

THE MAXIMS VIOLATION OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES IN THE MOVIE ENTITLED THE ADAM PROJECT

Cakra Sagiarta Lee, Trisha Endah Setiawati, Gek Wulan Novi utami*, Ni Luh Desy Suari

Dewi, I Gede Neil Prajamukti Wardhana

English Literature Department, Dhyana Pura University, Padang Luwih Street, Bali, Indonesia

wulannoviutami@undhirabali.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

In pragmatic research, conversations or utterances are important things to pay attention to because the speakers' use of language has an impact. Interestingly, the communication that we do usually does not necessarily follow the rules of maxims so we get the result of violating the rules of maxims. This study analyzed the detailed factor of violation and flouting of maxims which affect the way people communicate on a daily basis which are quietly violating to misleading, opting out, clashing, and flouting. This study utilized the qualitative method with the total of 17 data combined on each of the maxims acquired through the movie The Adam Project and analyzed by utilizing the theory of Cooperative Principle and Maxims. The results indicated that data about all types of maxim are found and for quantity and relation maxims, both are mostly violated by quietly violating to reach misleading purposes whereas quality and manner tend to be flouted to create conversational implicature, which the hearer should make an effort to understand the utterance.

Keywords: Cooperative Principle; The Adam Project; Maxims Violation; Flouting; Communication

I. Introduction

Communication is the means to share meaning between each other by doing cooperative efforts, which are logical, and purpose oriented to reach a certain agreed direction (Guo & Li, 2017: 40). Speakers and hearers would not be able to construct any successful conversation when the conversation seems off the ground from both perspectives as if disconnected the conversation would not be logical (Grice in Wasman, 2018: 77). We often hear about misunderstandings caused by misinterpreting information when communicating which is possible due to the choice of language diction or the way of conveying messages in conversations that are not quite right. We often take this phenomenon as pragmatic research data that focuses on data related to

language in communication, especially on the speech partner's response to the language used by speakers in an utterance or conversation.

In pragmatics, there are rules governing how to communicate so that it engages and makes communication work well that proposed by Grice. Grice (1989: 26; Yule & Widdowson, 1996: 36–37) formulated a general principle that people could follow to prevent a communication being off from the cooperative efforts of a conversation that is known as Cooperative Principle. The cooperative principle was then supported by four rules of conversation or namely four maxims which are maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner (Rahmi, Refnaldi, & Wahyuni, 2018: 177; Syafryadin, Chandra, Apriani, & Noermanzah, 2020: 3270).

Although, there exists already the principle to achieve successful conversation, people would not simply follow or fulfill the cooperative principle be it intentionally or unintentionally as their means to do communication and this situation is referred as violation of maxims (Rahmi et al., 2018: 178; Zebua, Rukmini, & Saleh, 2017: 104). Grice (1989: 30) also formulated four ways that could happen to violate the maxims such as, (1) quietly or not obviously violate a maxim which in some cases could be liable to misleading, (2) opting out from both the maxims and cooperative principle in which situation some may indicate their unwillingness to cooperate, (3) clashing, which occurs when speaker might not be able to fulfill a maxim without violating the other which makes speaker sacrifices the other maxim, (4) flouting a maxim which could result conversational implicature which carries implied meaning under the condition that the speaker is aware of maxims.

Maxim and violation are interesting to discuss, especially since the data used is a film script. This study chooses film scripts to become data because data analysis can be done easily because scripts are available and more in-depth because in films you can see the impact of using language whether it conforms to maxims or violates them. Several related studies have been conducted previously and contributed to the consideration of analyzing the content of this research. Zebua et al. (2017) attempted a descriptive qualitative research to analyze the violation and flouting of maxims which focused to find out the ratio and ways of violation and flouting between genders that resulted 51 violation and flouting combined within 6 episodes of *Ellen DeGeneres* talk show from 8 male and 8 female participants. The 51 results itself was broken down into 27 male and 24 female which also were broken down into 10 violations and 17 flouting from male participants and 13 violations 11 flouting. This means that male participants do flouting more than female participants do whereas the female participants do more violations than flouting. Andy & Ambalegin (2019) also did a descriptive qualitative research towards the violation of maxims in the movie *Night at the Museum* with 13 maxims violations from each of the maxims. The research found that maxims could improve the effectiveness of the conversation within the movie and the most violated maxim was the maxim of manner whereas the least

