

FLOUTING THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN *I AM SAM* MOVIE

Anita¹, Syamsuddin Rois²

¹²STKIP PGRI Ponorogo

tnita677@gmail.com

Received: 12 July 2022, **Revised:** 23 August 2022, **Accepted:** 16 September 2022

Abstract

Conversational implicature is one of topics in pragmatics study. Conversation that happens between speaker and listener usually includes deep meaning that different from the structural meaning. Thus, the focus of this study is to describe and explain the flouting of cooperative principles in conversational implicature. The objectives of this study are: to describe what maxims are flouted by the characters in *I am Sam* movie and why the characters flout the cooperative principle. This study used qualitative descriptive analysis. The data was collected through document and used qualitative content analysis technique. From the twenty nine conversations, most characters did more maxim of relevance flouting and less maxim of manner flouting. Using Grice's cooperative principle, the finding of this study indicated that each character had their reason for flouting. The characters flouted maxim of relevance because their utterance was not relevant with the previous utterance and in some instances they wanted to change the topic of conversation. They flouted maxim of manner because their utterance included more meaning, ambiguous meaning and sometimes not clear. They flouted maxim of quality because their utterance was not recognized the rightness, they used ironic statement. Lastly, they flouted maxim of quantity because they gave more information rather than required.

Keywords: Flouting; Cooperative Maxim; Movie

Abstrak

Implikatur percakapan merupakan salah satu cabang dari analisis pragmatik. Percakapan yang terjadi antara pembicara dan pendengar biasanya mengandung makna mendalam yang berbeda dengan makna struktural. Dengan demikian, fokus penelitian ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan dan menjelaskan pelanggaran prinsip kerja sama dalam implikatur percakapan. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah: mendeskripsikan maksim apa yang dilanggar oleh para tokoh dalam film *I am Sam* dan mengapa para tokoh tersebut melanggar prinsip kerja sama. Penelitian ini menggunakan analisis deskriptif kualitatif. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui dokumen dan menggunakan teknik analisis isi kualitatif. Dari dua puluh sembilan percakapan, sebagian besar karakter melakukan lebih banyak pelanggaran maksim relevansi dan lebih sedikit pelanggaran maksim cara. Dengan menggunakan prinsip kerja sama Grice, temuan penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa setiap karakter memiliki alasan untuk melakukan pelanggaran. Tokoh-tokoh tersebut melanggar maksim relevansi karena tuturan mereka tidak relevan dengan tuturan sebelumnya dan dalam beberapa kasus mereka ingin mengubah topik pembicaraan. Mereka melanggar maksim tata cara karena tuturan mereka mengandung lebih banyak makna, makna ambigu dan terkadang tidak jelas. Mereka melanggar maksim kualitas karena ucapan mereka tidak diakui kebenarannya, mereka menggunakan pernyataan yang ironis. Dan yang terakhir,

mereka melanggar maksim kuantitas karena mereka memberikan lebih banyak informasi dalam ucapan mereka.

Kata kunci: Pelanggaran; Maksim Kerjasama; Film

INTRODUCTION

Language has crucial function in human life, especially in communication (see Nugroho et al, 2021; Arifin, 2018; Setiawan & Rois, 2017). "Language is an arbitrary symbol system of articulated sounds made use of by a group of human as means as a communication and interaction each other's based on their culture and society (Dardjowidjojo, 2010:16)." Moreover Richards & Rodgers (1986:17) state that "language is the functional view". It means that language is a vehicle for the expression of functional meaning. The function of language is as an interactional view. It sees language as a vehicle for the realization of interpersonal relations and for the performance of social transactions between individuals (see Paulia et al, 2022; Suprpto, 2018;).

Additionally, Yule (1996:35) says that "speakers and listeners are involved in conversation generally cooperating with each other". It means that the purpose of cooperation is simply one in which people who are having a conversation can understand each other and would not make confuse. Furthermore, "A speaker can convey a thought without putting it into words (Burton-Roberts, 2007:26)." The speaker can say one thing (as determined by sentence meaning, perhaps relative to context) and mean something else (speaker meaning). The hearer's task is to understand the speaker, or more precisely, to recognize the speaker's communicative intension in making the utterance and in particular to identify what the speaker's means. The meaning of the sentence provides the hearer with only part of his basis for figuring that out. The hearer needs also to

take into account the fact that in that situation the speaker uttered that sentence with that meaning.

