

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background of the Study

In communicating, sometimes people do not always say what they truly mean. Keyton (as cited in Lunenberg, 2010) stated that communication can be defined as a process of delivering information from one individual to another. Grice (1975:49) then stated a theory entitled Cooperative Principle which includes rules / maxims on how communication supposed to be done. Cooperative Principle include maxim of quality (rules of truthful utterance), maxim of quantity (rules of exact amount of information), maxim of relation (rules of relevancy toward certain topic discussed) and maxim of manner (rules of using clear statement), by following the four rules of communication by Grice, not only it will help the speaker to be more organized in communicating but also will decrease the chance of misunderstanding. Li (2015) emphasized that Grice's Cooperative Principle has a great contribution towards interacting from one to another due to the maxims that lead them to communicate in a proper way: accurate, relevant, clear and in honest.

Even though communication supposed to be delivered in such a way; due to certain purposes, Cooperative Principles are being violated. Thomas and McDounagh (2013) stated that the ways of communicating can differ from one individual to another individual based on how effective it is used. It can be caused by a particular reason for the speaker itself. To emphasize certain meanings, the

speaker breaks the rules of communication; which is to deliver information directly. Al-Kayed, Kitishat, and Allah (2015) stated that maxim violation occurred when someone does not observe or obey the Cooperative Principle to deliver a certain purpose intentionally. Maxim violation can be differed with flouting, opting out and infringing by the way on how someone disobeys the rules in Cooperative Principle. Since the focus of this paper is only to discuss maxim violation, the other forms in disobeying Cooperative Principle are explained briefly. Flouting is more focusing on how the hearer would try to seek for hidden meaning, opting out is when someone cannot cooperate in communication due to customs that bound them to do so (confidentiality, priest and doctor ethical code) while infringing means to unintentionally disobey Cooperative Principles due to his or her inability to obey them in certain factors such as language barrier or unconsciousness (Szczepanski, 2014). Violating a maxim is more concerning how to mislead someone by disobeying Cooperative Principle. The importance of maxim violation itself is to achieve a certain purpose in our daily life, such as avoiding taboo, making jokes or reaching out to emotional engagement in every part of human relationships that cannot be achieved without violating them. The context, in this case, is very important to decide which meaning is implied by the speaker.

Grice (1975) elaborated on the terms of violating the Cooperative Principle by describing the opposite of obeying them. Therefore, violation of maxim of quantity refers to when someone states less or more information than what is needed; violation of maxim of quality refers to when someone being untruthful or lying; violation of maxim of relation refers to when someone is saying something

which is not relevant to the topic being discussed and violation of maxim of manner refers to when someone implies ambiguity.

Social media become one of the modern ways to interact with each other. This platform also encourages people to voice themselves in society. According to Ramadhani (2018), social media allows people to communicate and share their own opinions and intention. This statement refers to the probability of maxim violation itself because people have their ways of stating something. Several social media platforms are used by people around the world. Davies (2017) mentioned Facebook, Line, Massager, and WhatsApp as the choice of lifestyle to fulfill the desire to communicate. The platform of this situation might take place in personal chatting or in the comment section which allows people in interacting with certain communities that they might have.

According to the observation, maxim violation was found in ELE's student's social media interaction. English Language Education (ELE) is one of the departments in Ganesha University of Education consisting of mostly Native Indonesian speakers who learned English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Social media has become one of the tools for the students of ELE to share their ideas, doing personal or group chatting and also to comment on their friend's posting. In interacting on social media, English Language Education students sometimes violate the rules of Cooperative Principle to state certain meanings. It might be started from a joke or even in the extension of previous meaningful events. The context of the conversation would be very important to determine the meaning of

such utterances. Here are the examples of maxim violations found in the social media interaction of ELE students.

**05/26/19 (No.1)**

English

Yanti : *Kamu kemarin itu jadi ketemu bapaknya?*

(Have you met him yesterday?)

Andra : ***Gak jadi. Selasa baru ada di kampus kata bapaknya.***

**(Not yet. He will be available in campus on Tuesday, he said.)**

Yanti : *Yah... oke deh, makasih ya.*  
(Oh my, okay then. Thanks.)

In this conversation, Andra was violating the maxim of quantity. When Yanti asked whether he had met their lecturer or not, he added more utterance than what is needed; he added that he would be available on Tuesday. Here is also another example.

**10/20/18 (No.2)**

English

Tora : *Skripsi sudah selesai bang?*

(Have you finished your thesis?)

Andra : *Woy Japanese guy mendep ci.*

**(Hey Japanese guy, give me a break!)**

This is one of the cases when someone violated maxim of relation; whereas Andra prefers to respond with unrelated topics. By stating this, Andra violates the rules of maxim relation by not being cooperative and avoid relevancy between his words.

After knowing the occurrence of maxim violation in such utterance, it is necessary to define the meaning in such sentences to complete the analysis. To understand the meaning completely behind maxim violation observed in social media utterances, there

are 7 ways to define words included in one's sentence which is stated by Leech (1974). According to Leech (1974, as cited in Zhou, 2011), there are 7 ways to determine meaning in a sentence which are denotative (literal meaning), connotative (figurative meaning), social (environment influence), affective (emotional meaning), reflected (using symbol as a device), collocative (range of words that come in between), and thematic (context). The 7 ways of determining meaning are explained to determine meaning based on the relation towards several factors like context, literal meaning, and figurative meaning.