violated maxim is the maxim of quantity. However, the lack of identification of the ways through which people violated the maxims did not seem to be pointed out from the two researches that made this research take an interest to analyze. By identifying the violation of maxims based on the four ways formulated by Grice, it would be very useful to analyze how a maxim was violated and what was the maxim either purposely or unintentionally violated. To limit the discussion of the analysis, this research would take a focus on identifying the violation of maxim and the way certain maxims were violated in order to discover a better notion of the ways in which maxims are violated and the purposes to violate the maxims.

II. Methods

In this research, the qualitative method was used as the method of the study, in which qualitative research can elaborate on the “complexity and meaning of social phenomena” (Pope & Mays, 2000; Bailey, 2008: 127). Therefore, this method aims to understand, describe, compare, and explain a phenomenon's process in a particular setting. For the qualitative method, the data can be taken from the written text (document or notes) and/or audio-visual data (interviews, movies, songs, and discussions). Furthermore, a descriptive approach was used in the research design as it refers to an approach that precisely depicts something that occurred for an individual, situation, or group.

For this research, the data were taken from the dialogue of a movie entitled “The Adam Project,” which explored the violation and flouting of maxims based on Grice’s theory. Thus, the data were obtained by watching the movie and observing the conversation between characters in “The Adam Project”. The data that can be found in the movie that violated the maxim, there are 17 data of them. The data of the utterances that violated or flouted the maxims will be transcribed into a written text. Transcription can be done through repeated careful watching or listening, which will be the first step in analysing the data (Bailey, 2008: 129). Next, the data were selected and categorised into Grice’s category of maxims, which are quantity maxim, quality maxim, relevant maxim, and manner maxim, and the type of violation can be misleading, opting-out, clashing or lying, and implicature, which from 17 data can be divided into 4 data from quantity maxim, 4 data from quality maxim, 5 data from relation maxim, and 4 data from manner maxim. This step is also used to generalise the characteristics of a small selection of elements from a specific group to be representative of the characteristics of all elements in that group. The implication of this line of reasoning is that all elements of a group at least share the same characteristics (Maxwell & Chmiel, 2014; Reichertz, 2014).

III. Findings and Discussion

Through the theory of cooperative principle and maxims that were proposed by Grice (1989) there are four maxims that support the cooperative principle which are the quantity,

quality, relation and manner maxims. These maxims, despite controlling the conversation as to influence it to be more effective, are still prone to violations which could make the conversation's effectiveness withered. There are in total four ways of violating the maxims which are quietly or not obviously violating maxim which in some cases might be misleading, opting out, clashing, and flouting or exploiting (Taghiyev, 2017: 861). Siregar (2018: 26–28) stated that violating the maxim quietly or obviously could be done through misdirecting the hearer from getting into the implicature or simply distracting the hearer by talking another matter which tends to happen when the speaker doesn't prefer the direction of the conversation after predicting it which could happen through some steps as follows.

- 1) Quantity maxim violation
 - a) Speaker attempts circumlocution or not direct to the point to create vagueness
 - b) Speaker is uninformative
 - c) Speaker talks too short
 - d) Speaker talks too much
 - e) Redundancy of certain words
- 2) Quality maxim violation
 - a) Speaker lied or said anything untrue
 - b) Doing irony or makes sarcastic statement
 - c) Denial behavior
 - d) Distortion of information
- 3) Relation maxim violation
 - a) Speaker made the conversation unmatched with the topic
 - b) Changing the topic abruptly
 - c) Avoiding certain topic
 - d) Hiding a fact
 - e) Doing the wrong causality
- 4) Manner maxim violation
 - a) Using ambiguous language
 - b) Speaker exaggerates the topic
 - c) Usage of slang words
 - d) Speaker's voice is too low to hear during conversation