Conversation that happens between speaker and listener usually includes deep meaning that different from the literal meaning. The concept of implicature is used to explain the difference between "what is said" and "what is implicated" Grice (2002:24). Moreover, according to Grice (in Pradita, 2013: 6), an implicature is what is suggested in an utterance, even though neither expressed nor strictly implied by the utterance". In simple, implicature means an utterance that different from what is said. For many linguists, the notion of "implicature" is one of the central concepts in pragmatics.

Conversational implicature is one branch of pragmatic analysis. Levinson (2000:15) claims that there are 6 characteristics of conversational implicature: cancellability, nondetachability, calculability, nonconventionality, reinforcability, and universality. Yule (1996:128) states that "Conversational implicature is an additional unstated meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the cooperative principle". The cooperative principle should be known and understood by the language user to make the communication work well (see Arifin & Suprayitno, 2015; Prastyaningsih & Harida, 2021; Harida, 2016). The cooperative principle: Make your conversational contribution such as required. There are four maxims; quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Cutting (2008:36-39) stated that when speakers appear not to follow the maxim but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied is

called flouting the maxims. When the speakers do the maxim flouting, the conversation between the speakers and the hearers can be unsuccessful since they will misunderstand each other. Below is the example of flouting quality maxim:

A : I begin to realize why.. em... why jobs in language schools run out so sharply in the autumn and in the spring. It's all these damn MSc students and their wives, //(heh heh).

B : //(Heh heh heh).

A : Now I know why I was never wanted after October.

B : Yeah that's right. (heh)

This example shows that the speaker gives false information. He shows the hyperbole. Another example is flouting relation (relevance) maxim, as presented in the following instance:

A : There is somebody at the door.

B : I am in the bath.

B expects A to understand that his present location is relevant to her comment that there is someone at the door, and that he cannot go and see who it is because he is in the bath.

Example of flouting manner:

Those who flout the maxim of manner, appearing to be obscure, are often trying to exclude a third party. A husband says to his wife "I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody". He says in an ambiguous way, because he is avoiding saying 'ice cream' and 'Michelle'. So, his little daughter does not become excited and ask for the ice-cream before her meal.

The movie *I am Sam* was the object of the research because this movie has good theme and good moral value. *I am Sam* has strong plot, true story and the character development is note-worthy. As a kind of literary work that depicts human reality, movie can be used to

study the application of linguistic phenomena to achieve certain effects (see Hidayati et al, 2022; Puspitasari, 2021; Prastyaningsih & Harida, (2021). The characters in this movie can show the maxim flouting and usage to show the character's feeling in that time.

METHOD

This study used naturalistic/qualitative research. It is specifically descriptive qualitative research because the study describes the ideas through words. The data are the flouting of cooperative principles in the movie. Data analysis technique that is used by the writer is inductive analysis by using research data as the basis of understanding the focus of the flouting of cooperative principles in the conversational implicature of characters in the movie *I am Sam*.

Bogdan in Sugiyono (2011:240) states that "in most tradition of qualitative research, the phrase personal document is used broadly to refer to any first person narrative produced by an individual who describes his or her own actions, experience, and belief". In the qualitative research, document of person experience, history, and their literary work can be used as a data. Based on the explanation above, technique of Collecting data in this research by using document collection that are related to the movie. The technique of collecting data in this research as follows: 1) Choosing data and collecting data from the movie *I am Sam* helped by movie script that includes flouting of co-cooperative principles, and 2) Identifying the movie *I am Sam* based on its maxim flouted

This study used qualitative content analysis technique. The technique of analyzing data in this study are: watching movie *I am Sam* and giving marks in the script as data, choosing data and collecting data, data

classification (flouting maxim), analyzing data critically using theory as in review of literature, and making conclusion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section provided the findings of maxims flouting depicted in the movie, as follows:

Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

Datum 1 (28:40-28:50)

Waitress (1a): What about you?

Sam (1b) : I would like to have two eggs, sunny side up but not Runny, ok? and then I would like to have French Pancakes with the fruit topping on the side

Waitress (1a): We don't have French Pancakes. We have French toast.

