CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter discusses the conclusion and suggestion. Conclusion is formed after doing research, finding and analysis of the data. Suggestion leads further researchers who are interested to analyze similar topic of research.

CONCLUSION

After conducting the research problem, collecting the data and analyze the movie, the researcher found some conclusion about the research. The researcher found there are 20 data which violates the both maxim, maxim of quality and maxim relevance. It consist of 8 data violates the maxim of quality and 12 violates the maxim of relevance. The 8 data which violate the maxim of quality because of the utterances sometimes not tell a right situation. A dishonest answer also being the reason of why the data called violates the quality maxim. In addition, sometimes the interlocutor said a not real answer based the context or situation that happened from that movie. Besides that, the 12 data violate the relevance maxim. This caused the speaker and the interlocutor in their conversation doing an irrelevant conversation. They sometimes answer their speakers question with irrelevance answer. This caused the utterances violate the maxim even they understand what the speaker said.

Based on the explanation above, this mean on this movie, the character much violate the maxim of relevance. The character here is Michael Oher who much

makes a violation of his utterance. This cause he is the main character of this movie. So the chance to make a violation when speak is big. Michael Oher, on this dialogue often become as the interlocutor. In some utterance he violate quality and relevance maxim because he sometimes give a dishonest answer and irrelevant utterances based of what the speaker said. This caused he always want to hiding something. He did not want the other people know his real reason.

The violation on the 20 data is consisting of some data which violates because of some reason. They are 2 DATA violates because to showing anger (1) and (17). 8 DATA violations for the reason to hiding something (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (15), (20). Conversation (7) violates the maxim because want to change topic of speak. DATA (8) means to ridicule someone. DATA (9), (12), and (16) means to refuse or rejecting someone's offers. DATA (10) means to clarify something. DATA (11) is to showing anger. DATA (14) and (17) means to accepting someone's offers. DATA (13) to declaring command and DATA (19) to tell someone's proud of something.

From the data, the big reasons why the speaker and the interlocutor violate the maxim in *the blind side movie* are to hiding something and sometimes to refusing offers. This caused by the situation of the interlocutor. Michael as the main character and the person who always broke or violate the maxim usually want to hide the true situation of him. He did not want the other people know the true story of him. He also thinks that he is a black skin man and much of the speakers are white skin people. He felt doubt if he tell the true. He doubts that they can understand what he means.

SUGGESTION

Based on the result of the research, there is some suggestion for the next researcher who are interesting in doing similar research. This research contributes to comprehend the violation of quality and relevance maxim of cooperative principle. Hopefully, the research gives inspiration and guidance for the further researcher to be more careful in doing research, so that the result is being better than this. For the next researcher, this the Blind side movie can be a good reference if they want to look for the examples of the violation of quality and relevance maxim in cooperative principles

For the students university who want to know more about the violation of maxims specifically the applied of quality and relevance maxim in the utterance, they can use this skripsi as the guidance for them to know about the using of both maxim which is proposed by Grice. This skipsi will be more easily to indentify the quality and relevance used in utterance which exists in our life.

REFERENCES

Big Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI) (2002:88). Introduction to language

Arikunto, S. (2009). *Manajemen Penelitian.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Chaer, Abdul dan Leonie Agustina. 2010. *Sosiolonguistik Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta.

Leech, Geoffrey. 2011. *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik.* Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia

Rohmadi, Muhammad. 2004. *Pragmatik Teori dan Analisis*. Yogyakarta : Lingkar Media.

Yule, George. 2006. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.

Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2002. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Edisi Kedua. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Endarwati, Tri. (2015). *Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerjasama Dalam Film Animasi UN MONSTRE À PARIS Karya BIBO BERGERON.* Yogyakarta.

Putri, T. Tanjung. (2010). *Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesantunan Dalam Film Warkop DKI Maju Kena Mundur Kena.* Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.

Djuuna, I.S. Dwi. (2012). *The Violation of Maxims Cooperative Principle In A Movie The Last Voyage Narnia 3.* Gorontalo : Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

Sergeik. (2009, July 14). Retrieved December 15, 2017, from The Blind Side

Oktavianti, I. N. (2012, April 19). *storiesoflanguages.wordpress*. Retrieved January
25, 2018, from.https://www.google.co.id/amp/s/littlestoriesoflanguages.
wordpress.com /2012/04/19/prinsip-kerjasama-cooperative principle/amp/

Student, I. (2017, April 18). *indonesianstudents.com*. Retrieved January 20, 2018,
from www.indonesianstudent.com/pengertian-film-menurut-para-ahli-jenis-
dan-manfaatnya/#Effendi_1986

Austin, J.L. (1962). How To Do Things With Words. In Cummings, L. Pragmatik
Sebuah Perspektif Multidisipliner. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversational in Cummings, L. Pragmatik
Sebuah Perspektif Multidisipliner. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. (1989). Principle of Pragmatics. United States of America
Longman.inc, New York.

Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, C. F. (2009). Introducing English Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press

Searle, J. (1979). Speech Acts. United States of America: Cambridge University.

Wijana, I Dewa Putu. 2009. *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik Kajian Teori dan Analisis*.

Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka. From www.ucl.ac.uk/ls/studypacks/Grice-Logic.pdf diakses pada 29 Januari 2018

Parole, P. L. (2010, April 08). *Konteks Dalam Pragmatig.* Retrieved January 30, 2018, from http://althurfamily.blogspot.co.id/2010/04/konteks-dalam-pragmatik.html

Grice's, P. (1975) *Grice's Cooperative Principle.* Retrieved May 24, 2018, from http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/topic12/14cp1.htm

Creswell, J. W. 2009, *Research Design.* California : SAGE

Wijana, Dewa Putu. 1996, *Dasar-dasar Pragmatik* : Yogyakarta : ANDI.