CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

B.1 Theoretical Frame Work

B.1.1 Pragmatics Theory

In communications, a purpose or a function can be expressed in various forms / structures. For the purpose, of “ordering and asking” others, speaker can be expressed by imperative sentences, declarative sentences or even with interrogative sentences. Thus, in linguistics, there are two fields of study about meaning, semantics and pragmatics. Semantics and pragmatics are two main areas of linguistics that concerned at the meaning of the utterance, spoken and written. In this research is concerned in pragmatics side. Where pragmatics concentrates on those aspects of meaning that cannot predicated only based on linguistics’ rules, but also takes into account knowledge about physical, social and everything in human’s life.

Anne (2011 : 1) stated that The term pragmatics is often used in linguistic research to refer to the study of the interpretation of meaning. Although it has proven difficult to determine an exact definition for the term pragmatics. Therefore, the pragmatic choices made by conversational participants can simultaneously encode indications of position and time and interpersonal and cultural indicators such as power, status, gender and age.
The definition that has been outlined above suggests that as the field of linguistics, pragmatics, trying to reveal the meaning on the utterance externally and the relationship between narrative contexts. For example the word “good” does not always mean good, or nice. When Father as the speaker said “what about your English exam score?”, then Faiz as the interlocutor said “wow, only 4 points.” Then father said “Good, tomorrow do not learn. Just keep playing play station every day.” The meaning of an utterance is not only explained by the words that support speech, but also determined by the situation. It is clear that the word “good” in a meaningful dialogue “bad”. But tomorrow “do not learn” meaningful that the interlocutor must study hard and he had to stop playing play station. So, lesson about pragmatics is something interesting because we as participant required understanding the purpose of the speech which is said.

From the example above, it can be conclude that pragmatics is the study of language which involved some assumption to know more detail about what is the speaker mean by their utterance.

B.1.2 Grice’s Maxim of Cooperative Principle

As stated in the title, cooperative principle is a part of pragmatics. In this matter, pragmatics classifies the concept of cooperative principle according to the philosopher, Paul Grice. Grice’s formulation of the Cooperative Principle is rather more detailed: (Grice via Birner, 2013 : 48) “Make your conversational contribution such as is
required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”.

Cooperative principle can be understood as an essential factor when speakers and listeners are interacting. In other word, it is the expectation that the listener has towards the speaker, and the speakers supposed to convey true statements and say nothing more than what is required.

When people talk to each other, they try to converse smoothly and successfully. Cooperative principle is the basic of successful conversations. The speaker is intends to communicate something and it should be cooperative. Unfortunately, some of the speakers do not observance the maxims of cooperative principle. In this situation, Grice called flouting maxims of cooperative principle and violating maxims of cooperative principle.

Reza (2010 : 23) “the differences between the two to be that violation of a maxim is a covert non-observance of a maxim, whereas a flouting of a maxim is an intentional non-observance of a maxim, to which the speaker is notably saying something that is implied beyond what is said, and also understood by its interlocutor. Of importance here is that the flout needs to be understood by the interlocutors of the conversation, which can be difficult to determine. Likewise, it is hard to decide whether the speaker intends to mislead the interlocutors or not.”
Basically, there are two possible things that people can do with the maxim: observing maxim and not observing maxim.

B.1.2.1 Observance of Maxims

The speaker may obey the maxims of cooperative principle when they do not lie or provide clearly and unambiguously statement. They indicate to obey maxim of cooperative principle as well when they does not talk more than it requires and relevant to the topic of the conversation. The influential someone to obeys the maxim of cooperative principle is the situation of the conversation. All of the kind of observance maxim discussed below.

B.1.2.1.1 Maxim of Quality

Be Truthful

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Quality is speakers expected to be sincere, to be saying something that they believe corresponds to reality. They are assumed not to say anything that they believe to be false or anything for which they lacks evidence. Some speakers like to draw their hearer’s attention to the fact that they are only saying what they believe to be true and that they lack adequate evidence. Do not say that for which you can’t back up. Do not say what you believe to be false.
Give as much as possible information that is needed (not more). Do not lie, just say the truth. Try to make your contribution one that is true. If we are unsure of what we want to say, or want to avoid someone inferring we have evidence for what we say, we often use hedges such as: ‘As far as I know’, ‘I guess’, to show we are aware of the cooperative principle. Just to be truthful and don’t add any speculations disguised as objective information.

