:

A try to guess a man that he looked yesterday to B

_I think he is either John or Ben and I do not believe he is Glen._

The utterance indicates that there is no match between maxim of quality and quantity. Because the speaker has given more information than required and has no evidence about his statement.

b. Flouts Exploiting Maxim of Quality

Flouts exploiting maxim of quantity occur when speaker says something that is blatantly untrue or have no evidence of his/her statement.

For example:

_B was on a long train journey and wanted to read her book. A was a fellow passenger who wanted to talk to her:_

A: What do you do?
B: I am teacher.
A: Where do you teach?
B: Outer Mongolia.
A: Sorry I asked!
Outer Mongolia is seen as somewhere impossibly remote, so that B’s improbable response prompted the hearer to look for an implicature (in this case that his attentions were unwelcome)\textsuperscript{26}.

c. **Flouts Exploiting Maxim of Quantity**

This non observance occurs when the speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires. For example:

A: How we are getting there?

B: well we are getting there in Dave’s car.

B blatantly gives less information than A needs, thereby generating the implicature that, while she and her friends have a lift arranged, A will not travelling with them.

d. **Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Relation**

This non observance occurs when the participant of conversation obviously gives irrelevant statement to the topic in hand. For example he or she changes the subject of the topic blatantly. For example:

A: Which team that be the champions league last year?

B: Did you know? Anasis catch by KPK.

e. **Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Manner**

This non observance occurs when the hearer gives a beating on the bushes answer. Maybe if he or she says yes or no the conversation will be effective. For example:

This interaction occurred during a radio interview with an unnamed official from the United States Embassy in Port-au-Prince, Haiti:

I : Did the United States Government play any part in Duvalier’s departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?

O : I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion.

The official could simply have replied ‘Yes’. Her actual response is extremely long-winded and convoluted and it is obviously no accident, nor through any inability to speak clearly, that she has failed to observe the maxim of manner.

2. Violating a Maxim

Grice defines violation very specifically as the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim if speaker violates a maxim, he or she will be liable to mislead. For example:

There was a husband that asked to his wife who was guessed maybe having an affair.

H: Is there another man?

W: No, there is not another man.

Wife’s reply is true that she is not having affair with another man, but not the whole truth (she is, in fact, having an affair with a woman).

---

3. Infringing a Maxim

Infringing is speaker who no intention of generation an implicature and no intention of deceiving. On the other hand, this non observance stems from imperfect linguistic performance rather than any desire on the part of the speakers to generate a conversational implicature. This type of non observance could occur because the speaker has an imperfect command of the language (a young child or a foreign learner)\(^{28}\), because the speaker’s performance is impaired in some way (nervousness, drunkenness, excitement) or simply because the speakers constitutionally incapable of speaking clearly. For example:

*The conversation between Fifth grades of Elementary students*

A: How do you feel today?

B: I am feel sleepy.

B’s reply is incorrect; it must “I feel sleepy”.

4. Opting Out of Maxim

A speaker opts out of observing a maxim by indicating unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. This non observance occur frequently in public life, when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, reply in the way normally expected. For example:

Caller: … um I lived in a country where people sometimes need to flee that country.

Ross : Uh where was that?

Caller : It was a country in Asia and I do not want to say anymore.

5. Suspending a Maxim

This category is necessary to respond to criticisms of the type made by Keenan (1976) who proposed as a counter-example to Grice’s theory of conversational implicature the fact that in the Malagasy Republic participants in talk exchanges.29

D. Conversation

Conversation is daily activity which is done by human being as social creator who have speaking and hearing device normally. It is one way to make communication with another one. Whenever and wherever someone, he/she absolutely needs to communicate each other conversation structure is what we have assuming as familiar throughout much of the preceding discussion.30 For example, a teacher talking to students in classroom, a doctor talking to patient in a clinic, or individuals taking part in courtroom proceeding, attending committee meeting, buying stamps at the post office, asking address of some place, and dozens of other different experiences people have in which there is interpersonal exchanged of talk.

