

## CHAPTER IV

### RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter focuses on what types of flouting maxim that occurred by the characters and the contexts of situation when the characters flout the the maxims in *Everything I Never told You* novel. The main point of this chapter is to answer the research questions in chapter I. Here, the researcher takes the data from some characters' utterances in the conversations which is flouting maxim occurred.

#### A. Research Findings

In *Everything I Never Told You* novel, there are some characters but the important characters are Lydia, James, Nath, Marylin, Hannah and Jack. Lydia is the main character in this novel, she was the middle child of Marylin and James Lee. Lydia was their favorite child. She bacame everything that her parents wanted. Marylin is an American woman. She is very ambitious woman who wanted to be a doctor but her dreams must be cancelled because she married to James and have children. Then, she decided to make her dream came true by Lydia. She spent all her time and energy to make Lydia becomes a doctor. James is Chinese American man, in his life, he always wanted to fit in and accepted as an American. But with his appearance, people branded him as an orietal and isolated him. Lydia is different from her siblings. Lydia looks like her mother and it makes James put pressure on her. He wanted her to socialize and make friends.

Nath is the eldest of the Lee children. He always supported and comforted Lydia whenever their parents got too much for her. He was the only one who knew the truth that she is a lonely girl. Hannah is the youngest of the Lee children. She was born and being ignored by her parents because all their attentions was for Lydia. Jack is one and only Lydia's friends.

Then, the pressure from his parents increased and Lydia became frustated with their high expectations. She also being dependent on her brother Nath and could not bear to lose him to college and afraid if he can not supported and comforted her anymore. All her frustations and emotion that she felt led her to commit suicide.

From the novel, the researcher found almost all characters flouted four the maxims of cooperative principle in the novel *Everything I Never Told You*. They are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

## **B. Data Analysis**

There are the data of flouting maxims that uttered by the characters in the novel *Everything I never Told You*:

### **Datum 1**

Nath : She was in her room last night. I heard her radio playing.  
At eleven thirty.

Hannah : **Can you be kidnapped if you're sixteen?** (Chapter 1, pages 7).

**Context :**

The context happened when Marylin, their mother, try to find Lidya in outside their house just in case she was there, because their mother did not find her at her room. Nath told Hannah the fact that he knows about Lydia last night then Hannah responded it with irrelevant answer.

**Data Analysis :**

From the utterances above, Hannah flouted *maxim of relation* by saying “Can you be kidnapped if you’re sixteen?”. She responded with that statement because she assumed that Lydia is kidnaped by someone because she dissapears from their house and it is not relevant with Nath’s statement before. So, the researcher classified Hannah’s statement as *flouting maxim of relation*. Like Thomas stated in his book that flouting maxim exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand.

**Datum 2**

Hannah : Are we still going to school today?

Marilyn : **You’ve both missed the bus. Nath, take my car and drop Hannah off on your way. Don’t worry. We’ll find out what’s going on.** (Chapter 1, pages 7).

**Context :**

The context happened when Marylin was back from the outside and tell them that Lydia is not there. They hear the clock in the front hall ticked, then strikes seven thirty. Hannah thought it's time to go to school but no one moves from their places. So Hannah asked that they will go to school or not, but their mother gives more information in her response.

**Data Analysis :**

From the utterances above, Marylin flouted *maxim of quantity*. Marylin's response is "You've both missed the bus. Nath, take my car and drop Hannah off on your way. Don't worry. We'll find out what's going on.". On her statement, she gave too much information than Hannah should be needed. The statement is intricate. She also gave statement that Hannah and Nath shouldn't worry about what happened to comfort them but it made her gave more information to answer Hannah's question. As Grice stated in his book, in maxim quantity, we should not give more information than is required. Then, the researcher classified Marylin's statement above as a *flouting of maxim quantity*.

**Datum 3**

Dottie : Middlewood High, this is Dottie.

Marilyn : **Good morning, is my daughter in class this morning?**

Dottie : To whom am I speaking, please? (Chapter 1, pages 8).

**Context :**

The situation happened when Marylin calls Lydia's school to make sure wheather she is at school or not. In this situation Marylin gave statement that makes Dottie as Middlewood High's staff is confused. She did not introduce herself but she asks whether Lydia attends the class or not.

**Data Analysis :**

From the utterances above, Marylin flouted *maxim of manner*. She makes an ambiguity statement, saying "Good morning, is my daughter in class this morning?" without gave another required information such as her daughter's name or introduces herself first. Her statement makes Dottie confused. It is safe to say Marylin's statement as *flouting maxim of manner* by the fact above. Cutting defined those who flout the maxim of manner, appearing to be obscure, are often trying to exclude a third party. From Cutting's statement which based on Grice's theory about the flouting maxims and the analysis above, the researcher classified Marylin's statement as a *flouting maxim of manner*.

**Datum 4**

Louisa : I hope the summer students will be better. A few people insisted that the Cape-to-Cairo Railroad was in Europe. For

college students, they have surprising trouble with geography.

James : **Well, this isn't Harvard, that's for sure. Sometimes I wonder if it is all a waste.** (Chapter 1, pages 11).

**Context :**

The context happened when James and Louisa talked about how difficult they are to teach the course at the fall because there is a few students who misunderstanding with the material. Louisa hopes the summer students will be better.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, James's response, "Well, this isn't Harvard, that's for sure. Sometimes I wonder if it is all a waste." to answer about Louisa's statement is not relevant. James says "Well, this isn't Harvard, that's for sure..." because he wanted to infer implicit meaning from what he have said before. He wanted Louisa to know that it's possible if the students misunderstanding with *the Cape-to-Cairo Railroad was in Europe* because they are Middlewood college's students not Harvard students so he did not expecting too much about their comprehension about the course. So, the researcher classified James's statement as *flouting maxim of relation*. As Cutting stated in his book, if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect

that 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).

### **Datum 5**

James : Did you want something, Stan?

Stanley : **Just wanted to ask a question about the dean's latest memo. Didn't mean to interrupt anything.** (Chapter 1, pages 12)

### **Context :**

The conversation happened when Stanley came to James's office asking about dean's latest memo when James tried to help Louisa to put something from her hair. He answered James' statement with too much information response to tease James.

### **Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, Stanley flouted *maxim of quantity*. He gave too much information on his statement to answer James's question. He says " ... Didn't mean to interrupt anything." to tease James because he saw James tried to help Louisa to put something from her hair. The researcher thought the statement is not necessary in this situation. Stanley should only says "Just wanted to ask a question about the dean's latest memo". Thomas, in his opinion, stated that a flout of the maxim of quantity occurs when speaker

blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires. Then, it is safe to classify Stanley's statement as a *flouting of maxim quantity*.