Sam (1b) : No, I don't want French toast. I want French Pancakes, like at IHOP just the same kind like they have at IHOP, that's what my favorite breakfast is, ok?

This conversation happened in the restaurant when Sam and Lucy have a breakfast. Waitress offered the menu to Sam by said "We don't have French Pancakes. We have French toast?" Sam responded it by said "No, I don't want French toast. I want French Pancakes, like at IHOP just the same kind like they have at IHOP, that's what my favorite breakfast is, ok?". This utterance flouted maxim of quantity because Sam gave more information to the waitress. This utterance has misunderstanding between waitress and Sam. He wanted French Pancakes by said that it was his favorite breakfast. It means that Sam just wanted French Pancakes not others. He ignored the waitress although the waitress explained that his order did not be provided. It was shown in Sam (1b) "No, I don't want

French toast. I want French Pancakes, like at IHOP just the same kind like they have at IHOP, that's what my favorite breakfast is, ok?" Sam should just says "No, I don't want French toast, thank you". He did not need to say "I want French Pancakes, like at IHOP just the same kind like they have at IHOP, that's what my favorite breakfast is, ok?" because his explanation will not solve the problem. The menu that he choosed was not be provided.

Datum 2 (41:30-41:40)

Sam (2a) : By any chance, did you call your friend? The one that does this kind of works?

Rita (2b) : I don't have her number anymore. We lost touch

Sam (2a) : If you get back in touch with her and you find her number, will you call me?

Rita (2b) : I'm just in the middle of.. it's a special. Yeah, I will call you, ok.

Rita flouted maxim of quantity, because she gave more information. Rita should answer "No, I did not call her" not "I don't have her number anymore. We lost touch". She gave information that was not needed.

Then, she did not need to say "I'm just in the middle of.. it's a special". She should answer "I will call you, ok". That is enough. The implication of Rita's response is that she did not want to be disturbed by Sam.

Datum 3 (03:06-03:07). The conversation and the analysis as the following:

Sam (3a) : Are you ok?

Rebecca (3b): A...rgh...

This conversation flouted the maxim of quantity. It was shown when Rebecca answered (3b) "A...rgh..." not "Yes I am Ok" or "No, I am rather bad, I am not Ok and so on". Rebecca was not giving all the information because she held up her hurt of baby birth.

Datum 4 (04:53:05:02)

Sam (4a) : Becca....Becca... the bus is going!!!!

Rebecca (4b) : (Without answer, going on and ran a way)

This conversation happened when Rebecca and Sam would go home from hospital. Rebecca got Sam to stopping the bus and she ran away. When Sam called her like in (4a) "Becca....Becca... the bus is going!!!!". Rebecca ran away without give response. Rebecca flouted maxim of quantity because she was not giving all information. She escaped from Sam and her baby. It means that Rebecca did not like with her baby.

Datum 5 (1:19:48-1:19:55).

Rita (5a) : Willy. It's time for bed

Willy (5b) : (no response)

This conversation happened when Rita came from work at night. And Willy played his Frigging Raptor Scooter. Rita asked to him by said "Willy. It's time for bed" but Willy still played his scooter and did not give response to his mother. Willy flouted the maxim of quantity because he was not giving all information. It means that Willy did not want to go sleep earlier. He still wanted to play his scooter. He ignored Rita's advice without said anything.

Flouting the Maxim of Quality

Datum 6 (42:04-42:11)

Rita (1a) : What's that supposed to mean?

Patricia (1b) : Cracker went down the wrong pipe.

This conversation happened when Rita would be a pro bono lawyer in Sam case. This utterance flouted the maxim of quality because Patricia gave false information. She lied to Rita. It was shown in (1b) "Cracker went down the wrong pipe". Patricia was afraid if she said the

reality, Rita would be angry. Actually Patricia and her friends were derisive to Rita by said like that and laughing at him.

Datum 7 (1:11:11-1:11:21).

Mr. Turner (2a): Where were you sleeping last night?

Lucy (2b) : In my bed at the Foster home.

This conversation happened when Lucy in the court after she and her father escaped because they did not want to separate. Mr. Turner asked her (2a) "Where were you sleeping last night?". And Lucy answered (2b) "In my bed at the Foster home". Lucy lied to Mr. Turner. Actually she did not sleep at the Foster home at that night but she was going to the park with her father. The implication of Lucy's utterance is for protecting her father and herself from the treatment of court.