Opting out violation could be done through by blatantly neglecting to cooperate and could be expressed verbally or nonverbally which for instance when somebody says 'my lips are sealed' or 'you won't get a thing from me' or 'the data is confidential' which are expressions that show lack of cooperation (Mooney in Mane, 2017: 865). Violation of maxim through clashing could happen when between two or more maxims which the speaker couldn't fulfill all of the

maxims without sacrificing or violating the other which creates an unbalance level of fulfillment towards the maxims (Mukaro, Mugari, & Dhumukwa, 2013: 163–164; Nahak & Bram, 2021: 309; Westera, 2018: 10–11). For instance, when a Balinese being asked about what ‘*Ngaben*’ is in English, the answer wouldn’t be as simple as ‘cremation’ as it has far beyond meaning which is based on cultural aspect ranging from its processes to its objectives in doing *Ngaben*, Ardhana et al. (2019) stated the most suitable answer would be as follows.

The settlement of the bodies of people who died by burning their bodies, this ceremony too called the *Pelebon* or *Atiwa-tiwa* ceremony and can only be held once for someone who has died... a ritual that is carried out to send the corpse in the next life (94–97).

Through this statement, the definition of *Ngaben* would clearly violate the quantity maxim as it is too much information but it is done so in a clashing way to support the quality maxim in terms of the right definition of *Ngaben*. Flouting a maxim could be done by blatantly violating the maxims and not because of the speaker is unaware of maxims but because the speaker intended to create a conversational implicature which the hearer should make an effort to understand the utterance (Marlisa & Hidayat, 2020: 133–134). Cutting (in Noertjahjo, Arifin, & Ariani, 2017: 194) explained that people tend to do flouting in order to signify the intended meaning or the implicature to the hearer meanwhile people tend to do violating to create deceit towards the hearer by informing only a little about the meaning of an utterance. Throughout the research, the violations of maxims occurred as follows.

Violation of Maxim Quantity

There are in total 4 data of quantity maxim violation which indicate the speakers have done some circumlocutions, too much information, opting out, and clashing which are as follows.

DATA_001

Line 174–210

00:12:09,250 --> 00:14:08,666

Young Adam: *What's with the lightsaber?*

Adam: *It's not a lightsaber. Jesus Christ, Adam. I need you to play it cool.*

Young Adam: *Wait.*

Adam: *I know playing it cool isn't your thing.*

Young Adam: *Wait.*

Adam: *It never has been...*

Young Adam: *Wait, wait! How do you know my name?*

Adam: ***You're Adam Reed. Born February 10th, 2010. Your parents are Ellie and Louis Reed. Louis would've died about a year ago. You don't play any sports because of acute asthma. Plus***

you're freakishly small for 12. You go to Franklin Middle School, where you've been suspended two, three times for fighting, which is ironic because you can't fight to save your life. (Circumlocution)

Young Adam & Adam: *Hawking! Zip it!*

Young Adam: *How do you know my dog's name?*

Adam: *Because I named him. Where are you goin'? Oh God. All right. Here, ready? Deep breath. Hold it. Three, two, one. Everybody gets a trophy.*

Young Adam: *When I was seven, I ran into a table on the patio. I got 12 stitches. (Too much information)*

Young Adam & Adam: *Right here.*

Young Adam: *You knew how to get into my dad's garage. You knew how to close the fridge. You knew how to time my breathing. We have the same scar. And you're wearing my dad's watch. This watch. (Too much information)*

Adam: *This watch.*

Young Adam: *You're me. Holy shi... (Most efficient answer)*

Adam: *That's classified. But yes... I once was.*

As a context, Adam just came from the future and he was treating his wound when Young Adam stormed him out of curiosity, which made Adam, called Young Adam and out of curiosity, Young Adam interrogated Adam's identity. According to the answer, it turned out to be circumlocution from Adam which made him violate the maxim quantity as he acted vaguely in a way too complicated to address his real identity by literally blabbering a sequence of Young Adam's identity which indirectly telling him his true identity. The conversation could be even more effective if Adam just told Young Adam directly his identity or just literally opting out to not violate the quantity maxim but opting out would result in violation of manner maxim. The reaction from Young Adam after he indirectly noticed Adam's identity was also violating maxim quantity. As he actually already knew Adam's identity but he listed his entire past and Adam's behaviors, physical attributes, and accessories which makes him being too informative and apparently, the most efficient answer is to just confirm directly his identity from the last utterance "You're me".

