

THE NON-OBSERVANCE OF QUALITY MAXIM AS SEEN IN THE MOVIE *TWILIGHT SAGA: TWILIGHT*

Dwi Lestari

INTISARI

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi dan mengelompokkan violating dan flouting terhadap maksim kualitas dalam film Twilight Saga. Data yang digunakan adalah ungkapan karakter yang berisi violating dan flouting beserta konteksnya. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa violating adalah strategi yang sering digunakan (25 kasus). Strategi ini diikuti oleh flouting yang dilakukan dengan beragam cara: mengatakan sesuatu yang tidak merepresentasikan apa yang pembicara pikirkan (8 kasus), melebih-lebihkan (1 kasus), menggunakan ironi (1 kasus), dan berkelakar (3 kasus). Flouting terhadap maksim kualitas dengan menggunakan metafora tidak ditemukan, mengindikasikan bahwa metafora mungkin dipertimbangkan sebagai cara yang tidak efektif untuk menyampaikan pesan secara tidak langsung.

Kata kunci: konteks, tindak tutur, implikatur, prinsip kerjasama, violating dan flouting terhadap maksim kualitas

ABSTRACT

This research attempts to identify and classify violating and flouting of Quality maxim in the movie *Twilight Saga*. The data used were the characters' utterances containing of violating and flouting of the maxim along with their contexts. The findings show that violating is the mostly used strategy (25 cases). It is followed by flouting which is done in various ways: saying something which does not represent what the speaker thinks (8 cases), exaggerating (1 case), using irony (1 case), and bantering (3 cases). Flouting the maxim of Quality by using metaphor is not found, indicating that metaphor may be considered as an ineffective way to deliver a message implicitly.

Keywords: context, speech acts, implicature, cooperative principle, violating and flouting of Quality maxim

INTRODUCTION

Miscommunication sometimes occurs in our daily conversation. It may occur because the hearer has different interpretation from what the speaker means. To deliver a message effectively requires a cooperation of the speaker and the hearer. Grice (1975) claims that while exchanging verbal information the speaker and hearer need to cooperate in order to have a successful communication. He also proposes the cooperative principle, "Make your contribution such as is required, as the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted direction or purpose of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." (Grice, 1975: 45)

Communication process cannot be established smoothly if the speaker and the hearer do not observe the cooperative principle. The non-observance of the maxims is defined by Grice (1975) as a failure to observe the maxims. People fail to observe the maxims possibly because they are unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires, they are incapable of speaking clearly (they are nervous, frightened, have a stammer) or because they deliberately choose to lie (*ibid*, 1975: 49).

The subject of this study is the Quality Maxim, one of conversational maxims of cooperative principle, which requires the speaker and the hearer to make their contribution that is true. According to Cutting (2002: 35), the Quality maxim emphasizes that speakers are expected to be sincere, to say something that they believe corresponds to the reality. They are assumed not to say anything that they believe to be false or anything for which they lack evidence (*ibid*). However, in a certain situation, people may breach the maxim of Quality because they want to reach a certain purpose, such as to deliver a message implicitly.

Since the way people breach the Quality maxim varied, the Quality maxim is interesting to be studied. In a certain condition, a speaker breaches the Quality maxim by violating. When the speaker gives false information and knows that the hearer will not know the truth and only understand the surface meaning of the words, it can be said that he/she is violating the maxim of Quality. Another way to breach the Quality maxim is by flouting. It happens when the speaker does not make a true contribution but has an expectation that the hearer will understand the meaning implied. It becomes more interesting to analyze the topic since in a certain situation, a speaker, whether consciously or unconsciously, may breach the Quality maxim to reach a certain purpose.