Datum 8 (1:39:35-1:39:45)

Rita (19a) : Sam, Can I come in? Sam.

Sam (19b) : Not really room here. There is no room here.

This conversation happened in Sam's house. Rita came in Sam's house by called him in front of the door. But Sam did not answer the Rita's calling. He concentrated with his activity and did not open the door. He made a handicraft from paper as partition wall or wallpaper. He was despondent with his case. He felt hopeless at Lucy that she would not come back for him. Sam flouted maxim of quality because he answered Rita's asking by false statement. It was shown in (19a) "Sam, Can I come in? Sam.." (19b) "Not really room here. There is no room here". Sam means that he did not want Rita to came at him. Sam wanted at home alone. Sam did not answer "No, you cannot" or "Yes, you can" because Sam expected Rita to understand with his statement.

Flouting the Maxim of Manner

Datum 9 (24:45-25:01)

Ms. Wright : Mr. Dawson, it's becoming clear that she's holding herself back in the classroom. It's as if she's literally afraid to learn. No one doubts that you love your daughter. But the Department of Child and Family Services contacted us. They shared with us that your records show that your intellectual capacity is around that of a 7-year-old our concern is what happens when Lucy turns 8.

Mr. X : Mr. Dawson, do you understand... what Ms. Wright is trying to tell you about Lucy?

Sam : Yeach, John wanted to try new things. And it wasn't Yoko's fault. No, it was not Yoko's fault. Annie says you can hear it on the white album. Because John wanted to try new things.

In this conversation, Sam flouted maxim of manner. Sam's answer was not clear. It was unsuitable with that question. Sam's response was non sense. It made Ms. Wright confused to understand his utterance.

Datum 10 (33:56 -34:59)

Court (2a) : Right now, I want to talk to you about your legal rights.

Sam (2b) : Ok. There's room at this table. If anybody wants to sit next to me.

Court (2a) : I just want to talk to you about your legal rights. So, if you have not already contained legal Counsel. The court will appoint someone for you to present your case on January 5- ok?

Sam (2b) : That's a month from now. So, I come back here in one month with Lucy.

This conversation happened in the court office. Sam flouted the maxim of manner. Sam gave ambiguous information. Sam's utterance was not clear. He spoke another topic that was none sense. Sam did not understand with the court's statement. It made a misunderstanding between Sam and the court.

Flouting the Maxim of relevance

Datum 11 (01:50-02:06)

Sam (1a) : Good morning

Customer (1b) : Vanilla grande no-foam Latte.

Sam (1a) : That's wonderful choice.

This conversation happened when Sam in the Stunbruck coffee. The customer (1b) flouted maxim of relevance. Customer answered by said "Vanilla grande no-foam Latte". Customer should answer Sam's greeting by said "Good morning" and then Sam offered the menu. But this conversation implied that the customer ordered the menu. It was Vanilla grande no-foam Latte.

Datum 12 (02:59-03:05)

Doctor (2a) : You the one responsible for this?

Sam (2b) : I am sorry.

This conversation happened when Sam in the hospital. It was shown when his wife bore Lucy. Doctor asked him by said (2a) "You the one responsible for this?" and Sam answered (2b) "I am sorry". Sam flouted the maxim of relevance because he apologized for his coming late. Sam should answer "Yes" not "I am sorry". The purpose of Sam answered is for asking apologize.

Datum 13 (03:06-03:09)

Sam (3a) : Are you ok?

Rebecca (3b) : A...rgh...

This conversation flouted the maxim of relevance. It was shown when Rebecca answered (3b) "A...rgh..." not "Yes I am Ok or No, I am rather bad, I am not Ok and so on". Rebecca answered like in (3b) because she held up her hurt of baby birth.

Datum 14 (04:53-04:58)

Sam (4a) : Becca....Becca... the bus is going!!!!

Rebecca (4b) : (Without answer, going on and ran a way)

This conversation happened when Rebecca and Sam would go home from hospital. Rebecca asked to Sam to stopping the bus and she ran away. When Sam called her like in (4a) "Becca....Becca... the bus is going!!!!". Rebecca ran away without any response. She escaped from Sam and her baby. Rebecca flouted the maxim of relevance. It means that Rebecca did not like with her baby. She did not want to live with her baby.