DATA_002

Line 407–412

00:25:16,500 --> 00:25:18,166

Ray: So you're not gonna break this up?

Adam: ***God, no*** (*Most efficient answer*). **That'd be irresponsible of me. You'll just figure out some other way to pound the crap out of him. You always do. He's got a big mouth. I get it. Point is, this fight needs to happen right now.** (*Too much information*)

Within the context, Young Adam was caught by Ray & Chuck who always bully him when he was waiting for Adam in front of a store. Adam fortunately saw the bullying and he faced the bullies but had no intention to stop the bullying as Adam wanted Young Adam to learn some manliness to stop the bullying by himself. Ray then interrupted Adam by confirming whether he would get involved to the fight or let them do it.

Adam's answer revealed his intention by the first thing he said "God, no" which confirmed already his lack of intention to cooperate with Young Adam, but then his reasoning became a bunch of small talks which emphasize his true intention but through that his answer violated the maxim of quantity as he became to be too much informative and the answer could be as informative as required ever he didn't add anything.

DATA_003

Line 1013–1026

01:02:31,500 --> 01:03:12,666

Louis: Mankind has no business tampering with the mechanics of the universe. There are forces greater than science.

Adam: Right. That's why we're gonna put the genie back in the bottle. Destroy time travel before it's even invented.

Louis: Uh... What's done, no matter how terrible, should not and cannot be undone under any circumstance. Even us being here, talking like this, we're perverting fate and time.

Adam: I told you Sorian already did that. She's had the world by the balls since.

Louis: **And you know that for a fact? Do you have scientific proof that she changed things? No, you don't because you can't know. But I will tell you this. You being here opens up the potential for catastrophic reconfiguration. And that is quantifiable, that...** (*Opting out*)

Adam: Stop. Stop.

As a context, Louis Reed got a visit from Adam and Young Adam in the past, and in a motel the three of them made a conversation of what would happen in the future after the invention of time travelling. Adam tried to persuade Louis to work with them destroying the time travel machine for a better future, however, Louis didn't buy their warnings and stubbornly believed that nobody should change the future by messing up with the past.

The way he reacted towards Adam's warnings was hilariously unexpected as he argued the fact that the future would be a corrupted nightmare with Sorian handling the time travel

project by herself. He was basically opting out as in the case of “my lips are sealed!” but in a more elaborated way to the point he violated the maxim of quantity with all the arguments he stormed to Adam for negating his offer. Opting out could be done verbally and non-verbally and could show the legal or ethical reason of why the speakers are opting out in this context; the ethical reason is the main reason (Agus & Yustiani, 2020: 4).

DATA_004

Line 922–934

00:58:16,750 --> 00:58:49,625

Louis: To quote the Romans, "Enjoy yourselves. It's later than you think."

Adam: *Guy Lombardo. (Interruption)*

Louis: I am s... I'm sorry?

Adam: **Guy Lombardo. That was... Yeah. The quote, um... "It's later than you think." It's not the Romans. It's a singer. Guy Lombardo and his Royal Canadians.** (*Clashing to sacrifice Quantity maxim by long explanation*)

Louis: **It was Guy Lombardo, and it was from his 1949 classic, "Enjoy Yourself." But long before that, it was the Romans who etched it on their sundials. So, uh... so we're both right. It's interesting that you, uh... you know that.** (*Clashing to sacrifice Quantity maxim by long explanation*)

In this scene, Adam and Young Adam went to the past to be exact in 2018 to meet Louis in his class while he was lecturing and Adam then got into his class acting that he was auditing the class and interrupted Louis while he closed his class.

Both of the speakers, be it Adam or Louis violated the maxim of Quantity by clashing, the clashing occurred while both explained about each side's perspective and belief towards the quote “Enjoy yourselves. It’s later than you think.” Which shows that in order to explain the origin of that quote, both speakers had to explain the historical aspect of that quote and apparently created clashing on the quantity maxim to preserve the level of truth for the quality maxim.