### **Datum 6**

Officer Fiske : Now, your wife also went missing once? I remember the case in sixty-six, wasn't it?

James :**That was a misunderstanding. A miscommunication between my wife and my self. A family matter.**

Officer Fiske : I see. (Chapter 1, pages 13)

### **Context :**

This conversation happened when the the police came at James' house to collect the data about Lydia. Officer Fiske Told them if most missing-girl cases resolve themselves within twenty-four hours. He studied James closely and remembering the same case at the past, he remember if Marylin have gone.

### **Data Analysis :**

From the utterances above, James strongly flouted *maxim of relation*. He did not answer Officer fiske's question with properly. His response is not relevant. Normally, He can say "Yes, he did" but he say with "That was a misunderstanding. A miscommunication between my wife and my self. A family matter.". There is an implicit meaning in his statement to tell if Marylin have gone at the past and he did want to talk about it because he was afraid if



Marilyn will hear it and he don't want to remember that bad memory. Cutting stated if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that 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). From Cutting's opinion and the analysis above, the researcher decided to classify it as a *flouting maxim of relation*.

### **Datum 7**

James : Are you a history major?

Marilyn : No. Physics.

James : A senior?

Marilyn : **No. A junior. I'm going to medical school. So history it's not my field.** (Chapter 2, pages 25)

### **Context :**

The conversation happens at James's office. Marilyn met him because she wanted to apology for her classmates' attitude toward him. She gives too much information in her response to James's question while she introduces herself.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, Marilyn flouts *maxim of quantity*. She says "No. A junior. I'm going to medical school. So history it's not my field." to answer James's question. She adds too much information than James needed by saying "... . I'm going to medical school. So history it's not my field." In this context, Marilyn says those things because she wants James know that she wants to be a doctor and she did not attend the history class which is the information it is not necessary to James. Cutting defined the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. From the analysis and Thomas's opinion above, The researcher decided to classify Marilyn statement as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

**Datum 8**

James : Miss Walker, why are you here?

Marilyn : I just wanted to apologize for those boys.

James : Friends of yours?

Marilyn : **No. No. Just idiots.** (Chapter 2, pages 25)

**Context :**

The context happens when Marilyn met James in his office. She was there because she wanted to apologize for some of the boys who left the class. James asked if they were her friends but Marilyn refused it.

**Data Analysis :**

From the context above, Marylin says “No. No. Just idiots.” to reply James’s question. Marilyn’s response is overstatement because it is an exarggerating expression by saying “... just idiots”. From her statement, *flouting maxim of quality* is occurred by she used a hyperbole in her statement. She flouted the maxim to make a humour in their conversation. According to Grice, hyperbole is one of reasons to make the maxim of quality flouted. Cutting also stated if hyperbole is often at the basis of humour. Then, from the Experts’ statement and the analysis above, the researcher classified Marylin’s utterance as a *flouting maxim of quality*.

**Datum 9**

James : **Paleontology.**

Marilyn : What?

James : Paleontology. My Favorite subject. It was Paleontology. I wanted to dig up fossils. (Chapter 2, pages 26)

**Context :**

The conversation happened when James told Marylin about his favorite subject in school. Marylin did not catch the context of james’s statement so it made her confused for a while because James gave less information on his statement.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation, James flouted the *maxim of quantity*. He says “Paleontology” hoping Marylin understand but in the fact Marylin forget about what she have asked about his favorite major before. He gave less information in his statement. Cutting defined the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. Then, the researcher classified James’s statement as a *flouting maxim of quantity*.

**Datum 10**

Nath : What are you doing here?

Jack : **Hey, Nath. How are you?**

Nath : **How do you think I am?** (Chapter 3, pages 41-42)

**Context :**

The conversation happened at Lydia’s funeral. Jack stood off to the side of the grave waiting her mother. Nath came to him and demanded why is he here and being angry about it. Nath believed that Jack knows the fact about Lydia’s death.

**Data Analysis :**

There are two flouting maxims of relation that occurred in this conversation. First, *flouting maxim of relation* that occurred in Jack’s

statement. Jack flouted maxim of relation because his statement is not relevant at all to Nath's question. Second, *flouting maxim of relation* that occurred in Nath's statement. Nath answered their question with another question, and it is not relevant to answer Jack's question. Thomas stated that the maxim of relation is exploited by making a response of observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address to other person's goal in asking a question). So the researcher decided to classify their statement as *flouting maxims of relation*.

### **Datum 11**

Policeman : When was the last time you saw Lydia?

Jack : Monday afternoon. Before she disappeared.

Policeman : What were you doing?

Jack : We were sitting in my car and smoking

Policeman : And you were at the hospital, Mrs. Wolff?

Mrs. Wolff : **Doctor.**

Policeman : Pardon me. Dr. Wolff. You were at work?

Mrs. Wolff : **I usually take the evening shift. Every day except Sundays.** (Chapter 3, pages 44)

**Context :**

The conversation happened at Mrs. Wolff's house. The policeman asked Jack about his nature of relationship between him and Lydia. The policeman also asked when the last time he saw Lydia. The policeman asked Mrs. Wolff to make sure whether she involved or not.

**Data Analysis :**

There are two types of flouting maxims that occurred in this conversation. First, *flouting of maxim relation* at Mrs. Wolff's statement. Mrs. Wolff flouted maxim of relation because her statement is not relevant with policeman's question. She wanted policeman to call her with *doctor Wolff* not *Mrs. Wolff*. So, she says "Doctor" to infer the implicit meaning. Cutting stated if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that 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). Based on Cutting opinion above the researcher classified Mrs. Wolff's statement as *flouting of relation*. Second, flouting maxim of quantity at Mrs. Wolff's statement. Mrs. Wolff says "I usually take the evening shift. Every day except Sundays." to respond policeman's question. She gave too much information than policeman needed. So it's safe to classify this statement as *flouting maxim of quantity*. To strengthen researcher's analysis, Thomas stated that a flout of the maxim of

quantity occurs when a speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires.

### **Datum 12**

James : **Go in and play with the others until the pool empties out.**

Nath : Do I have to?

James : **We came here to swim. Mrs. Allen is watching your sister just so you could learn the breaststroke, Nathan. Don't waste everyone's time.** (Chapter 4, pages 57)

### **Context :**

The conversation happened between James and Nath at the pool when Nath learned breaststroke. The pool was full of children playing Marco Polo and a pair of elderly men glided in laps. There is no place for Nath to learn breaststroke but his father, James, demanded him to do it.