There have been studies which deal with Grice's conversational maxims, especially focusing on the maxim of Quality. Mahajan (2014), for example, conducted a research entitled *Gricean Quality Maxim in Shobha De's "Socialite Evening"*. This study was aimed at analyzing the Quality maxim deviations in the study of a novel in relation to the themes and character-revelation. The result of this study showed that lying and ironical remarks were the deviations from the Quality maxim. In addition, the result showed that lying and irony were employed as the strategies used by both female and male characters to outplay each other. From the result of this study, she concluded that deviations from the Quality maxim have functional value in fictional discourse: to deceive, to criticize, and to save one self as well as other characters.

Unlike Mahajan (2014) who analyzed the Quality maxim deviations in a novel, Danziger (2010) investigated the cultural configurations of Quality maxim in Mopan Maya of Eastern Central America. The objective of this research was to identify whether falsehood

utterances in Mopan's culture were categorized as mistakes (blameless non-violation), novel flousts (blameless pseudo-violation), or lies (blameworthy violation) of the Quality maxim. The data used were collected from questionnaires given to Mopan respondents. This study found that falsehoods were categorized by Mopan as blameworthy violations of Quality (lying) whether or not the utterer was aware of the falsehood at the moment of utterance. The researcher concluded that the findings support post-Gricean views in which routine conscious interrogation of interlocutors' intentions are not necessarily required for the conduct of ordinary conversation in any society.

Moreover, Juez (1995) dealt with irony in relation to flouting of Gricean maxims. Her research entitled *Verbal Irony and the Maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principle* was aimed at discussing how, by being ironic, a speaker or writer could flout not only the Quality maxim, but also the other three Gricean maxims as well. The data analysis revealed that ironical utterances could not only flout the Quality Maxim, but also the other three Gricean maxims. In this study, the researcher stated that a speaker or writer might flout the Quantity maxim when he/she was being ironic by not making further comments or not arguing any longer (i.e. saying less than it seems to be required). Sometimes, when someone was being ironic, the information given could be not explicitly relevant. As a result, the maxim of Relation was flouted. In addition, maxim of Manner might be flouted when a speaker or writer used irony with the intention of criticising which tended to be ambiguous and obscure in order to minimize the face threatening acts (FTA) or to avoid responsibility.

Different from the researches mentioned above, this study focuses mainly on the non-observance of Quality maxim in the first episode of *Twilight*

Saga movie. The main focus of this research is limited on the characters' utterances in the movie containing of violating and flouting of the Quality. The study attempts to identify violating and flouting of the Quality maxim in the movie, classify the strategies used by the characters to breach the Quality maxim, and to find out the mostly used strategy in doing so.

METHODOLOGY

The data of this research were the characters' utterances containing of violating and flouting of the Quality maxim. The data used in this research were taken from *Twilight Saga's* subtitle. The subtitle of the movie was downloaded from <http://subscene.com/subtitle/>. In addition, the movie was used to help identify the contexts of the dialogues because the subtitle does not provide the context.

There were several steps in the data collection process begun by watching the movie. It was followed by observing the characters' utterances from the movie's subtitle. While identifying violating and flouting of the Quality maxim from the subtitle, the researcher watched the movie again to obtain the contexts of the dialogues. Subsequently, the researcher wrote down the characters' utterances containing of violating and flouting of the Quality maxim. In short, the data included those utterances containing of violating and flouting of the Quality maxim along with the context.

After the data were collected, they were classified into violating and flouting. Since there are some strategies to flout the Quality maxim, the data belonging to flouting were classified into five strategies according to Cutting's proposition of flouting the maxim of Quality (2002). Based on the classification, the data were then counted in the form of percentage to

find out the strategies mostly used. The next step of this research was presenting the findings in tables which then followed by the explanation of the classification.

FINDINGS

1.1. Classification of the non-observance of Quality maxim

In this study, the data were classified into two categories of the form of the non-observance maxim of Quality, violating and flouting. Based on the classification, 25 cases of violating and 13 cases of flouting were found. The results is shown in the following table.