A: Where is my child?

B: Your child is playing in the garden.

A and B are doing conversation, A is asking to B where his child is, and B give a response that his child is playing in the garden. The conversation between them is totally obey the rules of Cooperative Principle.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

In this chapter the writer gives an analysis about implicature of non-observance maxim based on the data taken from *Yes Man* movie. All of the data analyses are from the conversation between Carl with other people on this movie. Carl who wants to live alone on this movie is actually funny, hilarious, and pretty relatable. Carl could be someone you know or know of, a complete misanthrope and socially inept guy who gets totally fooled by the power of *Yes* that he does not know how to stop and weigh the options for himself. He was a disgruntled, pessimistic bank loan officer who hated his job and everyone he met. After a devastating divorce, Carl could not seem to get the motivation, he needed to seek out new opportunities.

He always breaking the rules of maxim with implicature statement that brings him towards antisocial, forgetful, uncommitted life and he saw no problem with any of it. He often lies to every person he meets on this movie and this condition can be described as breaches all maxims. And right after he missed his best friend’s engagement party, he got a wake-up call about the need to modify his lifestyle. He told Carl about his program where one has to say “Yes” to everything in order to get the ball rolling to a more positive lifestyle. Carl noticed that after he said yes to things, his life started turning around. Now he gets a promotion and along better with the people in
his life and meets an interesting new girl. Carl finds that when he tries to say “no” to things, something bad usually happens, so he just says yes to everything even if he does not want to.

B. Data Analysis

Data 1:

Pict.1 The phone conversation that happens between Carl and Pete, the Setting itself is inside the video store.

Pete: So, what are you doing?
Carl: oh, just hanging out in my apartment. (00:01:11)

From the dialogue, at first we can presume there is no slightest mistake from the rules of maxim. But actually, when we look at the real fact situation that happens on this film, it is clear that Carl disobey it. Because when the conversation is being occurred, Carl is not in his apartment, he is being in video store. In other hand, he is lying. He blatantly lies to Pete. So this conversation can be categorized as flouting, flouting that is exploiting maxim of quality. And the implicature of conversation is Carl does not want Pete knowing where he actually been. So he lied in order to not be interrupted by Pete while he on that video store.
The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Pete will attend to Carl’s apartment.
2. Pete will visit Carl’s apartment soon.
3. Carl prevents Pete to come in to his apartment.
4. Carl will go out from his apartment soon.

Data 2:

Pic. 2 The conversation between Carl and Pete, where Carl position is inside the video store and Pete is outside the video store.

Pete: I can see you Carl. I am outside the video store.
Carl: That's not me. (00:01:59)

From the dialogue, the writer thinks that Carl also blatantly lies to Pete. By saying that's not me, Carl tries to make a deception to Pete that person who he is looking is not him. This situation can be analyzed as an implicature form from Carl because actually he does not know that Pete is stalking him from the outside of video store. So this conversation can be categorized as flouting, flouting that is exploiting maxim of quality. Because, actually the person who is sawn by Pete is really Carl. So, the implicature of this conversation is Carl does not want to meet with Pete by the time.
The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Pete will come in to video store.

2. Pete will ask Carl in order to go out from video store.

3. Carl will deny, by saying “maybe the man that you are looking is someone who similar whit me!”

4. Carl will end the phone call.

Data 3:

Pict.3 The conversation when Pete comes over to Carl’s apartment.

Pete: You haven’t been getting my calls?
Pete: You are full of shit. Here it is. (takes Carl’s phone)
Carl: Yeah, there is it.

Carl is pretending that he loses his phone. He blatantly lies to Pete and actually he just does not want accepting phone call from Pete. So, Carl has done the Flouting that is exploiting maxim of quality. The implicature from that Carl did is he wanted that Pete as his best friend do not disappoint at him for always reluctantly answer Pete’s call.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Pete will be angry to Carl.