Datum 15 (07:50-07.56)

Sam (5a) : Will you come over here and help me?

Annie (5b) : You know I can't do that. What does her mother say?

This conversation happened when Sam at home alone. Sam confused because Lucy was crying a long time. Then, Annie heard that noisy and she called Sam while opened her window. Sam asked to Annie by said (5a) "Will you come over here and help me?" and Annie answered (5b) "You know I can't do that. What does her mother say?" Annie flouted the maxim of relevance. Annie should answer "Yes I will" or "No, I will not" but she answered "You know I can't do that". It means that Annie expected Sam to understand that Annie could not come to Sam's house because her eyes were sick. So, she cannot go outside.

Datum 16 (09:26-09:30)

His Friends (6a) : Hi Sam... Hi Sam.

Sam (6b) : Sssstt.. what are you doing?
I'm just getting lucy a sleep
and you are making noisy.

This conversation happened when Sam was getting Lucy a sleep and his friends came. Sam was uncomfortable with his friends coming, because they were making noise. Sam flouted maxim of relevance because his answered was not suitable with his friends greeting. It was shown in (6b) "Sssstt.. what are you doing? I'm just getting lucy a sleep and you are making noisy". Sam should say "Hi" not "Ssstt". This utterance implied that Sam did not want his friends speak loudly because Lucy just had a sleep.

Datum 17 (10:18-10.29)

Robert (7a) : Did you bring Kramer vs Kramer?

Boy (7b) : I see what's happening here.
I see. So, this is all my fault
now.

Robert (7a) : Don't tell me you forgot again, I broke a date with a day dream to come here.

Robert's mom (7c) : Hi, Robert. Hello boys. It's me, Estelle.

Robert (7a) : Ma, I told you. Video night's over at 09:00

This conversation happened at Sam's house when they would have a video night. Boy flouted maxim of relevance. Because he did not response Robert question in (7a) "Did you bring Kramer vs Kramer?". Boy (7b) should answered by say "yes I did" or "No, I did not" but he said "I see what's happening here. I see. So, this is my entire fault now". It means that he asked to all of his friends that were it his fault?

Then, Robert flouted the maxim of relevance when he said "Ma, I told you. Video

night's over at 9:00". He did not answer "Hi Mom". It means that Robert did not like if his mother came at that time because video nights would be over at 09:00 and it was still at 06:30.

Datum 18 (13:40-14:00)

Lucy (8a) : Daddy, Do you think she'll ever come back?

Sam (8b) : Paul McCartney lost his mother when he was little and John Lennon lost his mother when he was little. Annie says that sometimes God picks the special people. That's what Annie says.

Sam flouted maxim of relevance because he did not want to make Lucy sad because of his answer that her mother would not come back. Sam means that many people who can live although they lost their mother. Sam explained it by giving example of the others people life based on his experience. It was shown when Sam answered Lucy's question (8a) "Daddy, Do you think she'll ever come back?". Sam did not answer "Yes she does" or "No, she does not" but he answered (8b) "Paul McCartney lost his mother when he was little and John Lennon lost his mother when he was little. Annie says that sometimes God picks the special people. That's what Annie says".

Datum 19 (17:45-17:59).

Sam (9a) : Yeah, So is that enough?

Shoes seller (9b): If there's a God. I'll count it.

This conversation happened when Sam and his friends bought Lucy's shoes. When Sam would pay those shoes, his money was not enough for paying. Afterwards all of his friends gave him money. Shoes seller flouted the maxim of relevance. It was shown when the seller of shoes answered Sam's question (9a) "So is that enough?" and he answered "If

there's a God. I'll count it". It means that "That is enough" but he did not say like that because the seller was apprehensive with their care.

Datum 20 (19:08- 19:21)

Sam (10a) : One more time?

Lucy (10b) : Daddy, it's my first day of school tomorrow. I don't want to be too sleepy. Everybody says Bob's Big Boy has the best hamburgers. Can we go there Wednesday instead of IHOP?

Sam (10a) : But Wednesday is IHOP

This conversation happened at night when Sam read a story for having Lucy a sleep. Lucy flouted maxim of relevance because tomorrow was her first day of school. She did not want to be too sleepy. It means that she want to sleep earlier. It was shown when she answered her father's question (10a) "One more time?" and Lucy answered (10b) "Daddy, it's my first day of school tomorrow. I don't want to be too sleepy".