To seek the purpose of one's utterance, sometimes there are real implications or goals that the speaker wants to achieve. It means that the speaker has his/her own intention in saying such utterances. To clarify one's purpose, it would be convenient to consider the goals of the speaker. Hence, the intention of the speaker plays an important role in this case. Hymes (1974, as cited in Blommaert, 2010) stated about 8 ways that should be considered in revealing meaning based on the speaker approach. Blommaert (2010) had mentioned that it is necessary to reach for Hymes theory in determining such a situation because it implied a fundamental insight in determining one's utterance. Hymes mentioned S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G. which stands for Setting/Scene, Participants, Ends/Goals, Act/Sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms, And Genre. One of the theories that should be considered is ends/goals. In this case, the goal is the actual outcomes in which the speaker wants to achieve. Therefore in this study, the purpose or goals of the speaker himself was analyzed. Based on this theory, there are purposes that can be mention namely emotional engagement, joke, and avoiding taboo. To make a deliberate description, the researcher would also include "other" categorization of purpose in case of

another situation that might occur while collecting the data excluding those in which previously mentioned. After the data is collected, other purposes that were found with minor occurrences behind their intentions are sarcasm, invitation, uncertainty, disturbance, reminder, politeness, time-saving, refusal, additional information, habit, exaggeration, suggestion, negotiation, correction, persuasion, and claim.

### **1.1. Problem Identification**

According to the background of the study, maxim violation probably occurs in social media interaction use, specifically in English Language Education (ELE) students. Based on the observation, maxim violation found in ELE's student's utterances in written social media utterances that violate maxims in Cooperative Principle. But such violation comes with a purpose; therefore the situation stated that maxim violation which usually occurred in spoken language was also found in a written form specifically in a social media interaction. This statement resulting in a question of whether other maxim violations could occur in other written utterances in social media interaction of English Language Education (ELE) students. After gathering and analyzing the data, other examples of Cooperative Principle violations were found in the written social media interaction of ELE students.

### **1.2. Limitation of the Study**

The maxim violation theory used to analyze the utterances was only using Maxim Violation theory by Grice (1975) which was originated from Cooperative

Principle. This theory includes the four maxims in Cooperative Principle to analyze violations in which made the range of analysis become sufficient enough to be implemented rather than to use another theory with a smaller range of analyses such as Relevance theory by Sperber and Wilson (1986, as cited in Levinson, 1989). Sperber and Wilson (1986, as cited in Levinson, 1989) theory about Relevance maxim in Pragmatics emphasized the relation between stimulus and what it represents in the hearer's perception. But this theory is only discussing about such relevancy between a certain context meanwhile Grice (1975) theories of Cooperative Principle is more deliberated and branched into four variables such as sufficiency (maxim of quantity), truthfulness (maxim of quality), relevancy (maxim of relation), and clearness (maxim of manner). Due to the wide range of data in this study, Grice's theory offers a wider range of analysis ground in which cannot be implemented by another theory with a smaller range of analysis.

For intended meaning, it was focusing on Leech theory (1974) about 7 ways to determine meaning including denotative (literal meaning), connotative (figurative meaning), social (environment influence), affective (emotional meaning), reflected (using symbol as a device), collocative (range of words that come in between), and thematic (context). Leech (1974) theories regarding 7 ways to determine meaning provided not only a literal and figurative approach in analyzing the meaning of one's words but it also gives other variations of analysis approaches such as symbolical and collocative approach in revealing meaning.

As for the purpose, it was focusing on one of Hymes (1974) theories which are specifically discussing the goals: trying to convey the purpose based on speaker

intention. Originally, Hymes mentioned S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G. as the abbreviation of Setting, Participants, Ends, Act sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norm, and Genre; but in this study, only Ends/Purpose theory that was used due to its importance in revealing one's purpose. The data in this study is mainly about written words; therefore it is not suitable to use all of Hymes theories due to the characteristics of the data. In this study, the section of 'Key' also cannot be analyzed due to characteristic differences in analysis, because the data in this study contains only written words in social media interaction meanwhile 'Key' is discussing the tone that the speaker used.

The utterances would only be discussing those written form (text) in social media platform produced by Indonesian students in ELE (English Language Education). The utterances are including those which occurred in several ways such as in individual or group chat, utterances in the comment section and other written text form in a social media interaction. The social media used in this study included Facebook, Line, Messenger, and WhatsApp.

### **1.3. Research Problem**

In accordance with the background of the study, the researcher formulates research problems.

- 1) What maxims were violated in ELE student's conversation?
- 2) What were the intended meanings implied in ELE student's conversation?
- 3) What were the purposes of the violation of such utterances?



#### 1.4. Purposes of the Study

In accordance to the research problems above, the purpose of this study are stated in these following statements.

- 1) To describe the maxim violation in ELE's students' conversation.
- 2) To describe the intended meaning implied in ELE's students' conversation.
- 3) To describe the purpose of the violation in such utterances.

#### 1.5. Significance of Study

The results of the study are expected to have theoretical and practical significance as follows.

##### 1.6.1 Theoretical Significance.

1. This study is applying the theory of violating maxims by Grice
2. This study also gives the example on how violating a maxim in social media platforms
3. This study gives examples of particular reason why the maxim is violated

##### 1.6.2 Practical Significance.

1. This study can be used as one of the references to analyze the violation of Cooperative Principle in terms of other Pragmatics study
2. This study also give information to the readers on how violating maxims is possible in social media platforms

3. This study as expected to help readers in understanding such utterances as the reference of Pragmatics event that might occur in their life