Violation of Maxim Quality

There are in total 4 data of maxim quality which indicate the speakers have done some denial behavior, lying, flouting by sarcasm and joking which are as follows.

DATA_005

Line 39–46

00:03:04,791 --> 00:03:27,500

Young Adam: Ow!

Ray: Got anything else you wanna say?

Young Adam: Actually, I...

Ray: Huh? No more jokes? Oh, I'm gonna enjoy this.

Young Adam: Who talks like that? Did you order, like, a "Bully Starter Kit" on Amazon or somethin'? I mean, do you even hear yourself? Chuck, we talked about this.

Chuck: **I didn't say anything.** (*Denial behavior*)

Young Adam: Shut up, Chuck.

Chuck: That's what I'm talkin' about. (*Confirming the denial*)

In this context, Young Adam was chased by Ray and Chuck and after a long run apparently Young Adam got caught by the bullies and the dialogue happened at the school's stairs. Within the dialogue, Chuck attempted a denial behavior through which act he did a violation to the quality maxim as he could truly be seen lying on the next dialogue that he said "That's what I'm talkin' about" which signifies that he actually spilled out something since Chuck actually sides on Ray more than on Adam.

#DATA_006

Line 118–119

00:09:13,625 --> 00:09:19,833

Young Adam: How did you get in my dad's garage?

Adam: **I... It was open.** (*Violation by lying*)

Young Adam: No, it wasn't. And that is a flight suit. Are you a pilot?

In this part, the context tells that Young Adam noticed that something was off with his dad's garage in which he found Adam lying his body to the wall and sitting since he got shot during his time travel. Young Adam then interrogated him while holding a baseball bat asking how Adam managed to get into the garage. His answer towards Young Adam's question was literally a violation of maxim quality as he blatantly lying towards him and it's proven by Young Adam's reaction by neglecting what he actually believed which the garage was actually locked. It is also likely confirmed by the way Adam reacted as he stuttered as stuttering would likely contribute as signs of dishonesty (O'Connor, Lyon, Wiens, & Evans, 2022: 50).

DATA_007

Line 293–304

00:19:13,333 --> 00:19:43,750

Ellie: Oh. This is my son, Adam.

Adam, this is Derek.

Derek: Oh, hey, Adam.

Young Adam: **Hello. You have a wonderful mouth mullet.**

You must be very proud. (*Flouting*)

Ellie: Oh my gosh, Adam.

Derek: Never heard it called that before.

Elie: Well, thanks again.

Derek: Sure. See you soon.

Young Adam: **Unlikely, but I'll put in a good word for you.** (*Flouting*)

Ellie: Okay. Okay. I'll see you at work.

Derek: Yeah.

Ellie: Bye.

Young Adam: **He seems nice. What?** (*Flouting*)

Ellie: You can be a real jerk sometimes.

Within this scene, Ellie introduced Derek to Young Adam and Young Adam answered him sarcastically through saying compliments towards him with the intention of harassing him since he didn't like Derek at all and didn't expect Derek to get close to his mom.

Here it can be seen that there are 3 times of flouting done towards Derek by Young Adam which the first one was intended to shame Derek's haircut by saying that he's too proud of it, and the second one was intended to show lack of interest towards Derek but acting as if he would help his relationship with Ellie. Lastly, he stated how Derek seemed nice but did not really mean it as it was just a compliment for formality. Throughout his reactions towards Derek, Young Adam knew his purpose of saying sarcasm which intended to make Derek notice how he did not like him at all and that showed how conversational implicature occurred within the conversation.

DATA_008

Line 391–393

00:24:15,875 --> 00:24:23,833

Adam: There's a difference. Give me some cash.

Young Adam: You don't have money?

Adam: **We don't use money in the future.** (*Flouting*)

Young Adam: Really?

Adam: Of course we use money in the future. Stay here. (*Confirmation of the flout*)

In regards to the context of this scene, Adam and Young Adam went out for groceries and since Adam came from the future, he didn't bring any money nor that his money would be

accepted anyway as means to pay. Thus, he asked Young Adam for money and Young Adam answered with innocent curiosity which later on be answered by a joke from Adam about the future.