Table 1. The frequency of violating and flouting of the Quality maxim

Non – observance of Quality maxim		Number	Percentage (%)
Violating		25	65.8
Flouting	D	8	21.0
	E	1	2.6
	M	0	0
	I	1	2.6
	B	3	7.9
Total		38	100

Notes:

- D:** Flouting of Quality maxim by saying something that obviously does not represent what the speaker thinks
- E:** Flouting of Quality maxim by exaggerating
- M:** Flouting of Quality maxim by using metaphor
- I :** Flouting of Quality maxim by using irony
- B:** Flouting of Quality maxim by bantering

The table shows that the characters of the movie mostly breach the Quality maxim by violating, numbering 25 cases (65.8%). Although flouting is less used than violating, the characters use this strategy in various ways: 8 cases (21.0%) by saying something that obviously does not represent what the speaker thinks, 1

case (2.6%) by exaggerating, 1 case (2.6%) by using irony, and 3 cases (7.9%) by bantering. Moreover, flouting maxim of Quality by using metaphor is not found (0%), indicating that metaphor may be considered as an ineffective way to deliver a message implicitly.

The examples of violating and flouting of the Quality maxim found in the movie will be discussed in the next section. Before moving on to the next section, the characters’ utterances containing of violating and flouting of the Quality maxim will be presented in the following table.

Table 2. The list of characters’ utterances containing violating and flouting of the Quality maxim

The Non-observance of Quality maxim	The Characters’ utterances
Violating	<p><i>No way. No, no, no.</i></p> <p><i>I wasn't planning on it.</i></p> <p><i>I was out of town for a couple of days.</i></p> <p><i>Personal reasons.</i></p> <p><i>Nothing.</i></p> <p><i>Yeah, I know, it's the...</i></p> <p><i>It's the fluorescents.</i></p> <p><i>Sounds like you were very lucky.</i></p> <p><i>I have something that weekend anyway. I'm going to Jacksonville that weekend.</i></p> <p><i>Non-refundable ticket.</i></p> <p><i>It's very common.</i></p> <p><i>It's just a little crowded.</i></p> <p><i>To be polite, that's it.</i></p> <p><i>Really, it's just like an old scary story.</i></p> <p><i>It's just a story, Bella.</i></p> <p><i>Oh, yeah, it's a little family thing.</i></p> <p><i>We just sort of ran into each other and got talking.</i></p>

		<p><i>No, we totally understand.</i></p> <p><i>No, I'm on a special diet.</i></p> <p><i>I didn't.</i></p> <p><i>No, I broke up with him.</i></p> <p><i>Yeah, that's why I have to leave. I don't want this. I have to go home.</i></p> <p><i>No. I want to drive. It'll give me more time to think.</i></p> <p><i>Yeah, and, you know, if I don't get out now, then I'm just gonna be stuck here like Mom.</i></p> <p><i>Everything's okay.</i></p> <p><i>Everything's fine.</i></p> <p><i>Calm down, everything's fine.</i></p>
Flouting	D	<p><i>It doesn't even matter. I have homework to do. I'll talk to you later.</i></p> <p><i>Yeah, I'm good. Ice doesn't really help the uncoordinated.</i></p> <p><i>I'm fine, Dad.</i></p> <p><i>I was standing right next to you, Bella.</i></p> <p><i>No, I wasn't.</i></p> <p><i>No, our bus is full.</i></p> <p><i>She already ate.</i></p>
	E	<i>Yeah, we waited, but we were, like, starving.</i>
	M	-
	I	<i>Well, they're all very welcoming.</i>
	B	<p><i>All right, keep exaggerating. I'll roll you into the mud.</i></p> <p><i>After I ram you in the ankles.</i></p> <p><i>Maybe that's why they kicked me out.</i></p>

and knows that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words. In this study, there are 25 cases of violating of the Quality maxim.

Sometimes people tend to tell lies for different purposes, such as to hide the truth, to satisfy the hearer, to convince the hearer, or perhaps to avoid some negative consequences. Consider the following example which shows that the speaker violates the maxim of Quality because of a certain purpose.