For example:

A: I’ll ring you tomorrow afternoon then.

B: Erm, I shall be there as far as I know, and the meantime have a word with Mum and Dad if they’re free. Right, bye-bye then sweetheart.

A: Bye-bye, bye.

B says ‘as far as I know’. Meaning ‘I can’t be totally sure if this is true, so that if A rings up and finds that B is not there, B is protected from accusations of lying by the fact that she did make it clear that she was uncertain. Most hearers assume that speakers are not lying, and most speakers know that.

B.1.2.1.2 Maxim of Quantity

Say enough do not say too much.

1. Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange)

2. Do not make your contribution more informative that is required.
Quantity maxim refers to the utterance, should be as informative as required and it should not be more informative than is required. Some speakers like to the point in the fact that they know how much the hearer listener or can be bothered with and say. Speaker requires being as informative as listener requires being comprehension, by ensuring that they are both succinct and explicit. In other words, when talking, speaker required to give neither too much nor too little information.

People who give too little information risk their listener not being able to identify what they are talking about because they are not explicit enough. Those who give more information than the listener needs risk boring them. Say only as much as you need to say.

B.1.2.1.3 Maxim of Manner

Be Clear

1. Avoid obscurity of expression
2. Avoid ambiguity
3. Be brief
4. Be orderly

Maxim of manner is telling the speakers to be perspicuous, avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief precise utterances, avoid unnecessary prolixity, be clear, and be orderly in our interaction. We should be clear in what we say. Never use a long word where a short one will do.
B.1.2.1.4 Maxim of Relation

Be Relevance.

The third maxim is that of relation, where speakers are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been said before. Make your contribution relevant, it means that when the speaker and listener are involved in communication, they have to comprehend it with the situation and the condition that happen. Are they allowed to produce their utterance in relation with the situation at that time or not.

Actually, this maxim is the most difficult to describe. Maxim of relation is which says that speakers are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been said. Stay on topic (don’t get carried away). To indicate that our contribution may be irrelevant to the interaction, for example to a change of the topic, by using a device such as ‘by the way’, ‘anyway’, ‘well’, to show we are aware of this maxim.

B.1.2.2 Non-Observance Maxim

Non–observance maxim may happen because of disability utterance. The disability utterance refers to language knowledge (usually happen on children or foreigner or when someone feeling nervous, drunk or too happy) and because the
speaker cannot speak clearly and brief. Sometimes, a speaker says something unclearly that may cause misunderstanding in a communication. Non-observance maxims appear when the speaker saying utterance that do not require of the 4 observance maxims. The reasons why the speaker do that because of their implying meaning in their utterance belong to any purposes.

B.1.2.2.1 Flouting Maxims of Cooperative Principle

The alcoholic woman is not always in alcoholism. When she in normal situation, there are sometimes when meaning is derived from deliberate flouting or ‘flouting of cooperative principle’ as Grice calls them. In different situation, when the alcoholic woman is very drunk, she is unintentional because she does not know what she is talking about. Develop flouting a maxim may happen in four maxims such as maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner and maxim of relation.

The maxim is basic assumption and they can be broken. When speakers appear not to follow the maxims but expect the listener appreciate the meaning implied, we said that they are flouting the maxims. However, when the speaker flouted the maxims and the listener still got the message behind the utterances, so mostly conversation still worked well.
**B.1.2.1.1 Flouting Maxims of Quality**

Maxim of quality is flouted when a speaker deliberately says something that is untrue or for which the speaker has inadequate evidence. In this case, speaker do not tell the truth or the information is lack of evidence and something the meaning is not literally true, which makes the maxim of quality is flouted.

(Cutting via Yuliastini, 2016 : 26) “The speaker may flout the maxim of quality in several ways. First, they may say something that obviously does not represent what they think. In other words, the speaker says something which is untrue. Second, the speaker may use hyperbole as exaggerating expression and metaphor. Hyperbole is often at the basis of humor. The last two ways of flouting the maxim of quality are irony and banter. Cutting says that irony is a friendly way of being offensive while banter is an offensive way of being friendly. In the case of irony, the speaker expresses the positive sentiment but implies negative. On the other hand, banter expresses negative sentiment and implies the positive one. It sounds like a mild aggression, but it is actually intended to express friendship and intimacy.”