### **Data Analysis :**

In this conversation, there are two types of maxim that James flouted. First, James *flouted the maxim of quality*. He says "Go in and play with the others until the pool empties out." is exaggerating expression and this statement is overstatement. According to Cutting, one of reasons maxim of quality can be flouted by using a hyperbole. Second, James *flouted the maxim*

*of quantity* by saying “We came here to swim. Mrs. Allen is watching your sister just so you could learn the breaststroke, Nathan. Don’t waste everyone’s time.” In this statement, James gave more information by tell why Nath have to play with others and learn breaststroke instead saying “Yes, you do.”. Grice in his book stated that in maxim quantity, we should not give more information than is required. So, the researcher decided to classified his statements as maxim of quanlity and maxim of quantity.

### **Datum 13**

James : You really think a chain on the door would have change anything?

Marilyn : **She would never have gone out on her own. I know she wouldn’t. Sneaking out in the middle of the night? Never. Someone took her out there. Some nutcase.** (Chapter 5, pages 68)

### **Context :**

The conversation happened between James and Marylin at the kitchen. They argued about the door was unlocked because Hannah forgot to put the chain on when she was back from the lake last night. Marylin thought if there’s someone have gotten in their house.



### Data Analysis :

On this conversation, Marilyn flouted *maxim of quantity*. There is a clash between maxims in her statement. Firstly, she responded James' question with the fact that she lacks adequate evidence which flouted the maxim of quality. She thought that Lydia is never sneaking out at the night and someone took her out there but there is no fact that refers to her opinion. So, she gave more information from her opinion in her statement and made flouting maxim of quantity occurred. Thomas stated a speaker flouts the maxim of quantity by blatantly giving either more or less information than the situation demands. Thomas also stated flouts can be necessitated by a clash between maxims. The analysis and Thomas' opinions above based on Grice's discussions about the reasons for flouting maxim. So, the researcher classified Marilyn's statement as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

### Datum 14

Officer Fiske : We've talked to a number of Lydia's classmates and teachers as well. From what we can tell, she didn't have many friends. Would you say Lydia was a lonely girl?

James : Lonely? ... lonely. She did spend a lot of time alone.

Marilyn : **She was busy, She worked very hard in her classes. A lot of homework to do. A lot of studying. She was very smart.**

The officer : Did she seem sad at all. these past weeks? Did she ever give any sign she might want to hurt herself? or—“

Marilyn : **Lydia was very happy. She loved school. She could have done anything. She'd never go out in that boat by herself.**

(Chapter 5, pages 69-70)

**Context :**

The context happened when the polices came to their house to give them an update of Lydia's case. Officer Fiske told that they have spoken with Lydia's friends that have listed before by James and Marylin to help the polices investigate Lydia's case, but no one barely knows her. So, Officer Fiske asked them the possibility of Lydia is a lonely girl.

**Data Analysis :**

On this context, there are *two floutings maxim of quantity* from marylin's statement. First, Marylin flouted the maxim of quantity by saying “She was busy, She worked very hard in her classes. A lot of homework to do. A lot of studying. She was very smart.”. There were too much information on Marylin's response to anwer Officer Fiske's question. She talked those things to imply the reason why Lydia is a lonely girl. According to Cutting, the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. Second, Marylin flouted maxim of quantity by saying ”Lydia was very happy. She loved school. She could have done anything. She'd never go

out in that boat by herself.”. There is clash between maxim quality and quantity in Marilyn’s statement above. Marilyn said something that she did know about the truth by saying “Lydia was very happy. She loved school.” but in fact she was not happy and did not like school. And then she added “She could have done anything. She’d never go out in that boat by herself” to convince her statement about Lydia was happy. In this situation Marilyn flouted the maxim quantity by make untruthful statement about Lydia and added more informations which is not necessary then made her statement being too informative than it is required. Thomas stated flouting maxim can be occurred by a clash of maxims. Based on the researcher’s analysis, Thomas and Cutting’s opinion above, the researcher decided to classify Marilyn’s statements as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

### **Datum 15**

James : Because you’re acting hysterical. You hear one news report and you get all these ideas in your head. Let it go. Marilyn, just let it go.

Marilyn : So I’m just a hysterical housewife? Well, someone is responsible. If I have to find out what happened to her myself, I will. I would think you’d want to know too. But listen to you. *Of course, officer. Thank you, officer. we can’t ask for more, officer.* I know how to think for myself, you know. **Unlike**

**some people, I don't just kowtow to the police.** (Chapter 5, pages 73)

**Context :**

This conversation happened inside their house when Officer Fiske asked Nath more questions about Lydia in front of the porch. Marilyn was angry to James because he stopped her berating the police with assuming about someone took Lydia out. She is being sarcastic to James just because James did not agree with her.

**Data Analysis :**

On this conversation, Marilyn flouted the *maxim of quality*. She was being sarcastic by saying "... Unlike some people, I don't just kowtow to the police." because she was annoyed by James did not agree with her assumption about someone took Lydia out. She thought James always obey what Officer fiske ever said and never want to know about the truth. Cutting stated the speaker flouting the maxim of quality by using sarcasm. Based on the analysis and supported theory about flouting maxim of quality above, the researcher classified Marilyn's statement as a *flouting maxim of quality*.

**Datum 16**

Police : Does lydia have a boyfriend?

Marilyn : **She barely sixteen.** (Chapter 5, pages 75)

**Context :**

This utterances happened when Marylin recalled what Officer Fiske's have said about Lydia is being a lonely girl and there is no evidence if everyone in the boat with her. She was pacing Lydia's room and found out an open package of cigarettes and a box of condoms. She thought it must belong to someone else but she remember on the first afternoon the police had asked her about Lydia's boyfriend.

**Data Analysis :**

From the utterances above, Marylin's statement is not relevant with the police's question. She inferred the implicit meaning by saying "She barely sixteen". She wanted the police to know that Lydia did not have a boyfriend and she did not allowed her. From the analysis above, it is safe to classified Marylin's statement as a *flouting maxim of relation*. Cutting defined if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that 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).

**Datum 17**

Nath : **Please. Please can we swim. Just an hour. Just five minutes. Just ten seconds.**

James : You know Lydia doesn't know how. I am not ready to play lifeguard today. (Chapter 6, pages 80)

**Context :**

This utterances happened at their car. They came home from the grocery store. Nath begged to swim but James did not allowed it because Lidya can not swim and he did not want to be her guard today. He was not in his mood to do something like that because Marylin still did not comeback home yet.

**Data Analysis :**

From the utterance above, Nath flouted *maxim of quantity*. He flouts the maxim quantity by giving more information in his statement. He used an overstatement by saying “ ... Just an hour. Just five minutes. Just ten seconds.”. He talked such things because he wanted to convince James to allowed them swim at that time. According to Thomas, a flout of the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires. From Thomas statement, the researcher is sure that Nath's statement above is *a flouting maxim of quantity*.