(1) 00:17:39,187 - 00:17:41,678 (VQ 3)

Bella and Edward are in the same biology class. At that time, Edward wants to apologize to Bella because some days ago he had not introduced himself. Then, she asks him indirectly why he didn't come to school some days ago.

Edward : Hello. I'm sorry, I didn't get a chance to introduce myself last week. I'm

Edward Cullen. You're Bella?

Bella : Yes. You were gone.

Edward : *Yeah. I was out of town for a couple of days. Personal reasons.*

In the dialogue above, Edward's utterance is considered as a violation of the Quality maxim. In this case, he says something that is insincere without anyone knows, including Bella as the hearer. Edward tells Bella that his reason for not coming to school is because he was out of town for personal reason. In fact, since he met her for the first time, there is a part of him which is thirsty for her blood. By violating the maxim of Quality, he wants to reach a certain purpose. He tries to hide his real reason by asserting that he did not come to school because he was out of town for personal reason. Therefore, he did not come to school because he tried to keep a distance from Bella.

1.2. Violating of the Quality Maxim

Violating the maxim of Quality occurs when the speaker says something which is false or lack of adequate evidence

As mentioned before, the speaker may violate the Quality maxim because he/she has a goal to reach a certain purpose. The example of violating the Quality maxim can be described also in the following situation.

(2) 00:20:37,187 - 00:20:39,426 (VQ 5)

The class is finished. Bella and Edward walk together in the corridor of their school for having a short conversation. When she looks at his eyes, she realizes that the color of his eyes has changed.

Bella : Hey, did you get contacts?
 Edward : No.
 Bella : Your eyes were black the last time I saw you, and now they're, like, golden brown.
 Edward : *Yeah, I know, it's the... It's the fluorescents.* (Leaving her)

Quality maxim which requires participants, both speaker and hearer, to say something sincerely is violated in the dialogue above. Edward's utterance in the last conversation can be categorized as a violation of the Quality maxim because he provides a piece of wrong information to his hearer. In this case, his utterance is different from its reality. The color of his eyes has changed because he is a vampire whose eyes can change any time, not because of the fluorescents. When he violates the maxim, he knows that Bella, as the hearer, will not know that he is telling a lie. Moreover, he violates the maxim because he has a purpose to hide his real identity. He is asserting that the color of his eyes has changed because of the fluorescents in order to save himself.

The example of the Quality maxim which is violated because the speaker has a certain purpose is also described as follows.

(3) 00:27:45,927 - 00:27:48,487 (VQ 9)

Bella and her classmates have a field trip today. When their teacher explains about compost to them, Edward comes to Bella. Bella and Edward have a short conversation which leads her to ask him the way he stopped the van during the incident.

Edward : What's in Jacksonville?
 Bella : How did you know about that?
 Edward : You didn't answer my question.
 Bella : You don't answer any of mine, so... I mean, you don't even say hi to me.
 Edward : Hi.
 Bella : Are you gonna tell me how you stopped the van?
 Edward : *Yeah. I had an adrenaline rush. It's very common.* You can Google it.
 Bella : Floridians. That's what's in Jacksonville.

Based on the dialogue and context provided, Edward's utterance in the last conversation is categorized as a violation of the Quality maxim. He violates the maxim since he does not make his contribution as a piece of true information. When he violates the maxim, he has a purpose to convince his interlocutor that the way he stopped the van is not strange. It is because he wants to hide his real identity as a vampire. In addition, he violates the maxim since his utterance is contradictory from its reality. It is because his adrenaline rush is not common if it is compared with a human being. Moreover, he also provides an utterance "you can Google it" in order to convince the hearer that his previous utterance is true. By doing so, he expects Bella, as the hearer, to have an assumption that he tells the truth.

1.3. Flouting of the Quality Maxim

Cutting (2002: 37-40) states when speakers appear not to follow the maxims but expect the hearers to appreciate the meaning implied, it can be said that they are flouting the maxims. Flouting of the Quality maxim occurs when the speakers say something which is false or lack adequate evidence, but they expect the hearer to understand the real meaning behind the words.