Sam also flouted the maxim of relevance, it was shown when Sam answered Lucy's question "Everybody says Bob's Big Boy has the best hamburgers. Can we go there Wednesday instead of IHOP?" and then Sam answered "But Wednesday is IHOP". This utterance implied that Sam did not want to go to Bob's Big Boy besides IHOP, because Wednesday was IHOP.

Datum 21 (22:25-22:38)

Woman (11a): Hay, hay you.. Hay handsome, hay you. "Premature baby claims he's cupid." Has arrow to prove it. You believe that?

Sam (11b) : But if he has the arrow, that's the only thing.

Sam flouted maxim of relevance because he expected to the woman that she would know the implication of his utterance. Sam

means that he did not believe with woman's statement. He answered by said "But if he has the arrow, that's the only thing". Not "No, I did not believe but if he has the arrow, that's the only thing".

Datum 22 (33:56-34:09)

Court (12a) : Right now, I want to talk to you about your legal rights.

Sam (12b) : Ok. There's room at this table. If anybody wants to sit next to me.

Court (12a) : I just want to talk to you about your legal rights. So, if you have not already contained legal Counsel. The court will appoint someone for you to present your case on January 5- ok?

Sam (12b) : That's a month from now. So, I come back here in one month with Lucy.

This conversation happened in the court office. Sam flouted the maxim of relevance. Sam's statement was none sense because there was misunderstanding between Sam and the court. Sam did not understand with the court's statement.

Datum 23 (41:30-41:35)

Sam (13a) : By any chance, did you call your friend? The one that does this kind of work?

Rita (13b) : I don't have her number anymore. We lost touch

Rita flouted maxim of relevance. Rita said "I don't have her number anymore. We lost touch". It means that Rita actually did not have her friend's number that she had promised to Sam before.

Datum 24 (42:10-42:24).

Rita (14a) : You think I don't do *probono*?

Women (14b): Have another glass, please on me. No on you. It's *probono*

Rita (14a) : I do *probono*.

Woman (14c): I know, you go girl.

The women flouted maxim of relevance because they did not like if Rita did *probono*. They expelled and laughed at her. They throwing out the topic by say "Have another glass, please on me. No on you. It's *probono*". Then, Rita clarified that she does it *probono*.

Datum 25 (43:00-43:25)

Court (woman) (15a) : Lucy, he's an hour and 45 minutes late. You'll only have a few minutes left.

Lucy (15b) : You can leave if you want

Lucy flouted maxim of relevance because she still wanted to wait her father although her father come late. She said "You can leave if you want". It means that Lucy asked to the court to leave her if she wants.

Datum 26 (1:10:54-1:11:12)

Mr. Turner (16a): I thought you didn't open your presents because you ran away from your own party. Because your best friend told everyone that you said you were adopted.

Lucy (16b) : I never said that. Why would I say that?

Mr. Turner (16a) : Why would your friend say that?

Lucy (16a) : Kids lie all the time.

Mr. Turner flouted maxim of relevance because he expected Lucy to say the reality. He was suspicious that Lucy lied. The flouting maxim of relevance was shown in the second and third statement. Lucy asked to Mr. Turner "Why would I say that?" and Mr. Turner asked her back "Why would your friend say that".

Datum 27 (1:19:32-1:19:44)

Sam (17a) : You gonna come see the movie? It is the best part.

Rita (17b) : It is getting late. We better get to work.

This conversation happened in the Rita's house when Sam and Rita would tell about Sam's case in Rita's house. At that time, Willy and Sam saw the movie. Then Rita eat snack in the other room. Sam came on Rita's room and asked to her (17a) "You gonna come see the movie? It is the best part", Rita answered (17b) "It is getting late. We better get to work". This conversation flouted the maxim of relevance. Sam hoped Rita would join him saw that movie but Rita said that "It is getting late. We better get to work". It means that there was any time for saw a movie, its time just for work, because they might finish his case. Sam provided some answer about Mr. Turner question at that night. He learned and practiced with Rita, Rita act as Mr. Turner and Sam act as an accused in the court.