2. Pete will give some advices to Carl in order to do not lie again.
3. Pete will walk out from Carl’s apartment.

4. Carl will admit his faults.

5. Carl will tell the truth that he does not want to accept his phone call.

Data 4:

Brochure man: Hey man, want to rock out tonight? 
Oh, it’s you. Let me guess, no?
Carl: yes.
Brochure Man: yes?
Carl: no, I meant ‘yes’ to your ‘no’. (00:05:34)

From the dialogue above, Carl is liable to mislead the brochure man. He just mocking the brochure man by giving replies yes then he said no! He means ‘yes’ to him ‘no’. So this conversation can be categorized as violating. The implicature of this conversation is Carl actually does not want to take that brochure, he is not interesting at all.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Brochure man will give some expletive to Carl.

2. Brochure man will say “thank you” to Carl.

3. Brochure man will ignore Carl.
4. Carl will pass it away.
5. Carl will take the brochure.

**Data 5:**

![Image](image-url)

Pic.5 The conversation occurs when Carl attends a motivation seminar. He is one of hundred participants.

*The Motivator: come on up, future ‘yes’ man.*

*Carl: That’s okay, I am just auditing (00:16:20)*

Carl blatantly lies, by saying “That’s okay, I am just auditing” because, actually he is participant of that seminar. He is trying give a logical reason to the motivator so that he fails coming up to the stage. The implicature of this conversation is Carl does not want to come over and say something in front of audience.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Carl will come on up.
2. Carl will stay up.
3. The motivator will come closer to Carl’s seat.
4. The motivator will give some questions to Carl from the stage.
Data 6:

Pict.6 Carl kisses the girl

*Lady*: excuse me, can I...
*Carl*: Absolutely, *(suddenly kissing the Lady)*. (0032:28)

Carl is totally no observing the maxim, because the Lady has not finished yet asking to him. But Carl’s seem like to the Lady as if she is asking him to give her a kiss. It is ridiculous. He does it, because he is being drunk and out of control. So, Carl has done the infringing of maxim because his performance is influenced by alcohol. The implicature of this conversation is Carl feel like a great man who makes every woman interested to him.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. The Lady will slap Carl.
2. The Lady will enjoy Carl’s kissing.
3. Carl will apologize for his silly action.
4. Carl will pretend that he does not do anything.
Data 7:

Pict. 7 Homeless man ask for help

*Homeless*: Hey, that’s a nice car. Could you like me to Elysian Park?
*Carl*: (pause) oh, uh...
*Nick*: yeah, sure he can. Right, Carl?
*Carl*: yeah, why not. (00:02:29)

Carl actually does not want to pick the homeless up. We can look from ‘pause’ which he has done. He is unwilling to respond the homeless but Nick ask him to pick him up. So he is forcedly pick him up. It can be categorized opting out the maxim. The implicature of this conversation is Carl is really does not want to pick the homeless up, he just trying to fulfill Nick’s hope.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Carl will pick the homeless up.
2. Carl will drop out the homeless before destination.
3. Carl will leave the homeless.
4. The homeless will get in to Carl’s car quickly.
5. The homeless will ask Carl’s money.
Pict.8 Carl takes Lucy to the wedding store. They are choosing equipment of the wedding.

Lucy: Bridal Bingo? How to play Bridal Bingo?
Clerk: (unwilling to reply, silent for a moment) It's same as regular bingo, but you just use embarrassing things about the bride.

The clerk totally does not cooperate with Lucy, she is being bored because she does not have a boy friend after long time. So, she is very jealous with Lucy who will get married early. The implicature of this conversation is Clerk does want to serve Lucy at the time.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Lucy will be angry to the server.

2. Lucy will cry because of the server’s answer.

3. Carl will try to communicating with the server.

4. Carl and Lucy will go out from the store.

5. Carl will ask to another server.

6. The clerk will leave them.
Data 9:

Pict.9 Carl helps his new friend as he approve his loan request

*Carl:* You must be my last loan
*Nurse man:* It’s a ducati. I’m thinking it’ll get people of my back about the man nurse thing. See what I mean?
*Carl:* Yeah nice ride.