The example of flouting maxim of quality:

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

Teacher : Wow! You’re such a punctual fellow! Welcome to the class.

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

It is obvious from what the teacher says that he is teasing the student and his purpose is, by no means, praising him. He exploits the maxim of quality (being truthful) to be sarcastic.
B.1.2.2.1.2 Flouting Maxims of Quantity

(Cutting via Yulistiani 2016 : 25) states that the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity will give too little or too much information than it is required. Furthermore, this happens intentionally in order to generate implicature without intention to mislead the addressee.

The maxim of quantity is flouted when a speaker deliberately gives more or less information than is needed within a conversation. For example:

Majid and Ali are talking on the phone

Ali : Where are you, Majid?

Majid : I’m in my clothes.

Majid tells the truth because it is expected that people are always in the clothes, yet he flouts the maxim of quantity because the information is insufficient for Ali. Majid give too little information than it is requires.

B.1.2.2.1.3 Flouting Maxims of 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. For example:

Wife : Darling..... What’s the story with that new watch on your wrist?
Husband: Oh, this watch you’re talking about! I knew it… I told my boss that my wife would be curious when she sees it. Oh, honey you have no idea how much they’re satisfied with my performance, lately!

The husband would be better off if he told his wife from the beginning of the conversation that his boss awarded him a prize. However, he flouts the maxim of manner to assure his wife that the watch was a gift from a person that she also knew and there is no need for jealousy.

B.1.2.1.4 Flouting Maxims of Relation

The maxim of relation is flouted when a speaker is giving a response or making an observation that is deliberately not relevant to the topic that is being discussed. An example of flouting the maxim of relation is when the hearer changes the subject or fails to keep to the topic.

(Cutting via Yulistiani, 2016 : 27) states that “If speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make the connection between their utterance and the preceding one(s)”.

It means that the speaker who flouts the maxim of relation is giving a response that is deliberately not relevant or related regarding to the topic that is being discussed in the conversation. For example:

Bob: What were you and Anna talking about? You were looking at me all the time!
Marry: Oh, well... why don’t we go get something to drink?

Marry answers Bob question with a suggestion in an obvious attempt to evade it perhaps to avoid hurting Bob’s feelings. Marry also expect that Bob will understand the reason why she does not want to discuss it.

**B.1.2.2.2 Violating Maxims of Cooperative Principle**

People are not always truthful and cooperative in a conversation. Each conversation may contain the purpose of the speakers. These purposes can be good or bad both for the speakers and the hearers. Unfortunately, when people in alcoholism, they violate the maxim of cooperative principle without any purpose. It happens as well when the alcoholic woman is drunk.

A speaker can be said to violate a maxims when they know that the hearer does know the truth thing and the meaning of the utterance. The speaker provide insufficient information, says something that is insincere, irrelevant or ambiguous, and the hearer wrongly assumes that they are cooperating. There are several ways/reasons a speaker might break one of the rules:

**B.1.2.2.2.1 Violating Maxims of Quality**

This type of violation refers to the occasions when people in conversations offer false information or information which lacks evidence. For example:

*A: I am married to an angle*
The speaker violates the maxim of quality because he lies (he is not married to an angle). The speaker violates the maxim in order to communicate another meaning rather than the literal one. The implied meaning is that he is married to a perfect woman like an angle.

**B.1.2.2.2 Violating Maxims of Quantity**

Violating the maxim of quantity occurs when interlocutors in conversations provide more or less information than is required. Consider the following example:

*Teacher*: Did you read the novel and write up the critique?

*Student*: I read the novel.

The student in the previous example violates the maxim of quantity since he provides less information than required. The student's violation of the maxim indicates that he read the novel but he did not write the critique.

**B.1.2.2.3 Violating Maxims of Manner**

This violation happens when the speaker is ambiguous. For example:

*A*: Let's get the kids something.

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

The speaker B violates the maxim of manner so that the kids will not understand what they are talking about.
B.1.2.2.4 Violating Maxims of Relation

This violation occurs when people offer irrelevant information. For example:

Ahmed: Did you like my singing?

Nader: The music was impressive, wasn’t it?

Nader in the previous example violates the relation maxim (Nader’s answer is irrelevant to the question) to imply that he did not like Ahmed’s singing.