Joking could create incongruity of certain topic as means to create humorous effect by intentionally violating the maxim which in other word it is flouting (Puspasari & Ariyanti, 2019: 76–80). Adam knew in the first place by answering this it would create even more curiosity towards Young Adam as the kid didn't know anything about the future, which he then created a false information to fool Young Adam for the sake of comedy within the movie. The fact that it was confirmed by his own saying that in the future people still do use money confirmed that it was a flout in order to fool Young Adam.

Violation of Maxim Relation

DATA_009

Line 64-68

00:04:22,625 --> 00:04:33,000

Ellie: What's going on, honey? Can you just tell me? If I keep having to leave work in the middle of the day, I'm gonna lose my job. It's the third time you've been suspended for fighting.

Young Adam: **You'd think I'd be better at it by now.** (*Implicature*)

The context of the conversation is that Ellie had been called several times by the school relating to Adam's problems. After confronting Adam about the situation and why he kept getting into trouble, Ellie asked Adam about what happened to him and whether he could tell her or not about his fighting. In his answer about his mom's confrontation, he responded sarcastically and did not answer her question properly. His answer also implied that keep being into a fight; he would be good at one. Thus, his utterance had violated the maxim of relevance and the way he responded to the question implied something else that derivated from the topic.

DATA_010

Line 110

00:08:51,833 --> 00:08:53,916

Young Adam: Jeez. Who the hell are you?

Adult Adam: **Put the bat down.** (*violation*)

Within the context of the story, Young Adam heard something from the cottage, so he followed the sound to find out someone was in there sitting on the floor. To his surprise, he intended to swing his bat at that person. Thus, the conversation happened there, where the Young Adam frantically asked the stranger his name by screaming. Instead of stating his name, the

stranger asked Young Adam to put his bat down. He violated the relevance maxim from his answer by answering something irrelevant to the question. The conversation could be more effective if he stated his name so the Young Adam would not panic. However, from the maxim's violation, he meant to calm the Young Adam before starting the conversation.

DATA_011

Line 284-288

00:18:47,791 --> 00:19:01,583

Ellie: Oh, hey. I'm surprised you're still up.

Young Adam: **Well, this night's been full of surprises, mother.** (*misleading*)

Ellie: That's chilling. What happened?

Young Adam: **How was your not-a-date? Will you be seeing him again?** (*misleading*)

Ellie: No. I don't know. I don't think so.

Ellie had just come home from a date at night when she saw Young Adam sitting on the couch playing with his dog. To show her surprise, she asked him a question. Throughout the conversation, Adam seemed to avoid her statement by stating other answers, in which he stated something quite ambiguous. It meant that he was hiding something, so he acted mysteriously, thus provoking his mother's curiosity and making her ask what had happened to him. Instead of answering her question, he abruptly changed the topic by asking her about his date. His utterance stated something unrelated to the previous context, in which he blatantly violated the maxim of relevance. From the answers and questions he gave, he had been misleading his mother to avoid the topic; thus, he violated the maxim.

DATA_012

Line 1143-1146

01:10:28,750 --> 01:10:38,583

Ellie: You're still here.

Louis: Oh.

Ellie: And you're cooking. What are you making? Hi.

Louis: Uh, I know you like the Denver omelette. (*Implicature*)

Ellie: That's not a Denver omelette. That is a cry for help.

In 2018 morning, Adam's mother, Ellie, went down the stairs and saw her husband, Louis, had not gone to the office. Therefore, she came to him, who was cooking an omelette in the kitchen. Within the dialogue, Ellie asked what he cooks, and the answer that Louis gave did not directly answer her question with "I am making..." but he gave the implication of what Ellie

liked to eat. It meant that his utterance was an implicature. Therefore, this conversation violated the maxim of relevance. The conversation could be even more relevant if Louis answered her question by stating what he was doing and can be followed by stating what she likes so that he could follow the cooperative principle. From the violation of the maxim, however, he implied that he just wanted to please his wife by stating that implicature.

DATA_013

Line 1245-1247

01:15:45,208 --> 01:15:50,500

Louis: I'm sorry. Are you okay?

Adult Adam: **This close!** (*Violation*)

Louis: **That was amazing.** (*Violation*)

Adult Adam: **This close!** (*Violation*)

Louis: Where's little Adam?