**Datum 18**

Nath : What does indenfinitely mean?

James : **I want you to forget everything mrs. Allen said. She is silly woman and she doesn't know your mother at all. I**

**want you to pretend we never even talked to her. This is not everyone 's fault. Especially not yours.** (Chapter 6, pages 80)

**Context :**

This conversation happened when James, Nath and Lydia had dinner. Nath asked James about his response to Mrs. Allen's question about how long Marylin will be away and James still felt uncomfortable to talk about Marylin. So, he talked an irrelevant statement in answering Nath's question.

**Data Analysis :**

In the conversation above, James flouted *maxim of relation*. He talked an irrelevant statement to response Nath's question by saying "I want you to forget everything Mrs. Allen said. She is silly woman and she doesn't know your mother at all. I want you to pretend we never even talked to her. This is not everyone's fault. Especially not yours.". James flouted maxim of relation because he did not want Nath to ask everything about Marylin and he also hesitated when Marylin will be back home. Thomas stated the maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g. by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address the other person's goal in asking a question). From Thomas's statement above, it is safe to researcher classified it as a *flouting maxim of relation*.

**Datum 19**

Nath : Daddy, can you believe people can go practically to the moon and still come back?

James : (Slapped Nath) **Shut up about that nonsense. How can you think about the things like that when--** (Chapter 6, pages 84)

**Context :**

This utterance happened at Sunday evening at their living room. Nath lately being so addicted with astronauts things. He always talked about it in every occasion. His father, James did know any of these things. Marilyn always be his focus because she is still gone. James was annoyed about it and when Nath asked the question, he can't control himself and slapped Nath instead.

**Data Analysis :**

James's flouted *maxim of relation* by saying "Shut up about that nonsense. How can you think about the things like that when—". His statement is not relevant to answer Nath's question before. He flouted the maxim of relation because he wanted Nath to stop saying about his interest about astronauts while his mother is still missing. His statement is not done because after he slapped Nath, Nath darted out of the living room and left him. Cutting stated that if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that 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).

### **Datum 20**

Dr. Greene : How are you feeling?

Marylin : **I think I'm pregnant** (Chapter 6, pages 89)

### **Context :**

The conversation above took place at the hospital. Dr. Greene stitched Marylin's palm up because the accident in parking lot of the grocery's store. Dr. Greene asked Marylin about her feeling after stitched up and she answered it with an irrelevant response.

### **Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, Marylin flouted *maxim of relation* by saying "I think I'm pregnant". She did not observe Dr. Greene's question well. Her response is not relevant to Dr. Greene's question. She said that she think she is pregnant instead she tells how does she really feel after her palm stitched up by Dr. Greene. She responded with an irrelevant statement because she thought that she is pregnant after the symptoms that she had felt before. She told herself if maybe she is sick because she is tired of preparing her exam but deep down inside she knew that there is wrong with her body. Thomas stated that the maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is

very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address the other person's goal in asking a question). Based on explanation above, it is safe to researcher classified Marylin's response as *a flouting maxim of relation*.

### **Datum 21**

Hannah : Who was it?

Nath : **A letter .... From Harvard. I got in.**

James : To Harvard?

Nath : The letter got delivered to the Wolffs.

James : (Smile) **Not bad.** Marylin. Guess what? (Chapter 7, pages 104 -105)

### **Context :**

This conversation happened among Hannah, Nath and James. Nath went to living room, he thought that he had to type the new essay and send it again to Harvard. The doorbell rang. It was Jack deliver Nath a letter from Harvard which came at Jack's house. Hannah from the hallway asked him who is coming.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation, there are *two types of flouting maxims*. First is *flouting the maxim of relation* from Nath's statement and the second is *flouting maxim quality* from James' statement. Nath flouted the maxim by saying "A letter .... From Harvard. I got in.". He answered to Hannah's question with irrelevant response. He did not tell Hannah if Jack who come to their house but told her what is the thing that Jack gave to him. He flouted the maxim of relation because he is so surprised for the letter and did not observe Hannah's question. According to Thomas, the maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address the other person's goal in asking a question). Second, *flouting maxim of quality* by James saying "Not bad ..." to respond Nath's statement. James use a banter in his response. Banter expresses a negative sentiment and implies a positive one. Cutting stated that banter can be a way of flouting the maxim of quality. He used banter to tease Nath. It proved when James smiles at him and put his hand on Nath's shoulder. It defined that he is really proud of him and Nath is really did a good job for being accepted in Harvard. From the analysis and the experts' statements above, the researcher classified Nath's responses as a *flouting of maxim relation* and James' response as a *flouting maxim of quality*.

**Datum 22**

James : I thought you could use this. It's supposed to – well, help you win friends. Be popular.

Lydia : I have friends, Daddy.

James : **Of course you do. I just thought you know, you're getting older, and in high school now – people skills are so important. It'll teach you how to get along with everyone. It's been around since the thirties. Supposed to be the best on the subject.**

Lydia : It's great, thanks, Daddy. (Chapter 7, pages 109)

**Context :**

This conversation happened at the Christmas morning when James gave her a present. The present was a book with title *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. James wanted Lydia made friends, he did not want her to be like him, being a lonely person at her adolescence.

**Data Analysis :**

From this conversation, James flouted *maxim of quantity*. His statement is overstatement by saying “Of course you do. I just thought you know, you're getting older, and in high school now – people skills are so important. It'll teach you how to get along with everyone. It's been around since the thirties.

Supposed to be the best on the subject.”. He gave too much information to respond Lydia’s statement by saying “ ... It’s been around since the thirties. Supposed to be the best on the subject.”. He flouted the maxim of quantity because he wanted to convince Lydia about the book. It will help Lydia to make friends. Grice in his book, *Studies in Other Words*, stated that in flouting maxim of quantity, do not give more information than is required. From the analysis and Grice’s statement above, the researcher classified it as *a flouting the maxim of quantity*.

### **Datum 23**

Jack : Good vacation?

Lydia : **What are you doing here?**

Jack : Electricity and Magnetism,

Lydia : I mean, this is a junior class.

Jack : **Did you know, Miss Lee, that is required to graduate? Since I failed the second unit of physics last year, here I am again. My last chance.**

Lydia : You failed?