Carl at this time is really unreasonable for easily give a loan to the man who wants a brand new Ducati motorcycle in order to help him on his job as a nurse. He seems not to understand that he is being taken advantages by him, the man certainly knows that Carl would say yes for everything. So this situation points out that Carl breach another rule of Maxim.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:

1. Carl rejects his new friend request.
2. Carl angry for being used by him.
3. Carl tries to reasonable with him the necessity of his request which are exaggerated for some reason.
4. Carl change the term of loan.
Data 10:

Pict.10 Allison is taking a photo of Carl

Allison: Hey Carl, are you okay?
Carl: (Groaning)
Allison: Hold it right there. (instead of giving some help, Allison take a photo of him), (00:49:37)

This situation is rather absurd, when Carl passed out because of tired of running and he had not take any sleep the night before. Allison who sees Carl at that time is not offering some helps instead, she just takes a photo of Carl. When she said ‘hold it right there’ must be meant she wants to call for a help, so this conversation is also breached the rules of maxim. The implicature of this conversation is Carl is just pretending fall asleep so that get a sympathy from Allison.

The possible actions that will be done by participants are:
1. Allison must call 911 or ambulance for helping Carl.
2. Allison must help Carl with her own hand.
3. Allison leave Carl because she do not want to help him.
4. Allison screaming so the other people can hear her out.
A. Conclusion

From the research findings the writer would like to take the conclusion of the some results. The non observance of maxim depends on the conversation situation. In every conversation; it is difficult to avoid offense either consciously or not. The non observance will happen because the situation, ignorance, external factors, or pressure.

We can look the conclusion from this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The Categorize of Non-Observance</th>
<th>The number of Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Flouting</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5, 9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>4, 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Infringing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Opting out</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Suspending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, we can look that the most categorize of non-observance that is rarely done by participants is flouting a maxim. The non observance of maxim is influenced by the relationship of the speaker and listener make the information as informative as is required. Speaker disobey the maxim of conversation in some ways. First, he quietly flouts a maxim, he violates a maxim, he opts out from the cooperation and even it actually already violates the first maxim but then face by a crush the other maxim.
When he disobeys the maxim of conversation, he will create a side meaning in his remark called *implicature*.

The implicature will rise at the time when one of the participants disobeys the maxim and it will turn to the personal communication. There is the basic reason which becomes the background of how the implicature rise. The background itself called context. Context is able to tell knowledge when it can explore and draw the background of the aspects (like the mental social and cultural aspects) which guide to interpretation of the language.

**B. Suggestion**

Based on the research, the writer would like to suggest to the readers of this thesis based on Yes Man movie, to more concern of the text of conversation. Because the non observance of the maxim in this movie case makes people confused in understanding it.

The writer hopes that this study will be useful and gives some contributions for the readers and also the students of English Letters Department who are expected to have more knowledge about the non-observance maxim.
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APPENDIXES

Carl Alien is at a standstill. No future. Until the day he enrolls into a personal development program based on a very simple idea: say yes to everything! Carl discovers with amazement the magical power of "Yes", and sees his professional and romantic life turned upside down overnight: an unexpected promotion and a new girlfriend. But he'll soon discover that better can be good's enemy, and that all opportunities shouldn't be taken.

The banker Carl Alien is a lonely man with low self-esteem after his divorce with Stephanie, for whom he still yearns. He avoids his best friend Peter. He has a boring job, stalled in a bureaucratic position in the loan department of a bank; and he spends his spare time watching DVDs. When he meets by chance his former high school mate Nick, he is convinced to participate of a self-help program called "Yes Man" leaded by the guru Terrence Bundley. The basic principle of the program is to say "yes" to new situations, leaving the negativism aside. Carl misunderstands the concept and says "yes" to every question. While leaving the encounter, he helps a homeless man and in the end of the night he meets the gorgeous Allison that helps him with her scooter. His life completely changes with his new attitude.