According to Cutting (2002), there are five ways to flout the maxim of Quality. First, the maxim of Quality can be flouted when the speakers say something that obviously does not represent what they think. Second, the speaker may flout the maxim of quality by exaggerating. Third, the maxim of quality can be flouted by using metaphor. Fourth, the speaker can also flout the maxim of quality by using irony (including sarcasm). Fifth, the strategy to flout the Quality maxim is by bantering. To be discussed more elaborately, the examples of each strategy will be presented below.

1.3.1. Saying Something Which Obviously Does not Represent What the Speaker Thinks

When a speaker says something that obviously does not represent what he/she thinks in order to deliver a message implicitly, it can be said that he/she flouts the maxim of Quality. There are 8 cases found in this study which show that the utterances do not represent what the speakers think. Here is the example.

(4) 00:22:00,045 - 00:22:01,911 (FQ D 4)

Bella is in the parking area, near her truck. Suddenly, there is a van coming to her which is uncontrolled by its driver. Charlie, Bella's father, is worried when he knows that her daughter almost becomes the victim of her friend's mistake. He

comes to the hospital to know his daughter's condition. When he meets his daughter, she seems rather shock.

Charlie : Bella. You okay? You and I are gonna talk (pointing at Bella's friend who caused the incident). You all right?
Bella : *I'm fine, Dad.* Calm down.
Bella's friend: I'm sorry, Bella. I tried to stop.
Bella : I know. It's okay.
Charlie : No. It sure as hell is not okay.
Bella : Dad, it wasn't his fault.
Charlie : You could've been killed. You understand that?
Bella : Yes. But I wasn't, so...
Charlie : You can kiss your license goodbye
(pointing at Bella's friend again)

There is a case of flouting the maxim of Quality found in the dialogue above which is done by Bella. Bella's utterance is categorized as flouting of the Quality maxim because it is different from its reality and used to get the hearer to understand the meaning implied. In this case, Bella flouts the maxim of Quality by saying something which does not represent what she thinks. Actually, she is rather shock after the incident. However, she says to her father that she is fine in order to calm her father down. Moreover, her utterance implies that she is requesting her father not to worry about her any more.

Sometimes flouting of the Quality maxim is used by the speaker to get the hearer to do something indirectly. Consider the following example.

(5) 00:29:00,093 - 00:29:01,998 (FQ D 7)

After the field trip finished, all students have to come back to their school. Bella and Edward still have a short conversation about the incident in their school. At that time, he is little bit angry

because she thinks that he regrets for saving her from the incident. Suddenly, Alice, Edward's sister, comes to them and offers her to join in the same bus.

- Edward : Bella, we shouldn't be friends.
 Bella : You really should've figured that out a little earlier. I mean, why didn't you just let the van crush me and save yourself all this regret?
 Edward : What, you think I regret saving you?
 Bella : I can see that you do. I just... I don't know why.
 Edward : You don't know anything.
 Alice : Hi. Are you gonna be riding with us?
 Edward : *No, our bus is full.* (Entering the bus immediately)

Based on the data and context of the dialogue above, Edward's utterance in the last conversation is categorized as flouting of the Quality maxim. It is because he gives a piece of wrong information which does not represent what he thinks in order to get someone else to do something indirectly. Actually, it is not the bus which is full, but Bella who is not allowed to join him in the same bus. He flouts the maxim of Quality because he wants to reach a certain purpose. He might have an intention to make a request or command to Bella that she should not join him in the same bus. Moreover, he uttered "No, our bus is full" on the assumption that the hearer will recognize the effect he intended, such as not to enter the same bus, or to leave him and then enter the other bus.

1.3.2. Exaggerating

Cutting (2002: 37) argues that the maxim of Quality can be flouted by exaggerating. As mentioned in the previous chapter, exaggeration is used when someone makes an overstatement. In this study, it is found only one case which

uses exaggeration as the strategy to flout the Quality maxim. The detailed example will be presented as follows.