Jack : **I failed, Fifty-two percent. Below below-average. I know that’s a hard concept to grasp, Miss Lee. Since you’ve never failed anything.** (Chapter 7, pages 112)

**Context :**

This conversation happened at physics class when the school started again. Jack had class with Lydia because he had failed the second unit of physics last year. Lydia was surprised because Jack is her senior and attend the junior class.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, there *are two types of maxim that flouted*. First, *flouting the maxim of relation* from Lydia's response by saying "What are you doing here?". Her response is not relevant to Jack's question. Jack asked her about her vacation but Lydia answer it with another question. Lydia flouts the maxim of relation because she was surprised by Jack's presence and did not observe his question. According to Thomas, the maxim of relation is exploited by making response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. Second, *flouting the maxim of quantity* from Jack's response by saying "Did you know, Miss Lee, that is required to graduate? Since I failed the second unit of physics last year, here I am again. My last chance.". He flouted the maxim because he gave too much information in his response to Lydia's question. He told Lydia about Physics is required to graduate and it was his last chance in Physics which is not required to Lydia's question. He also flouted the maxim of quantity by saying "I failed, Fifty-two percent. Below below-average. I know that's a hard concept to grasp, Miss Lee. Since you've never failed

anything.”. He gave too much information in his response again. Cutting stated that the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little of too much information. So, the researcher classified Lydia’s question as *a flouting the maxim of relation* and Jack’s responses as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

#### **Datum 24**

Lydia : Mind giving me a ride home?

Jack : **Miss Lee, Aren’t you supposed to be on your school bus?**

Lydia : Missed it.

Jack : I am not going straight home.

Lydia : I don’t mind. It’s too cold to walk.

Jack : Are you sure your brother wants you hanging out with a guy like me?

Lydia : **He’s not my keeper.** (Chapter 7, pages 115)

#### **Context :**

Lydia decided to be friends with Jack to make Nath angry. She tried to approach him with asked him to give her a ride home. Nath was surprised because Nath, Lydia’s brother, would not like if Lydia hanging out with him.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, there are *two flouting maxims of relation*. First, flouting maxim from Jack's response by saying "Miss Lee, Aren't you supposed to be on your school bus?". He flouted the maxim because his response to Lydia's question is irrelevant. He answer Lydia's question with another question. He flouted the maxim because he was surprised with Lydia's presence and did not observe her question well. Second, flouting maxim from Lydia's response by saying "He's not my keeper". in her response there is an implicit meaning that she did not say it. She wanted Jack know that she did not need Nath's approval to be hanging with everyone. Nath did not have authority forbidding her. To strengthen this analysis, Thomas stated the maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to adress the other person's goal in asking a question). Cutting also stated that if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that 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). In this conversation, flouting maxims of relation occurred because Jack did not observe Lydia's question and Lydia wanted to infer an implicit meaning from her statement in answer Jack's question.



**Datum 25**

Lydia : So what did you think of the physics test today?

Jack : (snorted) **I didn't think you cared about the physics.**

Lydia : **Are you still failing?**

Jack : **Are you?** (Chapter 7, pages 117)

**Context :**

The conversation took place at Jack's car. Jack decided to give her a ride to home. Lydia asked about the physics test today to break the ice but Nath quip her because she had told him if she did not care about the physics and now, she asked him about the test as if it is important to her.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation there are *two flouting maxims*. First, *flouting maxim of quality* in Jack's statement by saying "I didn't think you cared about the physics.". Jack's statement is overstatement. He did not answer Lydia's question with properly. He satirize her because she have told him if physics is not important for her when they've talked for the first time since years at the class. He flouted the maxim of quality because he being sarcastic. Cutting stated Maxim of quality flouted by using sarcasm. Second, *flouting maxim of relation* in Lydia's statement by saying "Are you still failing?" and Jack's statement by saying "Are you?". In this situation, Lydia flouted the maxim of

relation because her response is not relevant to Jack's statement. Jack also flouted the maxim of relation by giving an irrelevant response to Lydia's question. Thomas, in his opinion about flouting maxim of relation, said the maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address the other person's goal in asking a question). The Analysis above also supported by Grice's statement, he stated that in maxim of relation must be relevant.

### **Datum 26**

Jack : Hates me that much, does he?

Lydia : **Come on. Everybody knows what happens in this car.**

(Chapter 7, pages 117)

### **Context :**

The utterances above happened at Jack car when they went to home. Previously, Jack asked Lydia if Nath will upset when he see Lydia smoked and Lydia told him if Nath will be more upset when he find her at Jack's car. Then, Jack ask her if Nath hates him so much.

### **Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, Lydia flouted *maxim of relation*. Normally, she can say "Yes, he does." but she decided to say "Come on.

Everybody knows what happens in this car.”. In this situation, Lydia used implicit meaning in her statement. She wanted Jack to know that Nath will hate him because the image of Jack who always bring the girls in his car and take their virginity. Lydia’s statement is not relevant with Jack’s question. Cutting stated if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that 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).

### **Datum 27**

James : Where’s your mother?

Nath : **In Lydia’s room. She’s been in there all day.** (Chapter 8, pages 121)

### **Context :**

The conversation happened when James came home from Louisa’s apartment. He met Nath at the kitchen when Nath rummaging the refrigerator. He asked Nath where Marylin is.

### **Data Anaylis :**

From the conversation above, Nath flouted *maxim of quantity*. He gave more information in responding James’ question. Normally, he can say “In Lydia’s room” but he say “In Lydia’s room. She’s been in there all day.” He

flouted the maxim of quantity because he wanted to tell James if his mother has been in Lydia's room all day, she is still sad about Lydia's death and did not move on yet. Cutting, in his opinion about flouting maxim of quantity stated the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. From cutting's statement which based on Grice's theory and analysis above, the researcher classified Nath's statement as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

### **Datum 28**

- James : You're just home all day. Do you have any friends at all?
- Nath : **None. I am not like you. No conferences. No – Meetings.**  
(wrinkles his nose) **You smell like perfume, from your meetings, I guess?**
- James : **Don't you talk me that way. Don't you question me. You don't know anything about my life. Just like you didn't know anything about his sister.** (Chapter 8, pages 122)

### **Context :**

The conversation happened after James asked Nath about Marylin. James felt offended by Nath's answer as if Nath blamed him for Marylin's sadness and James told him about his business at the college. James asked Nath about

whether he had friends or not because he had been at home all day after his graduation from highschool. Nath felt offended because James knew that he had no friends. Then, Nath quipped him about his smell like a woman perfume and James felt angry because Nath was aware with Louisa's perfume on his skin.