B.1.3 The Girl on the Train

B.1.3.1 The Summary of the Girl on the Train

Rachel Watson is a 32-year-old alcoholic reeling from the dissolution of her marriage to Tom, who left her for another woman, Anna Watson. Rachel’s drinking has caused her to lose her job; she frequently binges and has blackouts. While drunk, she often harasses Tom by phone and sometimes even in person, though she has little or no memory of these acts once she sobers up. Tom is now married to Anna and has a daughter with her, Evie — a situation that fuels Rachel’s self-destructive tendencies, as it was her inability to conceive a child that began her spiral into alcoholism. Concealing her unemployment from her flatmate, Rachel follows her old routine of taking the train to London every day; her train slowly passes her old house, which is now occupied by Tom, Anna, and Evie. She also begins watching from the train an attractive couple who live a few houses away...
from Tom, fantasizing about their perfect life together. Rachel has never met them and has no idea that their life is far from perfect, or that the women, Megan Hipwell, helps Anna care for her child.

Megan outwardly seems perfect to Rachel – beautiful, apparently happy, and married to a handsome, devoted man. However, Megan has a troubled past that she conceals from everyone who knows her and which gives her severe insomnia. She secretly finds her life boring and shallow, and escapes from her troubles by taking a series of lovers. She has sought help by seeing a therapist, Dr. Kamal Abdic, whom she would like to seduce. Eventually, she reveals to him a dark secret she has never confided to anyone before.

Anna is young, beautiful, very much in love with Tom, and happy as a stay-at-home mother to the young Evie. While at first she enjoyed the idea of parading her conquest of Tom in front of Rachel, as a way to show that he picked her over Rachel, she eventually becomes furious at Rachel's harassment of her and her family, and wants to move from Rachel's former house and report Rachel's stalking to the police. Anna views Rachel as a threat to her family and home, and particularly dreads Rachel's presence because Rachel entered their home, picked up Evie, and walked outside with her one day.
One day, Rachel is stunned to see Megan kissing a man other than her husband. The next day, after a night of heavy drinking, Rachel awakens to find herself bloody and injured, with no memories of the night before but certain that she has done something she will regret. Soon, she learns that one of the top stories of the day is that Megan is missing. Rachel is questioned by the police after Anna reports having seen her staggering around drunk in the area the night of Megan's disappearance. Rachel starts to become interested in the missing persons case. She contacts the police to tell them she thinks Megan was having an affair, because she was watching her every morning and evening from the train, and then she contacts Megan's husband, Scott. Rachel lies and tells Scott she and Megan were friends, and she tells him her thoughts about the affair. Rachel learns that the man she saw kissing Megan the day she disappeared was Kamal.

Rachel contacts Kamal, lying about her true identity and background as part of a ruse to get close to him and learn more about him. She makes a therapy appointment with him, ostensibly to see if he can help her to recall the events that happened during her blackout the night of the disappearance. While Kamal suspects nothing, Rachel begins to gain insights into her life by speaking with him, inadvertently benefiting from her therapy. Her connections to Scott and Kamal, though built on lies, make her feel more important. She ends up not drinking for several days at a time but always relapses. Meanwhile, she continues to call, visit,
and harass Tom and his new family. Then Megan's body is found; she is revealed to have been pregnant, and her unborn child was fathered by neither Scott nor Kamal. As Scott discovers Rachel's lies and lashes out at her, her memories of the night of the incident become clearer. Rachel remembers seeing Megan get into Tom's car. At the same time, Anna discovers that Tom and Megan were having an affair.

These associations enable Rachel to trust her own memories more, and she realizes that many of the crazy things Tom told her she did while drunk, but that she doesn't remember doing, never really happened. He had been gas lighting her for years, which affected her belief in herself and made her question her sanity. Armed with this sad realization, and the knowledge that he must have been the one who killed Megan, Rachel warns Anna. When Anna confronts him, Tom confesses to murdering Megan after she threatened to reveal that he had impregnated her. Anna is cowed, fearful for her daughter's safety. Although Tom tries to beat and intimidate Rachel into keeping silent, she defies him and fights back. Knowing he is about to kill her, Rachel stabs Tom in the neck with a corkscrew. Anna helps Rachel make sure that he dies from the wound. When the police arrive, former adversaries Rachel and Anna co-ordinate their stories to support their actions having been in self-defense.
B.1.3.2 The Character List of *The Girl on the Train*

There is the character that has the important roles in the movie especially the alcoholic woman as the main character. The character having different personality and sometimes it becomes the real phenomenon in our daily life.