- (6) 00:40:41,724 -
 00:40:45,238 (FQ E1)

Bella and her friends (Jessica and Angela) are going to Port Angeles for shopping. While her friends are busy to choose some clothes, she decides to go to the bookstore. Then they decide to meet again in the restaurant for having dinner together. It is already late at night, but Bella does not come to the restaurant. Her friends are ready to go from the restaurant. When they were walking to the door, Bella and Edward arrived.

- Bella : Hey, you guys, I'm sorry. I just..
 Angela : Where were you? We left you messages.
 Jessica : *Yeah, we waited, but we were, like, starving, so we...*
 Edward : I'm sorry I kept Bella from dinner. We just sort of ran into each other and got talking.
 Jessica : Yeah. No. No, we totally understand. I mean, that happens, right?
 Angela : Yeah, we were...
 Jessica : We were, yeah, we were just leaving.

Based on the dialogue and context provided, Jessica's utterance is classified as flouting of the Quality maxim by exaggerating. It is because she makes her condition seem to be worse than it really is. In this case, when she flouts the maxim, she would not expect the hearers, Bella and Edward, to give her a response by saying "I don't think you are dying of hunger". However, she expects them to understand the implicit meaning of her utterance. By flouting the maxim of Quality, she is asserting that she and Angela had dinner earlier because they were very hungry. The utterance "Yeah,

we waited, but we were, like, starving” is uttered by her because she expect the hearer to understand that they were very hungry, or perhaps not to be angry with them because they have dinner earlier.

1.3.3. Using Metaphor

According to Cutting (2002), the speaker can flout the maxim of Quality by using metaphor. In this study, there is no finding of flouting the maxim of Quality by using metaphor. It may indicate that metaphor is possibly considered as the strategy which is ineffective to deliver a message implicitly. It is because the speaker’s meaning in a figurative or metaphorical expression is more difficult to be interpreted than in a literal meaning. As mentioned by Searle (1979), there are three stages that a hearer goes through to interpret a metaphorical statement. First, the hearer has to recognize that the statement is figurative, rather than literal. Second, the hearer has to find possible alternative meanings of the statement that he/she deduced as a figurative. Third, the hearer works out which of possible alternative meanings that is meant by the speaker. It is a complex process, affected by context, prior knowledge and shared knowledge, or common ground. However, when it works, the metaphor is understood (*ibid*).

1.3.4. Using Irony

In the previous chapter, it is explained that irony is the opposition between the intended meaning and the literal meaning of an utterance. There is only one case found in this study which uses irony as the strategy to flout the maxim of Quality. The following excerpt will be presented to give a clearer explanation.

(7) 00:13:29,271 - 00:13:31,432 (FQ I 1)

After coming back from school, Bella calls her mom by phone. Their conversation in the phone leads her mom to ask her about her new school, especially about her new friends.

Bella : I miss you.
 Bella’s mom : Oh, baby, I miss you, too.
 But tell me more about your school now, what are the kids like? Are there any cute guys? Are they being nice to you?
 Bella : *Well, they're all very welcoming.*
 Bella’s mom : O..o.. Tell me all about it.
 Bella : It doesn't even matter.
 (closing a book immediately)
 Bella’s mom : Yes, it does, honey.
 Bella : I have homework to do.
 I'll talk to you later.
 Bella’s mom : Okay. I love you.
 Bella : Love you too.

In the conversation above, Bella flouts the maxim of Quality by not being sincere and giving her mom the wrong information. When being asked about cute guys, she said that they’re all very welcoming. By being ironic, her utterance implies that they’re all not very welcoming. Although she said “they”, she refers only to one cute guy, Edward, because at that time she only thinks about him who gives her a look of pure hate since they were in the same class. It means that he is not welcoming to her. By flouting the maxim of Quality, she has an intention that her mom can understand what she really means. However, when her mom understands the real meaning of her utterance and asks her to tell more about it, she refuses it because she plans to confront him and demand to know what his problem was.