### **Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, there are three types of flouting maxim. First, *flouting maxim of quantity* from Nath's statement by saying "None. I am not like you. No conferences. No – Meetings." In Nath's statement, he gave too much information to answer James' question. Normally, he can say "No I don't" but he decided to give more information with comparing him with James who said that he have conferences and meeting in his summer course. Cutting in her book stated the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give to little or too much information. Second, *flouting maxim of quality* from Nath's question for James by saying "You smell like perfume, From your meetings, I guess?". Nath flouted the maxim of quality because he used sarcasm in his question to James. Nath was aware with James' smell like a woman perfume, so he quipped James by asking him if this smell from his meetings which is have a negative meaning. Cutting also stated sarcasm can be a reason the flouting maxim of quality will be occurred. The last, *flouting maxim of relation* from James' statement by saying "Don't you talk me that way. Don't you question me. You don't know anything about my life. Just like you did'nt know anything about his sister.". James' statement is not relevant with Nath's question. James

did not answer it with perfume things but get angrier than before instead. James flouted the maxim of relation because he knew that Nath's was aware with Louisa's perfume in his body, he was angry with Nath's question as if Nath suspected him and make him talk irrelevant statement. To strengthen the analysis, Thomas also stated that maxim of relation id flouted by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand.

### **Datum 29**

Marylin : They can't close the case. Whoever did this is still out there.

James : Who ever did this? The police think—they don't think there was anyone else involved.

Marylin : **They don't know her. Someone must have taken her out there. Lured her. She wouldn't have gone out there by herself. Do you think I don't know my own daughter?**

(Chapter 8, pages 123-124)

### **Context :**

This conversation happened between James and Marylin. James told Marylin that Officer Fiske called him and told that the police decided to close their investigation about Lydia's death. They were ruling the case a suicide. Marylin was angry and assuming that someone have taken out Lydia.

### **Data Analysis :**

On this conversation, Marylin flouted *maxim quantity* by saying “They don’t know her. Someone must have taken her out there. Lured her. She wouldn’t have gone out there by herself. Do you think I don’t know my own daughter?”. There is a clash between maxims in Marylin’s statement. Firstly she flouted the maxim of quality by assuming someone took her away and Lydia would go out by herself. Marylin did not have enough evidence to claim someone took her away and making her statement not truth. Secondly, by his assumption she gave more information in her statement than the situation required and made flouting maxim of quantity occurred. Thomas stated a speaker flouts the maxim of quantity by blatantly giving either more or less information than the situation demands. Thomas also stated flouts can be necessitated by a clash between maxims. The analysis and Thomas’ opinion above based on Grice’s discussions about the reasons for flouting maxim. So, the researcher classified Marylin’s statement as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

### **Datum 30**

Marylin : You believe them, don’t you? you think she did this thing. They just want to close the case. Easier to stop looking than to do any real work. If she were a white girl, they’d keep looking.

James : **If she were a white girl, none of this would ever have happened.**

Marylin : What do you mean? (Chapter 8, pages 124)

**Context :**

This conversation happened when Marylin thought James believe the police that Lydia committed suicide. Marylin assumed police won't continue the investigation because Lydia is not white girl. James felt upset with Marylin.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, the researcher found that James talk in ambiguous way. His statement made Marylin felt confused. James says in that way because he was upset with marylin saying if Lydia was a white girl, the police would continue their investigation and still looking for who take Lydia out there. He thought Marylin did not care with the differences of their skin colours, he thought Marylin did not care if he is a chinese. But listen to her saying "white girl" made him know that she was still labelling everything. He says "If she were a white girl, none of this would ever have happened." to imply that if she were a white girl, she would not commit to suicide and James would never be a Chinese man. Marylin did not understand because at the conversation, the topic is about the police stop the investigation, she did not have idea if James feel offended by her statement. Grice stated that one of the



reason of flouting maxim of manner occurred is by ambiguity. So, the researcher classified James' utterance as *flouting maxim of manner*.

### **Datum 31**

Louisa : Well, Have you checked his office?

Marylin : He wasn't there earlier. Perhaps he's there now. Could I use your phone?

Louisa : I am sorry, My phone's actually not working right know.

Marylin : **Thank you anyway, you've been very helpful.** If you see him, tell my husband that I'll see him at home". (Chapter 8, pages 132)

### **Context :**

This conversation happened when Marylin tried to find James at Louisa's apartment. She asked her if she know where James will be but Louisa lied and told if she did know where James will be. Marylin have known that James was in her apartment and her lying about her phone's was not working.

### **Data Analysis :**

From this conversation, There is one *flouting maxim of quality*. The *flouting maxim of quality* is from Marylin's statement by saying "Thank you anyway, you've been very helpful." She flouted the maxim of quality because

she used irony in his statement saying that Louisa is very helpful but in the fact, Louisa did not do anything to help her. Irony is when the speaker expresses a positive sentiment to imply a negative one. Cutting stated the speaker can flout the maxim of quality by using an irony. Thomas also stated that flouting the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which he or she lacks adequate evidence. Furthermore, the researcher classified Marilyn's utterance as *flouting maxim of quality*.

### **Datum 32**

Jack : So are you going to tell your brother we've been hanging out, and I'm not such a bad guy?

Lydia : **He would never believe me.** (Chapter 9, pages 135)

### **Context :**

This conversation happened when Jack taught Lydia to drive. She would be sixteen and get the driver's licence. Lydia still did not drive well yet. On the way to home, Jack asked if Lydia will tell Nath that he is not such a bad guy but Lydia told him that Nath would never believe her.

### **Data Analysis :**

From this conversation there is one type of flouting maxim. The flouting maxim is in Lydia's statement. She responds to Jack's question with an irrelevant statement. She normally can say if she would not tell Nath the truth about Jack.

She flouted the maxim because she infer the implicit meaning in her statement. She wanted Jack to know that Nath would never believe her if say Jack is good guy because Nath hated Jack and it's such a wasting time to convince him about the truth. According to Cutting's opinion about the flouting maxim relation, if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what utterance did not say. Then, the researcher classified Jack and Lydia's utterances above as *flouting maxim of relation*. Cutting's opinion above based on Grice's theory about cooperative principle.

### **Datum 33**

James : Ten bucks says you don't even have one cavity.

Louisa : **Five. I'm just a poor grad student, not a rich professor.**

(Chapter 9, pages 140)

### **Context :**

This conversation happened between Marylin, James, and Louisa. James pick Lydia up from school because he promised to accompany Lydia to get her learner's permit. In the car, she met Louisa, James' teaching assistant. Louisa have an appointment with the dentist so James offered her a ride.

### **Data Analysis :**

In this conversation, James told Louisa that he believes that she did not even have one cavity. Normally, Louisa answers by saying she has five cavities

but in this context, Louisa adds some information in her response by saying “ ... I’m just a poor grad student, not a rich professor.” Her statement is overstatement. She gives more information than James required. She strongly *flouted maxim of quantity*. She flouted the maxim because she wanted to convince James that she has five cavities because she was a poor graduation student. This analysis based on Grice’s theory about maxim of quantity, that we do not give more information than is required.

### **Datum 34**

Louisa : Do you like your necklace? I helped pick it out. Your dad asked my advice on what you might like.