Adult Adam: He's fine!

As the context depicted, Louis came to assist duo Adams from Sorians' security enforcer. He drove and hit the car that was supposed to hit the Adult Adam. By doing that, he also almost hit the Adult Adam, but instead, when he opened the car, the car's door hit him and made him bounce. This accident made the Adult Adam a little furious with Louis, but Louis, himself, felt thrilled with the situation. Therefore, two of them uttered some utterances irrelevant to one another; thus, this condition made them violate the maxim of relevance. In this case, the Adult Adam uttered the fact that he almost got hit, and Louis asked about his condition and felt happy with his doings.

Violation of Maxim Manner

DATA_014

Line 159-162

00:11:23,291 --> 00:11:34,656

Young Adam: Cool. Wait, wait, wait. Bullet? You were shot?

Adult Adam: **Yeah... No, actually, no. No, I was stabbed with a bullet. What do you think, you moron.** (*Implicature*)

Young Adam: I'm a moron? You're the one who was shot.

As the context followed Young Adam and Adult Adam's first meeting, Young Adam learned that the Adult Adam got shot. Thus, he uttered his shock at the news and asked for confirmation from the Adult Adam. Rather than state that the bullet had shot him, his answer was

convolute, not brief and frankly enough. Therefore, he had violated the maxim of manner with his answer. It was also further implied that by his response, he was being sarcastic toward Young Adam, who could not correctly read the situation, instead of asking the question. However, the conversation would be more effective and not violate the maxim if the Adult Adam answered the question by briefly stating “yes/no,” and it would avoid using ambiguous language.

DATA_015

Line 170-173

00:11:55,083 --> 00:12:08,083

Young Adam: Who even are you?

Adult Adam: **That is classified.** (*opting-out*)

Young Adam: Why are you here?

Adult Adam: **Also classi... classified.** (*opting-out*)

Young Adam: Are you in the air force?

Adult Adam: When I say "classified," what does your brain hear? Chocolate?

The context for the above conversation was about the Young Adam confrontation to get information about the Adult Adam about his identity, why he was in his cottage, and where he came from. However, his answer violated the maxim of manner, where he gave obscurity and ambiguous words to respond. Moreover, he chose the opt-out violation, where he chose not to cooperate with Young Adam, neglected his question; and simply gave a “*that is classified*” answer. From Adult Adam answered, however, it can be known that he tried to keep his identity from being exposed that he was from the future.

DATA_016

Line 935-936

00:58:49,708 --> 00:58:54,416

Louis: I'm sorry, do I know you?

Adam: **Just auditing the class.** (*Violation*)

The context happened in 2018 when Adam came to Louis's class, his father, in the past. Almost at the end of the class, Adam uttered the information that he knew about the quote that Louis had just said, and after further explanation, the conversation happened there where he asked whether he knew about Adam or not. However, he gave an ambiguous answer to that question; thus, he violated the maxim of manner. His words became absurd because they did contain any context within them. In addition, to avoid violating the maxim, he could reveal his identity, but if he did, he would startle his father, Louis.

DATA_017

Line 1228-1232

01:14:33,166 --> 01:14:50,291

Adult Adam: Adam, what are you doing? I'm about to get my ass kicked.

Young Adam: **Don't worry. He doesn't wanna fight.** (*Implicature*)

Adult Adam: They wanna fight. They really, really wanna fight.

Young Adam: **Just look him in the eyes and smile. Smile in a way that says, "I want this."**
(*Implicature*)

The context above described the situation when Young and Adult Adam tried to penetrate Sorian's base where they met with security enforcers. Adult Adam had to engage in a fight, while the Young Adam was helping from far away with the help of the drone that could shoot. However, in the middle of the fight and Adam got cornered by the security enforcers, he asked Young Adam for help but Young Adam delayed it; thus, the violation of the manner maxim happened. Young Adam gave an ambiguous answer to Adult Adam's request for help. Turned out, that the answer he gave was referred to a previous situation where the Adult Adam said the same thing to the Young Adam when he had a confrontation with Ray and Chuck. The purpose of these utterances was to tease Adult Adam before giving him aid.