**Rachel Watson**

The protagonist of the story, she is an alcoholic and the title's girl on the train. She goes every day on the same morning and evening trains, observing the same suburban houses beside the tracks. However, there is one house that she watches every day, naming the people in it, Jess and Jason. She loves this house because it reminds her of her past, perfect life, before her divorce from Tom. However, after witnessing a tryst going on between "Jess" and another man, she gets involved in a crime scene related to this house's inhabitants.

**Tom Watson**

Tom is the antagonist of the story. He is Rachel's ex-husband. Tom and Rachel divorced after Rachel grew depressed by their infertility and he began cheating on her with Anna. Though Rachel still very much loves him two years later, she discovers that he was having an affair with Megan during his marriage to Anna and that he was Megan's killer. Tom is a compulsive liar, which he covers with charm and by blaming others, especially the women in his life.
Anna Watson

Anna is Tom's new wife. She hates Rachel and gets annoyed when Tom talks to or about her. Anna is very happy with her life with Tom and their baby girl, and takes pleasure in power. She especially liked being the "other woman" when Tom and Rachel were still married. However, after finding out that Tom lied to her just as much as to Rachel, she helps Rachel kill Tom, prioritizing her child and herself over him.

Megan Hipwell

Rachel's "Jess," she feels conflicted in her marriage, often seeking comfort in her husband Scott but also finding him overprotective. She has affairs with her therapist and, we later find, with Tom. On a Saturday night in July, she goes missing and days later she is found dead. Much of Megan's trauma comes from the death of her brother Ben and the later death of her child, Libby, who she had while living with a boyfriend named Craig.

Scott Hipwell

Rachel's "Jason," he is suspected of killing Megan because they had a fight prior to her departure and subsequent death. He and Rachel form a friendship and brief sexual relationship when she reveals what she learned about Megan's affair. In the end, he is proven innocent.
Kamal Abdic

Kamal is Megan's, and briefly Rachel's, therapist. He is the man Rachel sees kissing Megan from the train. He and Megan were having an affair, but he suspects it was based on transference, a common occurrence for patients and their therapists. However, he indulged anyway. He is suspected of killing Megan due to this romantic link, but he denies this and is set free due to insufficient evidence.

Cathy

Cathy is Rachel's flatmate. Rachel moved in with her after her divorce from Tom, intending it as a short-term living situation. However, Rachel has lived with Cathy for over two years by the time the story takes place. Cathy is very unhappy with Rachel as a roommate since she often drinks to excess and makes messes.

Detective Inspector Riley

He is the second detective working on Megan's case. Riley is generally antagonistic to Rachel, believing she is an unreliable source of information due to her alcoholism and obsession both with her husband and with Megan's case.

B.2 Review of the Related Research

In purposed to develop and complete this research, here are several related previous research about pragmatics that has been done by many researchers
especially about cooperative principles. However, there remains something that can be dig for anyone who is interested in conducting a research in this field like research that entitled “An Alcoholic Woman Talks on *The Girl on the Train* movie Using Grice’s Cooperative Principle”.

Generally, all of the previous research that explained below are some example that the researcher used as the references for analyze the data. There are so many research that ever been used about cooperative principles which is the object is movie, most of the data that taken from the movie is the conversation among the normal and conscious people. To make this research different from the other research, the data that taken is the conversation from the alcoholic woman which is semi-conscious and that condition make her difficult to get and to give the information. Sometimes she gives good response but she also can gives bad response in answering the question too. Sometimes she tells the truth but sometimes she lies. Giving the confusing question is also her stereotype. So, to make the alcoholic woman and the listener getting easy in gasping the intended meaning or clear message from what her asking or her answering, maxims of cooperative principle by Grice is used to make the conversation runs well.