Lydia : **How would you know what I like? you don’t even know me.**

Louisa : I have some ideas. I mean, I’ve heard so much about you from your dad.

Lydia : Really, daddy’s never mention you.

James : Come on, Lyddie, you’ve heard me talk about Louisa. How smart she is. How she never lets those undergrads get away with anything.

Lydia : **Daddy, where did you drive after you got your license?**

James : To school, to swim practices and meets, and wrrands, sometimes.

Lydia : But not on dates

James : No. Not on dates. (Chapter 9, pages 140-141)

**Context :**

This conversation happened when Lousia asked Lydia about her birthday present. Lydia did not like Louisa because she assumed that James and Louisa have an affair. She thought that Louisa is sleeping with his father by her attitude to James. So, Lydia being not cruel and annoying in answering Louisa's question.

**Data Analysis :**

In this conversation, Lydia made *two flouting maxims of relation* in her responses. first, Lydia flouted the maxim by saying "How would you know what I like? you don't even know me." in answering Louisa's question about her birthday present. She flouted the maxim because she answered Louisa's question with another question which it's not relevant. She did not like the fact that Louisa pick her present. Her response is implying to make Louisa understand that she did not like her present. Second, Lydia flouted the maxim by saying "Daddy, where did you drive after you got your license?". She responded it is also not relevant with James' statement. She flouuted the maxim because

she wanted to change the topic, she did not want to respond to her father's statement by saying he already had talked about Louisa before. Thomas stated that the maxim of relation is flouted by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. Flouting the maxim of relation also occurred by the speaker blatantly changing the subject in conversation.

### **Datum 35**

Marylin : How long?

James : Since the funeral.

Marylin : The funeral. She's very young. how old is she? Twenty-two? Twenty-three?

James : **Marylin. Stop it.** (Chapter 10, pages 147)

### **Context :**

The conversation above happened between Marylin and James. James came home in the afternoon from Louisa's apartment. James came to Marylin because he knew that Marylin had known about his affair with Louisa. Marylin asked him about how long he had cheated on her and about Louisa's age but James feels uncomfortable to talk about it and asks her to stop it.

### Data Analysis :

From James' utterance "Marylin. Stop it.", He flouted *maxim of relation*. He gives an irrelevant response in answering Marylin's question. Normally, James can answer Marylin's question with Louisa's age but he but answered it by told Marylin to stop talking about Louisa. James flouted the maxim because he wants to end the conversation. He wanted Marylin to not asked about Louisa anymore and feeling uncomfortable about it. Thomas in his opinion told that maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. Then, it is safe to classify James' statement as *flouting maxim of relation*.

### Datum 36

Marylin : I am disappointed. I thought you're different.

James : **You got tired of different don't you? I am too different. Your mother knew it right away. You think it's such a good thing, standing out. But look at you. Just look at you.** (Chapter 10, pages 148).

### Context :

The conversation above happened when Marylin and James fight about James' affair with Louisa. Marylin told James if Louisa wanted a marriage. Because Louisa is like Marylin when she was young, adoring someone like

James. James is infuriated by Marylin's mention her mother because he knows her mother never wanted their marriage. Marylin also told if she thought James was different from the other men.

### **Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, there is one of flouting maxim. James used an overstatement in his response to Marylin's statement. He does not observe Marylin's statements well. His response is irrelevant because he thought Marylin told about how different he is with other people since he is a chinese. He also thought that Marylin wanted to be an outstanding by married him but then she was regretting her decision. In the fact, Marylin thought James was different from the other men. She thought James was better than them that never cheated on her. But James was triggered by Marylin mention her mother in her statement. James remember that her mother did want Marylin to marry him, he remember her disappointment in Marylin and James' marriage. Thomas, in his opinion about flouting maxim of relation is maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. From the analysis and Thomas' opinion that based on Grice's theory about cooperative principle, the researcher decided to classify James's utterance as *flouting maxim of relation*.

### **Datum 37**

Nath : Which one's better?



Lydia : **Where'd you get that?**

Nath : Bought it (Chapter 11, pages 156).

**Context :**

This conversation was at Lydia's room. Nath goes into Lydia's room to ask her choosing between two shirts that he should wear when he visits Harvard. Lydia never see the one of them before because Nath bought it recently.

**Data Analysis :**

From Lydia's utterance, she flouted *maxim of relation* by saying "Where'd you get that?" She answered Nath's question with an irrelevant response which is another question. She used the statement because she was surprised with Nath's new shirt and she never see it before. She flouted the maxim by not observe Nath's question but ask him where'd get that shirt. This analysis based on Grice's theory that the characteristic of maxim of relation is must "be relevant".

**Datum 38**

Nath : What do you think?

Lydia : **The other one's better. You're going to college, not Studio 54.** (Chapter 11, pages 156).

**Context :**

This conversation happened when Nath appears from the bathroom after try to wear his new clothes. He asked Lydia's opinion about his new shirt. Lydia tells him to wear the other one.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, Lydia flouted *maxim of quantity*. She gives more information in her response than Nath is required. He can only say "The other one's better" but here she adds more information by saying "You're going to college, not Studio 54.". The shirt makes Nath is stunning and it is too much to use it at college and she does not want Nath to wear it. Cutting stated the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. So, the researcher classified Lydia's statements as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

**Datum 39**

Lydia : Nath. It's me.

Nath : What's matter?

Lydia : **You didn't call**

Nath : What?

Lydia : You promised, you'd call.

Nath : That's why you're calling?

Lydia : No, listen, Nath. I need to tell you something.

Nath :**What happened? Did mom nag you about your homework? Wait, let me guess. Mom bought you a special present, but it was just a book. Dad bought you a new dress – no, a diamond necklace – and expects you to wear it` Last night at dinner you had to talk and talk and talk and all their attention was on you. Am I getting warmer?** (Chapter 11, pages 160).

**Context :**

This conversation happens between Lydia and Nath. Lydia calls Nath because he break his promise to call her when he had arrived at Harvard and tell his activities in there. Nath feels annoyed with Lydia's call.

**Data Analysis :**

In this conversation, there are *two flouting maxims of quantity*. First, flouting maxim of quantity in Lydia's response by saying "You didn't call". She gives too little information in her response to nath's question. She expects Nath will understand about her statement so she says straight on point but unfortunately he does not. Second, flouting maxim of quantity in Nath's response by saying "What happened? Did mom nag you about your homework?"

Wait, let me guess. Mom bought you a special present, but it was just a book. Dad bought you a new dress – no, a diamond necklace – and expects you to wear it. Last night at dinner you had to talk and talk and talk and all their attention was on you. Am I getting warmer?”. He gives too much information on his response. He taunted her by the possible reason she could be calling him. He flouts the maxim because he feels annoyed by Lydia’s calling. He wants to enjoy his “harvard life” and feel free from his family which always makes Lydia as their first priority. Cutting stated the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. From Cutting’s statement which based on Grice’s theory and analysis above, the researcher classified Lydia and Nath’s statements as *flouting maxim of quantity*.