IV. Conclusion

Based on this study it can be concluded that the data found were 17 data consisting of 4 data including violations of maxim quality, 4 data including violations of maxim quantity, 5 data violations of relevant/relational maxims, and 4 data violations of maxim manner. From the violation maxim quantity data found, the dominant violation is caused by too much information that interlocutors given. In violation of maxim quality, violations are dominated by flouting. In relation maxims, the most dominant violation is conversation that is irrelevant to the topic of the previous conversation. Furthermore, the last one is violation of maxim manner; data violation is dominated by flouting implicature.

References

- Agus, C., & Yustiani, K. P. (2020). The Non-Observance Of Grice's Cooperative Principle And Humorous Implicature In Barack Obama's Interview. *CULTURA FRANCA: Journal of English Linguistics, Literature and Cultrure*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Andy, A., & Ambalegin, A. (2019). Maxims violation on "Night at the Museum" movie. *Jurnal Basis*, 6(2), 215–224.

- Bailey, J. (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: transcribing. *Family practice*, 25(2), 127-131.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Guo, F., & Li, X. (2017). An analysis of conversational implicature in nirvana in fire from the perspective of cooperative principle. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 6(7), 39-47.
- Mane, S. S. (2017). *Study of Meaningful Nonfulfillment of Cooperative Principle Resulting in Social Implications*.
- Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). The analysis of flouting maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) talkshow. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 7(2), 132-142.
- Maxwell, J. A., & Chmiel, M. (2014). Generalization in and from qualitative analysis. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis*, 7(37), 540-553.
- Mays, Nicholas & Pope, Clive. (2000). Qualitative research in health care: Assessing quality in qualitative research. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*. 320. 50-2. 10.1136/bmj.320.7226.50.
- Mukaro, L., Mugari, V., & Dhumukwa, A. (2013). Violation of conversational maxims in Shona. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture (JCLC)*, 2(4), 161-168.
- Nahak, Y., & Bram, B. (2021). Gricean Maxim Violations in a Javanese Song Entitled Sléncó. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 4(3), 307-315.
- Noertjahjo, E., Arifin, M. B., & Ariani, S. (2017). Analysis of flouting and violating towards maxim of quality in MY SISTER'S KEEPER novel. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni Dan Budaya*, 1(3), 206.
- O'Connor, A. M., Lyon, T. D., Wiens, M., & Evans, A. D. (2022). Use of global trait cues helps to explain older adults' decrements in detecting children's lies. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 27(1), 48-62.
- Puspasari, M. A., & Ariyanti, L. (2019). Flouting maxims in creating humor: A comparison study between Indonesian and American. *Prosodi*, 13(2), 75-88.
- Rahmi, S. S., Refnaldi, R., & Wahyuni, D. (2018). The violation of Conversational Maxims found in political conversation at Rosi Talkshow. *English Language and Literature*, 7(1).
- Reichertz, J. (2014). Induction, deduction, abduction. In *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 123-135). SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243>
- Siregar, R. F. (2018). *An Analysis Of Conversational Implicature in V for Vendetta Movie*. Retrieved from <https://repositori.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/3781>
- Syafriyadin, S., Chandra, W. D. E., Apriani, E., & Noermanzah, N. (2020). Maxim Variation, Conventional And Particularized Implicature On Students' Conversation. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology of Research*, 9(02), 3270-3274.
- Taghiyev, I. (2017). Violation of Grice's maxims and ambiguity in English linguistic jokes. *IJASOS-International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 3(7), 284-288.

- Wasman, A. F. (2018). Grice's Conversational Hypothesis (Purposes and Challenges) MA Linguistics. *Journal of Raparin University-Vol, 5*(15), 73.
- Westera, M. (2018). Rising declaratives of the Quality-suspending kind. *Glossa. 2018; 3 (1):*[32 p.]. DOI: 10.5334/Gjgl. 415.
- Yule, G., & Widdowson, H. G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. OUP Oxford.
- Zebua, E., Rukmini, D., & Saleh, M. (2017). The Violation and Flouting of Cooperative Principles in the Ellen Degeneres Talk Show. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature, 12*(1), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v12i1.11474>