**B.2.1 Related to Observance Grice’s Maxim of Cooperative Principle**

The research was done by Karen Swan and Chia-Huan Ho (2007) entitled: “Evaluating Online Conversation in an Asynchronous Learning Environment: An
Application of Grice’s Cooperative Principle” This research goes beyond student perceptions of online learning experiences, satisfaction, and attitudes, to examine the actual participation and dynamics that occur in online discussions and their relationship to student learning outcomes. A content analysis approach was used to investigate students’ socio-cognitive processes in an online graduate-level English grammar class. Student postings were rated using a newly developed Gricean Cooperative Principle scoring rubric to assess student participation as determined by four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner. Results suggest that Quality is the most important criterion for predicting direct responses to a posting. Students with high average Quality scores also received higher final course grades than did their counterparts. In addition, students with high scores for Manner earned higher conference grades than did their counterparts.

The next research was done by Ilham Putra (2014) entitled: “The Grice’s Cooperative Principle in Transcript of Beyond Interview on Piers Morgan Tonight” by Grice’s theory, this research is aimed at identifying the kind types of non-observance that occur in the utterances and to know the meaning behind the utterances of the interviewer (Morgan) and the interviewee (Boyance) in delivering their ideas / messages in purpose to reach an ideal communication.
B.2.2 Related to Floutin Grice’s Maxim of Cooperative Principle

The research was done by Niclas Andresen (2013) entitled :“Flouting the maxims in comedy: An analysis of flouting in the comedy series *Community*”. This research explores how flouting of the Gricean maxims is used to create comedy in the television series *Community*. The aim of the research is to find out what maxims are flouted the most to create comedy and what maxims the different characters flout in order to create comedy. The research examines the use of flouts in different situations and explores in what situations the different characters flout the maxims for comedy. The research is based on transcription of eight episodes of the series. The results show that the maxim of quantity was flouted most often, and some characters used more flouts than others. These results suggest that the use of flouts has to do with their different personalities, which is why some characters did not use as many flouts in order to create comedy, since it would not be in line with their personality.

The next research was done by Nailufah (2008) entitled : "Flouting maxims on Grice’s Maxim in the Drama of *The Death of Salesman* by Arthur Miller". In this research, the first and the second acts, it is found : the flouting maxim of relation (19), the flouting maxim of quantity (10), the flouting maxim of quality (9), the flouting maxim of Manner (7). The most frequency unintentional breaking of the maxims is flouting maxim of relation.
The last research was done by Peter Szczepanski (2014) entitled: “Flouting the maxims in scripted speech: An analysis of flouting the maxims of conversation in the television series Firefly”. The aim of this research is to find out what maxims are flouted the most in the television series Firefly and analyze what the effects of these flouts are. Presented here is an analysis of how scripted conversation in the aforementioned television show is constructed. By applying Grice's cooperative principle and his theories on flouting and implicatures, certain patterns emerge that show recurring uses of flouts for specific effects. The results are based on a study of three episodes of the television series Firefly. The results show that the maxim of quality is flouted the most and that the distribution of flouts between characters is somewhat uneven. This suggests that the use of flouts has to do with the personalities of the different characters.

B.2.3 Related to Violating Grice’s Maxim of Cooperative Principle

The research was done by Nila Arthanti (2013) entitled: “Violation Of Grice’s Maxims In The Garfield “Hangs Out” Comic: Comparison Between Source Text (St) And Target Text (Tt)”. It is conducted by using qualitative descriptive design and has 2 problem statements that lead to find the types of Grice’s maxims in carrying out the research. In that research, The violation of maxim quality is 11 turns (21.15%), violation of maxim quantity is 10 turns (19.23%), violation of maxim relation is 17 turns (32.69%), and violation of maxim manner is 14 turns (26.93%).
The next research of violating Grice’s maxim of cooperative principle was done by Ardiansyah Nugraha (2013) entitled: *Maxim Violation In Real Steel Movie: A Pragmatics Approach*. The objectives of this research are to describing the violation of Grice Maxim’s Cooperative Principle in communication of characters in Real Steel Movie. The type of this research is descriptive qualitative. In order to know the kinds of maxims which are violated the steps are: describing the data in the form of dialogue, describing the context and analyzing how the characters used cooperative principle in his dialogue. The study shows that the characters often violate the maxim of cooperative principle by generating a conversational implicature. The maxim which often violated by the characters is maxim of Quality, because the characters give lack evident, Maxim Quantity also violated in this movie, Maxim of Relation also violated and Maxim of Manner violated in the same amount.