#### **Datum 40**

Jack : So when’s Nath getting back?

Lydia : Tonight, I think.

Jack : Must be weird not having him around?

Lydia : (bitter laughed) **Four days wasn’t long enough for him, I bet. He can’t wait to leave for good.** (Chapter 11, pages 162).

**Context :**

This conversation happened at Jack's car, he parked his car in the shade after Jack and Lydia were overlooking the town. Jack asks about when Nath comeback from his visit to Harvard.

**Data Analysis :**

Lydia flouted *maxim of relation* by saying "Four days wasn't long enough for him, I bet. He can't wait to leave for good." She told him if Nath wants to leave home as soon as possible instead told him about her feeling when Nath is not around her. She avoids to tell her feeling because she does not want Jack know that she is sad about it. She responds Jack's question with an irrelevant statement. According to Thomas, maxim of relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand.

**Datum 41**

James : Hannah? Where's your mother?

Hannah : **Upstairs. Sleeping. I told her you would come home.**

(Chapter 12, pages 170).

**Context :**

This context happened when James is back to their house. In the living room, He found Hannah is sleeping hugging herself with both arms. He whispers to wake her up and asks where is Marylin.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, Hannah flouted *maxim of quantity* by saying “Upstairs. Sleeping. I told her you would come home.”. She flouted the maxim because she gives more information than required in response to James’ question. She adds more information in his response such as “I told her you would come home.” to make James knows that she believe him to come home after James and Marylin’s fight yesterday and decided to go out from home. According to cutting, the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. So, it is safe to the researcher classified Hannah’s statement as a *flouting maxim of quantity*.

**Datum 42**

Nath : Do you think that changes anything? It doesn’t. Tell me the truth. Now. I want to know. What happened between you two. What made her go out on the lake that night?

Jack : **I thought Lydia told you – I should have told you myself, I should have said, a long time ago--**

Nath : What? That it's your fault? (Chapter 12, pages 176).

**Context :**

This conversation takes place at the lake when Nath sees Jack sitting at the dock. He comes to Jack because he wants Jack to tell him about everything that happened with Lydia. He thought that Jack involved in Lydia's death. Nath got misunderstand with Jack.

**Data Analysis :**

From the conversation above, Jack flouted *maxim of manner* by saying "I thought Lydia told you – I should have told you myself, I should have said, a long time ago—". He says in ambiguous way and makes Nath misunderstand with his statement. He flouts the maxim of manner because his statement is obscure. He answers Nath's question with ambiguity statement because he thought Lydia told Nath about his feeling for him. It makes nath thought that Jack and Lydia in relationship and he is guilty of Lydia's death but the truth is they are just friend becuase Jack had feeling for Nath not Lydia. Cutting defined those who flout the maxim of manner, appearing to be obscure, are often trying to exclude a third party. From Cutting's statement which based on Grice's theory about the flouting maxims and the analysis above, the researcher classified Jack's statement as a *flouting maxim of manner*.

### C. Discussion

The following table shows the results of counting the number of flouting maxims of cooperative principle by each character in *Everything I Never told You* novel written by Celeste Ng:

Table 4.1 Flouting maxims in the novel *Everything I Never Told You*

NO	Characters	Flouting Maxim of Quality	Flouting Maxim of Quantity	Flouting Maxim of Relation	Flouting Maxim of Manner
1	Lydia	-	2	9	-
2	Nath	1	4	2	-
3	James	2	3	7	1
4	Marylin	3	6	2	1
5	Hannah	-	1	1	-
6	Jack	1	2	3	1
7	Louisa	-	1	-	-
8	Mrs. Wolff	-	1	1	-
9	Stanley	-	1	-	-
Total of Flouting Maxims		7	21	25	3
Total of All Flouting Maxims		56			



From the analysing and the counting from 42 data of characters' utterances within conversations, the researcher found 56 flouting maxims of cooperative principle. Based on the table above, there are 7 flouting maxims of quality from some characters' utterances. The characters' who flouted the maxim of quality are Nath, James, Marylin and Jack. The table also showed that Marylin flouted 3 maxim of quantity and make her as the characters' who flouted the most maxim of quality in this novel. The reasons some characters flouted the maxim of quality in this novel because they avoided to be truthful and say something they do not have adequate evidence. They also flouted the maxim of quality by using sarcasm, irony, hyperbole, and banter in their statements.

There are 21 flouting maxims of quantity from the characters' utterances. The table showed from 9 characters who flouted the maxims of cooperative principle, they all flouted the maxim of quantity. But the character who flouted the most maxim of quantity is Marylin. She flouted 6 maxim of quantity within conversations. Some characters flouted the maxim of quantity because they did not give information as much as required. Some character gave too much and less information in their statements. They also flouted maxim of quantity by a clash between maxims which they flouted maxim of quality by giving untruthful statements and make the statements is more or less informative than is required.

Then, there are 25 flouting maxims of relation are found in this novel. the table showed 7 characters flouted the maxim of relation. Lydia became the characters who flouted the most maxim of relation. The researcher found 9 flouting maxims of relation in her utterances within conversations. The characters flouted this maxim because they gave an irrelevant response to answer the other characters' questions. They also flouted the maxim of relation because they wanted to infer the implicit meaning from their statements and wanted to change the topic in their conversations. The maxim of relation became the type of maxim which most flouted by the characters in this novel.

The last, there are 3 flouting maxims of manner are found in this novel. The researcher only found flouting maxim on James, Marylin and Jack's utterances. Some characters flouted the maxim of manner by saying in ambiguous way and gave obscurity statements. The maxim of manner is the type of maxim which least flouted by characters in this novel.

From the explanation above, the researcher decided to choose the maxim of reation as the type of maxim is mostly flouted in characters' utterances within conversation. There are 25 flouting maxims are found from some characters' utterances. Lydia became the character who flouted the most the maxim relation by 9 flouting maxims are found in her utterances. It means Lydia and some characters often did not observe the maxim of relation in the conversations from the novel *Everything Never told You* written by Celeste Ng.

Furthermore, the flouting maxims of cooperative principle can also be found in written text such as a novel. The flouting maxims of cooperative principle are not only found in comedy or scientific story but also in family drama story. It proved by the flouting maxim are founded in character's utterances within conversation in the novel *Everything Never told You*. The flouting maxims can be occurred in daily conversation of family members. Some characters flouted the maxim in this novel because they blatantly do not obey and observe the maxims and to infer the implicit meaning from what they have said to the hearer.