1.3.5. Bantering

There are 3 cases of flouting the maxim of Quality by bantering found in this study. As stated in the previous

chapter, banter expresses a negative sentiment and implies a positive one. Here is the example of flouting the maxim of Quality by bantering.

(8) 00:04:30,499 - 00:04:33,400 (FQ B 1)

00:04:33,400 - 00:04:35,300 (FQ B 2)

Bella, Charlie's daughter, has just moved from Phoenix to Forks. Some minutes after her home coming, Charlie's friend, Billy Black, and his son come to Charlie's house. Then, Charlie introduces them to her.

Charlie : Bella, you remember Billy Black?
Bella : Yeah. Wow, you're looking good.
Billy : Well, I'm still dancing. I'm glad you're finally here. Charlie here
hasn't shut up about it since you told him you were coming.
Charlie : *All right, keep exaggerating. I'll roll you into the mud.*
Billy : *After I ram you in the ankles.*
Charlie : You want to go?
Billy : Yeah.
Charlie : Bring it.

What is uttered by Charlie to Billy is considered as flouting the maxim of Quality. Charlie flouts the maxim of Quality by expressing a negative sentiment but implying a positive one. When Charlie flouts the maxim, he may have an intention to make a request to Billy to stop talking about his attitude which is always talking about his daughter home coming. Billy's response to Charlie is also categorized as flouting the maxim of Quality by bantering. It is because his utterance is considered as an offensive way of being friendly. His utterances "after I ram you in the ankles" which are funny and not serious might have an implied meaning that he will stop talking

about Charlie to Bella after he and Charlie "fight" each other.

Another example of flouting the maxim of Quality by bantering is described below.

(9) 00:07:26,132 - 00:07:28,802 (FQ B 3)

Bella's first day at her new school begins with sport subject. At that time, she seems not to join volley ball. Suddenly, someone gives her the ball. She is not ready for it, so she hits it immediately. As a result, the ball strikes Mike's (another student) nape hardly.

Bella : I'm sorry. I told them not to let me play.
Mike : No way. No, no, no. That's... That's... Don't..You're Isabella, right?
Bella : Just Bella.
Mike : Yeah. Hey, I'm Mike Newton.
Bella : Nice to meet you.
Mike : Yeah, yeah.
Jessica : She's got a great spike, huh?
Mike : Yeah, it's...
Jessica : I'm Jessica, by the way. Hey, you're from Arizona, right?
Bella : Yeah.
Jessica : Aren't people from Arizona supposed to be, like, really tan?
(Looking at Bella whose skin is fair)
Bella : Yeah. *Maybe that's why they kicked me out.*
Jessica : You're good.
Mike : That's so funny.

In the dialogue above, Bella flouts the Quality maxim by bantering. Her utterance "maybe that's why they kicked me out" probably implies that it does not matter whether the color of her skin is the reason of her moving to Forks or not. Her utterance is categorized as flouting of the Quality maxim by bantering because it is used as an offensive way of being friendly with her new friends. Moreover, her

utterance is intended to be an expression of friendship or intimacy.

CONCLUSION

This study was set to discuss the non-observance maxim of Quality in the *Twilight Saga* movie. As stated before, while violating is used to mislead the hearer, flouting is used to deliver a message implicitly. Based on the result of this study which is presented in the previous chapter, violating is the strategy mostly used to breach the maxim of Quality. It may indicate that the characters of the movie tend to lie rather than tell the truth because of some reasons. On the other hand, flouting the maxim of Quality is less used than violating perhaps because the speakers want to avoid misinterpretation when they deliver a message indirectly.

The findings of this research show that the characters of the movie violate the maxim of Quality because they face a certain situation which is difficult for them to tell the truth. If they tell truth, they may get some negative consequences. As a result, they give a piece of wrong information with the intention to mislead the hearer. As for flouting the maxim of Quality, the findings show that characters say something that obviously does not represent what they think because they have a purpose to get the hearer to do something for them indirectly. The characters flout the maxim by exaggerating because they want to emphasize the real meaning of the utterance produced. Irony is used to flout the maxim because the character finds a fact that is different from what is intended. Moreover, the characters flout the maxim by bantering because they want to make the conversation more intimate.