Datum 28 (1:19:48-1:19:54)

Rita (18a) : Willy. It's time for bed

Willy (18b) : (no response)

This conversation happened when Rita came from work at night. And Willy played his Frigging Raptor Scooter. Rita asked him, "Willy. It's time for bed" but Willy still played his scooter and did not give response to his mother. Willy flouted the maxim of relevance. It means that Willy did not want to go sleep earlier. He still wanted to play his scooter. He ignored Rita's advice without said anything.

Datum 29 (1:39:35-1:10:54)

Rita (19a) : Sam, Can I come in? Sam..

Sam (19b) : Not really room here. There is no room here.

Rita(19a) : Yeah, well. I lived in the East Village. I don't need a lot of room.

This conversation happened in Sam's house. Rita came in Sam's house by called him in front of the door. But Sam did not answer

the Rita's calling. He concentrated with his activity and did not open the door. He made a handicraft from paper as partition wall or wallpaper. He was hopeless with his at Lucy that she would not come back for him. Sam flouted maxim of relevance because he answered Rita's asking by other statement. That statement was not relevant. It was shown in (19a) "Sam, Can I come in? Sam.." (19b) "Not really room here. There is no room here". Sam means that he did not want Rita came at him. Sam did not answer "No, you cannot" because Sam expected Rita to understand with his statement.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it turned out that all characters flouted all of maxims in *I am Sam*. There are maxim of relevance, maxim of quantity, maxim of quality and maxim of manner. Although, the characters did not flout them together, they have their own reason why flouted the cooperative principles. The characters flouted maxim of relevance because their utterance was not relevant with the previous utterance and in some instance they want change the topic of conversation. They flouted maxim of manner because their utterance includes more meaning, ambiguous meaning and sometimes not clear. They flouted maxim of quality because their utterance is lack adequate evidence, they use ironic statement and sometimes their utterance was not recognized the rightness. And the last, they flouted maxim of quantity because they give more information in their utterance, they did not give all information, they exaggerates their utterance and sometimes they not to the point.

REFERENCES

- Arifin, A. (2018). How Non-native Writers Realize their Interpersonal Meaning? *Lingua Cultura*, 12(2), pp. 155-161. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i2.3729>
- Arifin, A. & Suprayitno, E. 2015. *Flouting the Grice's Maxims Found in Mr. Poppers' Penguin Movie*. Proceeding of National Seminar 'Prasasti' 1(1), pp. 1-8. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingprasasti/article>
- Burton-Roberts, N. (2007). *Pragmatics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cutting, J. (2008). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. (2010). *Psikolinguistik Pengantar Pemahaman Bahasa Manusia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Grice, H. P. (1991). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (2002). *Studies in The Way of Words*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Harida, R. (2016). HSBC's Cultural Theme Advertisement in Politeness Principle and Relevance Theory. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 3(2), pp. 111-115. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/JBS>
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature Language, Speech, and Communication*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Nugroho, R., Wardiani, R. & Setiawan, H. (2021). Kesantunan Berbahasa dalam Percakapan Antarmahasiswa Semester Delapan STKIP PGRI Ponorogo. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 8(1), pp. 37-43. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/JBS>
- Paulia, S., Sutejo & Astuti, C. W. 2022. Konflik Sosial dalam Novel *Bayang Suram Pelangi* Karya Arafat Nur. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 9(1), pp. 39-45. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/JBS>
- Pradita, I. (2013). The Pragmatic Aspects of Humor Creation: A Study on Grice's Cooperative Principles. *Journal of English and Education*, 7(2), pp. 1-15. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20885/jee.vol7.iss2.art1>
- Prastyaningsih, E. & Harida, R. (2021). The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in *New Moon* Movie. *Salience*, 1(2), pp. 61-69. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Salience>
- Richards, J. C & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Setiawan, H. & Rois, S. (2017). Wujud Kesantunan Berbahasa Guru: Studi Kasus di SD Immersion Ponorogo. *Gramatika*, 3(2), pp. 145-161. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22202/JG.2017.V3i2.2003>
- Sugiyono. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suprpto. 2018. Kepribadian Tokoh dalam Novel *Jalan Tak Ada Ujung* karya Muchtar Lubis; Kajian Psikoanalisis Sigmund Freud. *Metafora*, 5(1), pp. 54-69. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30595/mtf.v5i1.5028>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.