Generally, the findings of this research are quite different from the previous researches mentioned in the literature review. However, the findings of this

research have similarity with the research done by Mahajan (2014) which found that the deviations from the Quality maxim have some functions. As found in this study, violating the maxim of Quality is used to hide the truth, convince the hearer, or avoid some negative consequences. For instance, the characters choose to lie in order not to let the hearer know his/her identity. In the case of flouting the maxim of Quality, the characters have a purpose to deliver a message implicitly, such as requesting someone else to do something for them in an indirect way.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Benton, Matthew. 2014. 'Gricean Quality'. *Noûs* XLVIII.4: 1–22. Accessed on November 7, 2014. <http://philpapers.org/archive/BEN_GQ.pdf>.
- Cruse, Alan. 2006. *A glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Danziger, Eve. 2010. 'On Trying and Lying: Cultural Configurations of Grice's Maxim of Quality'. *Intercultural Pragmatics* VII.2: 199–219. Accessed on April 2, 2014. <<https://pages.shanti.virginia.edu/evedanziger/files/2011/03/Danziger-preprint-Trying-and-Lying.pdf>>.
- Goldberg, Sanford C. 2013. "Disagreement, Defeat, and Assertion." *The Epistemology of Disagreement: New Essays*. Ed. David Christensen and Jennifer Lackey. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation." *Syntax and Semantics*. Ed. Cole P and Morgan

- J. Vol. III. New York: Academic Press.
- Grundy, Peter. 2000. *Doing Pragmatics*. Second edition. London: Arnold.
- Juez, Laura Alba. 1995. "Verbal Irony and the Maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principle." *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* VIII.2: 25-30. Accessed on October 30, 2014. <http://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/5395/1/RAEI_08_02.pdf>.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahajan, 2014. S. D. "Gricean Quality Maxim in Shobha De's "Socialite Evening"." *Indian Streams Research Journal* IV.7: 1-6. Accessed on November 7, 2014. <<http://isrj.org/colorarticles/5189.pdf>>.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2009. *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Second edition. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Second edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Meyer, Charles F. 2009. *Introducing English Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 'Non Observance Of Grices Maxims English Language Essay'. *Custom Essays and Model Answer Service*. Uni Assignment Centre, n.d. Accessed on October 30, 2014. <<http://www.uniassignment.com/essay-samples/english-language/non-observance-of-grices-maxims-english-language-essay.php>>.
- 'Non Observance Of Grices Maxims'. *English Language*. UKESSAYS, n.d. Accessed on October 30, 2014. Oxford University Press.
- <<http://www.ukessays.com/essays/english-language/non-observance-of-grices-maxims.php>>.
- Raceanu, Marina Alexandra. 'Bulletin Scientifique En Langues Étrangères Appliquées'. N.p., n.d. Accessed on September 22, 2014. <<http://revues-eco.refer.org/BSLEA/index.php?id=455>>.
- Rees, N. 1999. *The Cassell Dictionary of Anecdotes*. London: Cassell.
- Richards, Jack C. and Richard Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Third edition. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Searle, John. 1979. *Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. Ortony, A. First edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Google Book Search. Accessed on November 17, 2014.
- Searle, John. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Google Book Search. Accessed on September 27, 2014.
- Subscene. *Twilight Saga: Twilight*. 2008. Accessed on March 22, 2014. <<http://subscene.com/subtitles/the-twilight-saga-1-twilight/english/287861>>
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited. Google Book Search. Accessed on October 8, 2014.
- Twilight*. 2008. Dir. Catherine Hardwicke. Perf. Kristen Stewart and Robert Pattinson. Summit Entertainment.
- Walter Elizabeth, ed. 2008. *Cambridge Advance Learner Dictionary*. Third edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: