

### **Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendation**

This chapter presents conclusion and recommendation of this study. In conclusion, the researcher concluded the result of this study based on the research question itself. Moreover, the second part is recommendation. In recommendation, the researcher provided some suggestions for the next research.

#### **Conclusion**

Here is the conclusion of the data finding and the discussion in chapter four related to the types of flouting maxim which appeared in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.

- Related to the data findings of this research, it can be concluded that some of the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie have carried out the flouting maxim of cooperative principle. The data findings showed that all of the types of flouting maxim were done by some of the actors and actress in the movie. From the four kinds of maxim, maxim of quantity was mostly flouted in conversation, followed by maxim of relevance or relation, maxim of quality, last but not least was maxim of manner. In other words, the four types of flouting maxim by Grice did appear during the conversations in the movie which has answered the research question itself.

## FLOUTING MAXIM OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN A MOVIE

### **Recommendation**

Here are some recommendations to this research:

- In order to reach a good quality of conversation, participant must fulfill the four maxim of cooperative principle (maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner).
- For the next researchers who are willing to conduct the same topic as this research, that would be good to understand deeply about the cooperative principle and flouting maxim, so that would be very helpful in classifying and analyzing the data findings.
- A research which related to cooperative principle and flouting maxim could also choose another subject as main data of the research. For example, flouting which happened during discussion time or learning process in classroom.

## FLOUTING MAXIM OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN A MOVIE

**References**

- Birner, B. J. (2012). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell
- Brown, G., Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, A. (2000). *Meaning in Language*. United States: Oxford University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- Grice, P. (2002). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1975) *Logic and Conversation*. Bekerley: University of California.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics (2nd ed.)*. Great Britain: Arnold.
- Huda, M. (2013). *Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of Euro Trip movie*. (Undergraduate Thesis). Malang: Universitas Brawijaya
- Kai, K. (2017). *The Flouting of Cooperative Principle in Movie 'Beastly' by Daniel Barnz*.(Undergraduate Thesis). Gorontalo: Universitas Negeri Gorontalo.
- Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. (Oka, M, Trans.). Jakarta: UI-Press.

## FLOUTING MAXIM OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN A MOVIE

\_\_\_\_\_ (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York, United State of America: Longman Inc.

Levinson, S. C. (2008). *Pragmatics*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An Expanded Sourcebook Qualitative Data Analysis (2nd ed.)*. London: SAGE Publications.

Nadar, F. X. (2009). *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Pamili, Gamar. (2019). *A Study of Flouting Maxim of Cooperative Principle in The Pursuit of Happiness Movie*. (Undergraduate Thesis). Gorontalo: Universitas Negeri Gorontalo.

*The Fault in Our Stars* (2014). (2013). Retrieved from

[http://www.impawards.com/2014/fault\\_in\\_our\\_stars\\_xlg.html](http://www.impawards.com/2014/fault_in_our_stars_xlg.html)

*The Fault in Our Stars* (film). (n.d.). Retrieved from

[https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Fault\\_in\\_Our\\_Stars\\_\(film\)](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Fault_in_Our_Stars_(film))

## FLOUTING MAXIM OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN A MOVIE

*The Fault in Our Stars* Movie Review. (2014). Retrieved from

<https://www.commonensemedia.org/movie-reviews/the-fault-in-our-stars>

Thomas, J. (2013). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New

York: Routledge.

Vikry, M. (2014). *An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Iron Man 3*.

(Undergraduate Thesis). Jakarta: Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah

Jakarta

Walliman, N. (2011). *Research Methods The Basics*. New York: Routledge.

Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Pustaka Pelajar.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### Appendix

DATUM	UTTERANCES	Flouting Maxim				INTERPRETATION
		Qn.	Ql.	Rl.	Mn.	
1	<p>Patrick: “Isaac, I know that you’re facing some challenges right now. Do you want to share with the group? Or maybe your friend, here?”</p> <p>Isaac: “No, I’ll share. Hey, guys. Uh... Hi I’m Isaac. I have retinoblastoma. We had surgery on one eye when I was younger... so this is a glass eye. And then I’m going in to the hospital to have another surgery... to take out the other eye. So, after that surgery, I’m just gonna be totally blind. <i>But I’m lucky, because I have this beautiful, smoking hot girlfriend... who’s way out of my league, Monica. And I have great friends like Augustus Waters to help me out.</i> So, that’s what’s up.</p>	-				<p>Isaac has flouted the maxim of quantity because he gave too much information to Patrick which is unnecessary. In Patrick’s statements, he asked about Isaac’s cancer condition. By answering his cancer condition/what happened to him is enough to be cooperative in the conversation.</p> <p>However, Isaac added more information about his girlfriend and bestfriend which caused him disobeying the maxim of quantity itself.</p>

	Thanks.					
2	<p>Patrick: “And how are you feeling, Gus?”</p> <p>Gus: “I’m grand, yeah. <u><i>I’m on a roller coster that only goes up, my friend.</i></u>”</p>	-	-			<p>In this conversation, Gus has flouted maxim of quantity by adding more unnecessary statement. Beside that, in analyzing the statement deeply, Gus has actually flouted another maxim too. By saying ‘<u><i>I’m on a roller coster that only goes up, my friend.</i></u>’, Gus has blatantly disobeyed the maxim of quality by telling untrue statement</p>

3	<p>Hazel: “What is with the “always”?”</p> <p>Gus: ““Always” is, like, their thing. They’ll “always” love each other, and whatnot. <u>They probably texted “always” to each other 14 million times this year.</u>”</p>	-				<p>Gus added ‘<u>They probably texted “always” to each other 14 million times this year</u>’ in his statement. According to Hazel question, she just asked what always mean to Isaac and Monica and by answering ‘Always is, like, their thing. They’ll “always” love each other, and whatnot’ is enough to contribute in this conversation. However, Gus did flout the maxim of quantity for being more informative in the conversation.</p>
---	--	---	--	--	--	---



4	<p>Gus: "Let's go watch a movie."</p> <p>Hazel: "What?"</p> <p>Gus: "Hmm?"</p> <p>Hazel: "<u>Huh? Um... I'm free later this week, we could...</u>"</p> <p>Gus: "No, I mean now."</p> <p>Hazel: "<u>You could be an axe murderer.</u>"</p> <p>Gus: "There's always that possibility. Come on, Hazel grace. Take a risk."</p> <p>Hazel: "I don't... really? That is disgusting."</p> <p>Gus: "What?"</p> <p>Hazel: "<u>What, do you think that that's cool or something?</u> You just ruined this whole thing."</p>					<p>In this conversation, it seemed that Hazel has flouted the maxim of relevant twice and quantity once. In the first utterance '<u>Huh? Um... I'm free later this week, we could...</u>' and the second one '<u>You could be an axe murderer</u>' Hazel flouted the maxim of relevant because of providing irrelevant statements. During the conversation, Gus asked Hazel to go to watch a movie with him, then instead of saying yes or no, she said something which is not related to Gus's topic of conversation. The third time Hazel flouted the maxim of quantity for providing unnecessary statement '<u>What, do you think</u></p>
---	---	--	--	--	--	--

						<i>that that's cool or something?'</i>
5	<p>Gus: "So, are you back in school?"</p> <p>Hazel: "<u>I got my GED</u>. So, I'm taking classes at MCC."</p>	-				<p>In this conversation, if Hazel said 'Yes, I'm taking classes at MCC', it would not flout the maxim of quantity by giving contribution such as is required. In fact, Hazel added 'I got my GED' which is not what Gus was asking. Therefore, Hazel flouted the maxim of quantity.</p>
6	<p>Hazel: "Do you mind if I sit down?"</p> <p>Gus: "Yeah. Make yourself at home. Mi casa es tu casa."</p>					<p>In Hazel's statement, she said '<u>Sorry, the, um, stairs... and the standing...</u>' which was</p>

	Hazel: <i>“Sorry, the, um, stairs... and the standing...”</i>				-	not really clear what’s wrong/what happened with the stairs and standing. Therefore, it can be assumed that Hazel flouted the maxim of manner since she uttered unclear statement.
7	Hazel: <i>““Weird fetishes”?”</i> Gus: <i>“Come on. Just think of something. The first thing that pops in your head. Something you love.”</i>				-	In the conversation, Gus asked Hazel about her weird fetishes and Hazel asked back what actually weird fetishes are. Instead of answering Hazel’s question, he asked her to just think of something. Gus’s response was not related to Hazel’s question which caused him failed to obey the maxim of relevant.
8	Gus: <i>“Okay, what is it about?”</i> Hazel: <i>“Uh, cancer.”</i>					This time, Both Hazel and Gus have flouted the maxim of cooperative principle in the

<p>Gus: “It’s about cancer?”</p> <p>Hazel: “But not like that. Trust me, it’s amazing. <u>The author, his name is Peter Van houten. He’s the only person I’ve ever come across in my life... who, a, understands what it’s like to be dying... but, b, hasn’t actually died.</u>”</p> <p>Gus: “Okay. <u>I will read this horrible book with this very boring title...</u> that does not include zombies or stormtroopers. And in exchange... you will read this. This haunting, yet brilliant novelization of my favorite video game.”</p>	-	-			<p>conversation. Hazel disobeyed the maxim of quantity by saying ‘<u>The author, his name is Peter Van houten. He’s the only person I’ve ever come across in my life... who, a, understands what it’s like to be dying... but, b, hasn’t actually died</u>’ while saying ‘<i>But not like that. Trust me, it’s amazing</i>’ is enough to answer Gus question about the novel. In this case, Hazel was being more informative which caused her disobeying the maxim of quantity itself. However, Gus also flouted the maxim of quality by saying ‘<u>I will read this horrible book with this very boring title...</u>’. Gus provided a statement</p>
--	---	---	--	--	--

						which has lack adequate evidence. He does not even read the novel yet, so he does not have any evidence to prove that the book is horrible and boring.
9	<p>Frannie: “That’s different. Did he give it to you?”</p> <p>Hazel: “<u>By it, do you mean herpes?</u>”</p> <p>Frannie: “<u>Wow. Yes, I did.</u> It’s a mother’s dream. Hey, don’t worry.”</p> <p>Hazel: “Oh, my God, mom. I’m not worried. It’s not a big deal.”</p> <p>Frannie: “Yeah.”</p> <p>Hazel: “We just hung out, <u>it’s not like I’m waiting for him to call me.</u>”</p>		-	-	-	<p>According to the conversation, both of them have failed in obeying the maxim of quality.</p> <p>Hazel did flout the maxim twice while her mom Frannie once. By providing statements which they believe to be false, they have failed to comply the maxim of quality.</p>

10	<p>Frannie: “Today, in China, international goji berry day. Isn’t that great?”</p> <p>Michael: “<i>I like the color.</i>”</p> <p>Frannie: “Mmm hmm. This is the dry.”</p> <p>Michael: “Uh huh. Very good.”</p> <p>Frannie: “They’re good, right?”</p> <p>Michael: “Mmm hmm. So they eat a lot of goji berries on goji berry day?”</p> <p>Frannie: “<i>We do.</i>”</p>	-				<p>In the conversation, Michael said something which is not related to Frannie's question while Frannie also did not really say what Michael expected her to answer. Therefore, it can be said that Michael failed to comply the maxim of relevant while Frannie also did flout the maxim of quantity by being uninformative.</p>
11	<p>Gus: “Hazel grace.”</p> <p>Hazel: “Welcome to the sweet torture of reading an imperial affliction. Are you okay?”</p> <p>Gus: “Uh... me? Yeah, I am excellent. <i>I am, however, with Isaac,</i></p>	-				<p>Hazel asked Gus if he is okay since she heard some kind of noise from Gus’s place. Moreover, Gus answered ‘<i>I am excellent</i>’ which made him cooperative during the</p>

	and... Isaac, does support group Hazel make this better or worse? Isaac! Focus on me. How fast can you get here?"				conversation. However, then he added ' <u>I am, however, with Isaac</u> ' which is included in being more informative and made him flouted the maxim of quantity.
12	<p>Isaac: "The trophy?"</p> <p>Gus: "Yeah."</p> <p>Isaac: "Are you sure?"</p> <p>Gus: "<u>I've been looking for a way to tell my father I kind of hate basketball. Go to town!</u>"</p>			-	<p><u>'I've been looking for a way to tell my father I kind of hate basketball. Go to town!'</u> was a statement which Gus said to Isaac when Isaac asked him if he is sure that it is okay to break the trophy. It seemed that Gus's answer is not relevant to Isaac's question. If Gus will just say '<u>Yes, I'm sure</u>', he would not flout the maxim of relevant.</p>

13	<p>Hazel: “I know. It is rather abrupt.”</p> <p>Gus: ““Rather abrupt”? Are you kidding me? It’s evil! I mean, I understand that she dies... <u>but there’s an unwritten contract between author and</u>”</p> <p>Isaac: “Gus?”</p> <p>Gus: “Yeah.”</p> <p>Isaac: “Cool?”</p> <p>Gus: “Sure. <u>Between author and reader.</u> And I feel like ending your book in the middle of a sentence... violates that contract, don’t you think?”</p>		-			<p>Gus has delivered a statement which has lack adequate evidence to Hazel. He said ‘<u>but there’s an unwritten contract between author and reader</u>’ but he was not sure/could not prove if his statement was right. Therefore, it caused Gus break the maxim of quality.</p>
14	<p>Gus: “Have you tried contacting this Peter Van houten fellow?”</p> <p>Hazel: “I’ve written him so many letters, but he’s never responded. <u>Apparently, he moved to Amsterdam and became a recluse, and...</u>”</p>		-			<p>If Hazel just says ‘<u>I’ve written him so many letters, but he’s never responded</u>’, she would not break the maxim. In fact, she added ‘<u>Apparently, he moved to Amsterdam and</u></p>



						<i>became a recluse, and...</i> ’ which made Hazel fail to obey the maxim quantity by being more informative in the conversation.
15	<p>Gus: “Hazel grace.”</p> <p>Hazel: “Augustus Waters.”</p> <p>Gus: “I cannot stop thinking about this goddamn book.”</p> <p>Hazel: “<i>You’re welcome.</i>”</p>				-	While Gus was saying that he could not stop to think about the novel, Hazel unexpectedly said ‘ <i>You’re welcome</i> ’ which has no relation with Gus’s statement. Thus, Hazel has flouted the maxim of relevant.
16	<p>Gus: “Not bad.”</p> <p>Hazel: “You think?”</p> <p>Gus: “Yeah, <i>I mean, it’s a bit pretentious... but then again, Van houten uses words like “tendentious” and “bacchanalia”, so... I think he’ll like it.</i></p>				-	Hazel expects Gus to tell his opinion about the letter which she wrote to Van houten. But, Gus answered more than what is required. Hence, he has failed to obey the maxim of quantity.

17	<p>Frannie: “Hazel?”</p> <p>Hazel: “Mom!”</p> <p>Frannie: “Hazel, what’s wrong?”</p> <p>Hazel: “<u>Mom, look at this. Come here. Come here, come here. Look.</u>”</p>				-	<p>This time, in the conversation, Frannie asked what happened to Hazel since she heard something from Hazel’s room. However, rather than answering her mom’s question, she tend to reply with an irrelevant answer.</p>
18	<p>Hazel: “Can we go? I mean, do you think we could actually go?”</p> <p>Frannie: “<u>I mean, Amsterdam! I want you to have everything you want in the world. But we don’t have the money, you know? Just getting all the equipment over there.</u> How do we do that?”</p> <p>Hazel: “Yeah, duh. I’m sorry.”</p>	-			-	<p>After knowing that she could go to Amsterdam to meet Mr. Van houten, Hazel asked her mom if it is possible to go. Frannie said ‘<u>I mean, Amsterdam! I want you to have everything you want in the world. But we don’t have the money, you know? Just getting all the equipment over there</u>’ which seemed that she was not being perspicuous during the conversation. Thus,</p>

					she has flouted the maxim of manner.  Moreover, Hazel also broke the maxim of relevant for providing answer which is not related to Frannie's question.
19	<p>Hazel: "It was actually a really fun trip!"</p> <p>Gus: "<u>That's the saddest thing I've ever heard.</u>"</p> <p>Hazel: "I met goofy!"</p> <p>Gus: "Now I'm just embarrassed."</p>		-		<p>Gus said '<u>That's the saddest thing I've ever heard</u>' to Hazel for going to Disney land which is totally a wrong statement. Going to Disney land for 13 year old Hazel is really a fun thing because she met a lot of Disney's characters. In this case, Gus blatantly flouted the maxim of quality.</p>
20	<p>Michael: "So, uh... you're a survivor yourself, huh?"</p> <p>Gus: "Yeah. <u>I didn't cut this fellow off for the hell of it. Although it does make an excellent weight-loss strategy. Legs are</u></p>		-		<p>Michael asked Gus if he is a cancer survivor so it is enough to say with yes/no answer. In this case, Gus's contribution is more than</p>

	<i>heavy.</i> ”					enough which caused him flouted the maxim of quantity for being more informative during the conversation.
21	<p>Hazel: “Is this where you take all of your romantic conquests?”</p> <p>Gus: “Every last one of them. <u>That’s probably why I’m still a virgin.</u>”</p> <p>Hazel: “You are not still a virgin. Are you really?”</p> <p>Gus: “<u>Let me show you something. See this circle? That is the circle of virgins.</u>”</p>	-		-		Gus flouted the maxim twice. The first time, he flouted by being more informative than what exactly Hazel has asked him which is also unnecessary. Second one, he failed to comply the maxim of relevant for providing irrelevant statements during the conversations. Hazel asked him if he is really a virgin, but Gus did not try to be in line with Hazel.
22	<p>Gus: “Sandwich?”</p> <p>Hazel: “<u>Let me guess.</u>”</p>			-		First, Hazel failed to obey the maxim and followed by Gus. The topic of the

	<p>Gus: “<u>Dutch cheese and tomato. Sorry, the tomatoes are Mexican.</u>”</p> <p>Hazel: “How dare you! Hmm.”</p>		-		<p>conversation starts with Gus asking Hazel if she wants some sandwich. In order to be cooperative during conversation, Hazel should just tell Gus if she wants it or no. In fact, she replied ‘<u>Let me guess</u>’ which seemed not related to Gus’s previous question. Therefore, Hazel broke the maxim of relevant. Next, followed by Gus ‘<u>Dutch cheese and tomato. Sorry, the tomatoes are Mexican</u>’ who flouted the maxim of quality itself.</p>
23	<p>Frannie: “He just met you...”</p> <p>Hazel: “I know!”</p> <p>Frannie: “And he’s giving you his wish.”</p>				<p>Talking about wishes in this conversation made Hazel flouted the maxim of quality. She said ‘<u>Well, we’re sharing the wish.</u></p>

	<p>Hazel: <i>“<u>Well, we’re sharing the wish. We’re... I mean, he... he... yeah. We’re sharing it.</u>”</i></p>		-		<p><i>We’re... I mean, he... he... yeah. We’re sharing it’</i> to her mom when Gus has decided to go with Hazel to Amsterdam for his last wish. Meaning that Gus shared his last wish with Hazel and Hazel has said a statement which she believed to be false.</p>
24	<p>Hazel: “Stop. Pay attention. Please! Can I go?”</p> <p>Frannie: <i>“<u>Right, as your mom, I love this idea. And I... I think we should talk to Dr. Maria.</u>”</i></p>				<p>- The first statement was uttered by Hazel for asking her mom’s permission to go to Amsterdam. On the other hand, Frannie’s response to Hazel’s question was not really clear if she agree or not. As a result, Frannie has failed to fulfil the maxim of manner.</p>

25	<p>Hazel: “Can I still go to Amsterdam?”</p> <p>Dr. Simmons: “<u>That would not be wise at this juncture.</u>”</p> <p>Hazel: “Why not?”</p> <p>Frannie: “ Is there any way we can make this trip happen?”</p> <p>Dr. Simmons: “<u>It would increase some risks.</u>”</p> <p>Hazel: “But so does going to the mall.”</p> <p>Dr. Simmons: “Yes, but an airplane?”</p> <p>Hazel: “But they have oxygen on airplanes.”</p> <p>Dr. Simmons: “<u>You’re stage four.</u>”</p>	-			-	<p>This conversation happened in a room at hospital where they were discussing the possibility of Hazel going abroad. During the conversation, Dr. Simmons has failed to be cooperative for three times. He flouted the maxim of quantity twice and relevant once. This ‘<u>That would not be wise at this juncture</u>’ statement did not answer Hazel’s question since Hazel asked ‘<i>Can I still go to Amsterdam?</i>’. Next, the flouting maxim of quantity also happened when the doctor said ‘<u>It would increase some risks</u>’ for Frannie’s question about is there any way that the trip can be allowed or not. Lastly, he did not</p>
----	--	---	--	--	---	---

						fulfil the maxim of relevant for uttering irrelevant statement when they were discussing about oxygen on airplanes.
26	<p>Gus: “What’s the matter? Talk to me.”</p> <p>Hazel: “I don’t know. Everything. I want to go to Amsterdam, Gus.</p> <p>And I want Van houten to tell us what happens after his book. I also don’t really want this particular life. <u>I mean, it’s really just the sky. The sky is making me sad. And there’s this pathetic old swing set... that my dad built for me when I was a kid and...</u> it’s just everything, I guess.”</p>		-			Here, Gus asked Hazel what is it that made her upset. Actually, if Hazel just said ‘ <i>I don’t know. Everything. I want to go to Amsterdam, Gus. And I want Van houten to tell us what happens after his book. I also don’t really want this particular life</i> ’, she would not break the maxim. In fact, she added ‘ <u><i>I mean, it’s really just the sky. The sky is making me sad. And there’s this</i></u>



						<p><i>pathetic old swing set... that my dad built for me when I was a kid and... it's just everything, I guess'</i>. She uttered a statement which she believe to be false. The reason she got upset is because she could not go to Amsterdam and not because of the sky or the old swing set. For that reason, she broke the maxim of quality.</p>
27	<p>Hazel: "<u><i>Gus, I'm a grenade. One day I'm gonna explode... and I'm gonna obliterate everything in my wake and...</i></u> I don't know, I feel like it's my responsibility... to minimize the casualties."</p> <p>Gus: "A grenade?"</p> <p>Hazel: "<u><i>I mean, that's why I don't have a hamster.</i></u>"</p>		-		-	<p>There are two flouting maxim in this conversation. The first one was done by Hazel in her utterance. Hazel said '<u><i>Gus, I'm a grenade. One day I'm gonna explode... and I'm gonna obliterate everything in my wake and'</i></u>'. In her previous statement, she</p>

						<p>mentioned that she was a grenade and she was going to explode which was totally wrong. In fact, she is a human being and not a grenade. Hazel's statement was classified into flouting maxim of quality by providing false statement. Second flouting was also done by Hazel. It happened because when Gus asked her 'A grenade?', she replied with an irrelevant answer '<u>I mean, that's why I don't have a hamster</u>'. There was no relation between Gus' question and Hazel's answer. Thus, it was classified as flouting maxim of relevance.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

28	<p>Gus: “No.”</p> <p>Hazel: “No? I like it.”</p> <p>Gus: <i>“That’s why. In case you’re wondering, that’s why I like you, Hazel grace. You’re just so busy being you, you have no idea how utterly unprecedented you are.”</i></p>			-	<p>While discussing about suitable name for the old swing set, all of a sudden Gus uttered a statement which is unrelated with the topic of conversation. This made Gus disobeyed the maxim of relevant throughout the conversation.</p>
29	<p>Hazel: “Mom!”</p> <p>Frannie: “What’s wrong?”</p> <p>Hazel: <i>“Sorry.”</i></p> <p>Frannie: “No, I was just taking a bath.”</p>			-	<p>Frannie expected Hazel to say what is happening with her since she suddenly called her mom. However, Hazel tends to say ‘Sorry’ which made her fail to be relevant during the conversation.</p>
30	<p>Hazel: “You’re se... we’re going to Amsterdam?”</p> <p>Frannie: “We’re going to Amsterdam. <i>We figured the whole thing out. We’re going. Dr. Maria, everybody knows. But only for three</i></p>			-	<p>By providing more information, Frannie has failed in obeying maxim of quantity. Based on the conversation, Hazel was just asking if</p>

	<i>days, not six.”</i>					they will go to Amsterdam. In fact, Frannie answered the question and also added more information which categorized as flouting maxim of quantity.
31	Hazel: “What did you forget? Do you have my passport?”  Frannie: “ <i>Yeah, I’ve got it.</i> ”	-				Hazel asked two things which are the passport and what she forgot. In fact, Frannie said ‘ <i>Yeah, I’ve got it</i> ’ which caused her in disobeying the maxim of quantity for not giving contribution such as is required and being uninformative.
32	Jackie: “What’s in your nose?”  Jackie’s Dad: “Jackie! I’m really sorry about that.”  Hazel: “No, it’s totally fine. It’s called a “cannula” and it helps me breathe. <i>See this little friend right here? He feeds</i>	-				In this conversation, the little Jackie was asking Hazel about the thing which Hazel put in her nose. By saying ‘ <i>It’s called a “cannula” and it helps me breathe</i> ’ is

	<u>oxygen through your tube.</u> ”					enough to be cooperative in the conversation, but she added ‘ <u>See this little friend right here? He feeds oxygen through your tube</u> ’ which including in giving more information and caused her to flout the maxim of quantity.
33	Frannie: “You two are so adorable.” Hazel: “ <u>We’re just friends.</u> ”			-		For uttering irrelevant statement, Hazel has failed to obey the maxim of relevant.
34	Gus: “Mmm... <u>I want this dragon carrot risotto to become a person... so that I can take it to Vegas and marry it.</u> ” Hazel: “I like your suit.” Gus: “Thank you. It’s the first time I’ve ever worn it.” Hazel: “That’s not the suit you wear to funerals?” Gus: “No. That one is not nearly this nice. <u>When I first got sick... they</u>			-		The first flouting maxim is quality. In Gus’ statement ‘ <u>I want this dragon carrot risotto to become a person... so that I can take it to Vegas and marry it</u> ’, it was impossible to happen because dragon carrot risotto is a food and not a person who he can marry.

	<p><i>told me I had an 85% chance of being cancer-free. Great odds.</i></p> <p><i>But that meant a year of torture, the loss of my leg... and still, a 15% chance it might fail. Just before the surgery... I asked my parents if I could buy a really nice suit.”</i></p>				<p>Thus, for stating false statement, Gus’ previous statement has categorized as flouting maxim of quality. The second one is flouting maxim of quantity. Gus also flouted the maxim of quantity when he answered Hazel’s question about the suit that he wore. He was being more informative on his last statement in the conversation.</p>
35	<p>Gus: “So, we’re on a date?”</p> <p>Hazel: “<i>Hey, you watch it.</i>”</p> <p>Gus: “<i>We are Mr. &amp; Mrs. Waters.</i>”</p>			-	<p>Two flouting maxim appeared in this conversation. Hazel was the first who flouted the maxim by saying ‘<i>Hey, you watch it</i>’ to Gus’ question about they were on a date or not. Hazel’s response was not related to Gus’ question so that it was</p>

						<p>categorized as flouting maxim of relevance.</p> <p>The next flouting was done by Gus which was flouting maxim of quality. Gus mentioned in his statement that they are Mr. and Mrs. Waters. Gus' statement was indicated that he provided false statement since Hazel is not Mrs. Waters. Thus, it is included in flouting maxim of quality.</p>
36	<p>Gus: "This is it."</p> <p>Hazel: "I'm so excited, I can barely breathe."</p> <p>Gus: "As opposed to normal?"</p> <p>Hazel: "<u>Get out of here.</u>"</p>				-	<p>By providing unrelated statement, Hazel has flouted the maxim of relevance/relation.</p> <p>Topic and answer were not in one line, that is why it was classified into flouting maxim of relevance. Gus was asking another thing and she also replied with another thing.</p>

37	<p>Van houten: “The Americans?”</p> <p>Lidewij: “<u>You invited them</u>. Please, come in.”</p>			-		<p>In this short conversation, Van houten was asking Lidewij if the people who came were the Americans. Instead of saying yes/no, Lidewij replied ‘<u>You invited them</u>’ to Van houten’s question. It seemed that Lidewij has disobeyed the maxim of relevance by giving different answer to the topic of question.</p>
38	<p>Van houten: “Which of you is Augustus Waters?”</p> <p>Gus: “I am. <u>And that’s Hazel</u>.”</p>			-		<p>By providing more information than what has been asked by Van houten, Gus has failed to fulfill the maxim of quantity by added ‘<u>And that’s Hazel</u>’ to his statement.</p>
39	<p>Lidewij: “Perhaps some breakfast first, Peter?”</p> <p>Van houten: “<u>She thinks I have a drinking problem</u>.”</p>			-		<p>Van houten’s contribution in the conversation seemed to have no relation</p>



						with Lidewij's question. Hence, he has flouted the maxim of relevance.
40	<p>Gus: "And, incidentally, sir, we both really wanted to thank you for dinner last night. And for the champagne.</p> <p>Hazel: "It was amazing. It was magical."</p> <p>Van houten: "We bought them dinner last night?"</p> <p>Lidewij: "<u><i>It was our pleasure.</i></u>"</p>	-				Based on Lidewij's response, she did not provide the answer which Van houten's was asked. It made her contribution was less and flouted the maxim of quantity.
41	<p>Van houten: "You've come a long way. What can I do for you?"</p> <p>Hazel: "We have some questions...obviously, about what happens at the end of your book. Uh, specifically to those who Anna leaves behind. Like her mom, the Dutch tulip man..."</p> <p>Van houten: "<u><i>How familiar are you with Swedish hip-hop?</i></u>"</p> <p>Hazel: "I would say, limited."</p>				-	According the topic of conversation, Van houten response did not fit in to the topic itself. They were discussing about the end of the book, then suddenly Van houten uttered ' <u><i>How familiar are you with Swedish hip-hop?</i></u> '. Van houten's utterance was irrelevant which caused him flouting the maxim of

						relevance.
42	<p>Gus: “Are you messing with us? Like, is this some sort of performance?”</p> <p>Hazel: “Gus, sit down. All right, so at the end of the book, Anna’s...</p> <p>Van houten: <u>“Let’s imagine you’re racing a tortoise. The tortoise has a 10 yard head start. In the time it takes you to run 10 yards... the tortoise has moved maybe 1 yard, and so on, forever. You’re faster than the tortoise, but you can never catch him, you see? You can only decrease his lead. Now, certainly, you can run past the tortoise... as long as you don’t contemplate the mechanics involved. But the question of “how?” turns out to be so complicated... that no one really solved it... until cantor’s proof that some</u></p>	-				<p>It is clearly showed that Van houten’s response to their topic of conversation was unclear. The topic in this conversation was about the ending of the book. However, Van houten came up with his statement about tortoise which made it confusing. Therefore, Van houten’s statement is classified as flouting maxim of manner.</p>

		<i>infinities are bigger than other infinities. I assume that answers your question.</i>					
43	Hazel:	“But that doesn’t mean that her family and friends don’t have a future, right? Right?”					This time, Van houten flouted the maxim of relevance for being irrelevant to Hazel’s question during the conversation took place.
	Van houten:	<i>“I said I’m not interested.”</i>			-		
44	Hazel:	“Then make something up!”					Van houten’s utterance was not related to Hazel’s statement in the conversation. Hence, it is categorized as flouting maxim of relevance.
	Van houten:	<i>“I want you to leave.”</i>			-		
45	Van houten:	“Have you ever stopped to ask yourself... why you care so much about your silly questions?”					Based on Hazel’s response, her utterance was not suitable for the question. This is indicated as flouting maxim of relevance.
	Hazel:	<i>“Oh, go fuck yourself.”</i>			-		
46	Gus:	“Hey, it’s okay. It’s okay. I’ll write you a sequel. All right? I’ll write you a sequel. <i>It’ll be better than any piece of shit that</i>					Here, Gus provided a statement which he could not prove if it is true or not. The

	<p><i>drunk guy could write.</i> It'll have blood, and guts, and sacrifice.</p> <p>You'll love it."</p> <p>Hazel: "So sorry that I spent your wish on that asshole."</p>					statement has less evidence since Gus has never written a book yet before. It means that he would not know if his book is better than Van houten's. Thus, his statement is categorized as flouting maxim of quality.
47	<p>Lidewij: "Hazel and Augustus! I'm very sorry. Circumstace has made him cruel. I thought meeting you would help him... that he could see that his work has shaped real lives. But, I'm very sorry. Perhaps we can do some sightseeing? Have you been to the Anne frank house?"</p> <p>Hazel: "<i>I'm not going anywhere with that man.</i>"</p> <p>Lidewij: "No. He is not invited."</p>	-				It showed in the conversation that Hazel did not provide the answer which Lidewij asked. This is considered as giving less information to Lidewij which is the submaxim of flouting maxim of quantity.
48	<p>Gus: "<i>It just sort of ends right above where the knee would be... and tapers off.</i>"</p>				-	There are two floutings in this conversation. First, Gus flouted the maxim of manner by

	<p>Hazel: “What?”</p> <p>Gus: “My leg. <i>You know, just so you’re prepared.</i>”</p> <p>Hazel: “Gus... get over yourself.”</p>	-				being unclear in his statement. The second one is also Gus which classified as flouting maxim of quantity by providing more information.
49	<p>Gus: “How did you come up with that?”</p> <p>Hazel: “I don’t know, it just came out. <i>I was so angry.</i>”</p>	-				By uttering more statement, Hazel has flouted the maxim. It made her statement classified as flouting maxim of quantity.
50	<p>Hazel: “Oh, my gosh, we probably still have a few hours, right? Should we go to the Van gogh museum?”</p> <p>Frannie: “<i>Whatever you want.</i>”</p>	-				Here, Frannie was being uninformative by not giving the answer as Hazel has asked before. Meaning that Frannie did not fulfill the maxim of quantity.
51	<p>Gus: “Mrs. Lancaster?”</p> <p>Frannie: “Yeah?”</p> <p>Gus: “Do you think Hazel and I can just have a little time alone?”</p>					Gus asked Hazel’s mom Frannie if they can have some times to talk. Frannie replied ‘ <i>Sure, Gus. Um, I am gonna run to the</i>

	<p>Frannie: “Sure, Gus. <u>Um, I am gonna run to the room... and be ready whenever you guys want to do something.</u>”</p>	-			<p><u>room... and be ready whenever you guys want to do something</u>’. If Frannie did not add ‘<u>Um, I am gonna run to the room... and be ready whenever you guys want to do something</u>’, she would not disobey the maxim of quantity. In fact, she added it which made her disobeying the maxim of quantity.</p>
52	<p>Hazel: “So how are your eyes, Isaac?”  Isaac: “They’re good. <u>They’re not in my head, is the only problem. Besides that...</u>”</p>	-			<p>Hazel asked Isaac about his eyes. Then, Isaac replied ‘<u>They’re good</u>’. If Isaac just answered like that, he would not break the maxim of quantity. In fact, he added ‘<u>They’re not in my head, is the only problem. Besides that</u>’ which made him</p>

						more informative during conversation. As a result, Isaac has failed to fulfill the maxim of quantity.
53	Hazel: "How do you even know that?" Isaac: " <u><i>I'm blind but I'm not that blind.</i></u> "			-		This time, Isaac has mentioned something which is irrelevant to Hazel's question. Therefore, it was classified as flouting maxim of relevant.
54	Isaac: "Is Monica there?" Gus: " <u><i>It doesn't matter where Monica is.</i></u> "			-		Gus' response to Isaac question was indicated as being uninformative to the topic of conversation. Gus' did not give a contribution such as is required. Therefore, it made him flouting the maxim of quantity.
55	Hazel: "Gus, I think we should wait until dark." Gus: "It's all dark to Isaac"					Isaac statement about himself who was just blind and not deaf made him failed in

	<p>Isaac: “<i>Dude, I’m not deaf. I’m just blind.</i> So I can hear you when you make fun of my disability.”</p> <p>Gus: “I’m sorry.”</p>	-				<p>obeying the maxim of quantity. As he has said something which Gus and Hazel have known. They both knew that Isaac was blind and not deaf.</p>
56	<p>Isaac: “Okay. Where do I throw?”</p> <p>Gus: “<i>Just throw hard. Yes. Yes!</i>”</p>			-		<p>In this short conversation, Isaac was asking Gus where he should throw the eggs. Isaac was clearly asking the exact angle to throw the eggs since Isaac is blind. In fact, Gus reponded “<i>Just throw hard. Yes. Yes!</i>”.</p> <p>Based on Gus’ statement, it seemed that Gus was being irrelevant to the question of conversation by uttering unrelated answer. Thus, it made him flouted the maxim of relevant.</p>



57	<p>Hazel: “Gus. Gus. Babe, what’s going on?”</p> <p>Gus: “<u>Look.</u>”</p>			-	<p>It is very clear that Gus was being irrelevant this time. While Hazel asked what happened to him, he replied ‘<u>Look</u>’. As a result, Gus’ answer has classified into flouting maxim of relevance.</p>
58	<p>Hazel: “Gus, what are you doing here? What are you doing here?”</p> <p>Gus: “I wanted to buy cigarettes. <u>I don’t know what happened to my pack. I might have lost it or something, or they took it, but I just... I wanted to do something for myself, you know? I wanted to do it myself.</u>”</p>			-	<p>Gus’ contribution here was more than enough. He answered Hazel’s question by adding more information which was not asked by Hazel before. As a result, flouting maxim of quantity appeared in Gus’ statement by being more informative during conversation.</p>
59	<p>Gus: “Hazel? Will you tell me a story?”</p> <p>Hazel: “A story?”</p>				<p>In this short conversation, it showed that Gus was asking if Hazel would tell him a</p>

	<p>Gus: “Or like a poem?”</p> <p>Hazel: “<u>I do know... I... I know a poem.</u>”</p>	-				<p>story or a poem while they were on the way to hospital. Instead of saying yes/no answer, Hazel said ‘<u>I do know... I... I know a poem</u>’ which was included in providing less contribution in the conversation. Thus, Hazel has flouted the maxim of quantity.</p>
60	<p>Hazel: “Can I see him?”</p> <p>Mrs. Waters: “<u>We’ll tell him you were here.</u>”</p>			-		<p>Gus’s mom is not being cooperative in the conversation by disobeying the maxim of relevant. The reason is because during the conversation takes place, Hazel asked if she can go to see Gus inside his room. In fact, Mrs. Waters tend to say ‘<u>We’ll tell him you were here</u>’ rather than saying no to Hazel.</p>
61	<p>Hazel: “What are you thinking about?”</p>					<p>This time, Gus has done the flouting twice;</p>

Gus: “Oblivion. I know it’s kid’s stuff or whatever, but... I always thought I would be a hero. I always thought I’d have a grand story to tell. You know, something they would publish in all the papers, and... I mean, I was supposed to be special.”

Hazel: “You are special, Augustus.”

Gus: “Yeah, I know. But... you know what I mean.”

Hazel: “I do know what you mean, I just don’t agree with you. You know this obsession you have with being remembered?”

Gus: “Don’t get mad.”

-

-

the first one was classified as flouting maxim of quantity, and the second one was flouting maxim of relevance. Gus disobeyed the maxim of quantity because of giving too much information than what is required. Hazel asked what Gus was thinking, and Gus replied ‘Oblivion. I know it’s kid’s stuff or whatever, but... I always thought I would be a hero. I always thought I’d have a grand story to tell. You know, something they would publish in all the papers, and... I mean, I was supposed to be special’. If he just replied with ‘Oblivion’, he would not break the maxim of quantity. Also, the next

						flouting was being irrelevant to Hazel’s question. Gus’ utterance ‘ <i>Don’t get mad</i> ’ seemed not to be in line with Hazel’s question ‘You know this obsession you have with being remembered?’. Therefore, it was classified as flouting maxim of relation/relevance.
62	<p>Gus: “Do you think you could find your way down... <i>to the literal heart of Jesus</i> in the next few minutes?”</p> <p>Hazel: “Maybe. Is everything okay?”</p> <p>Gus: “<i>I love you, Hazel grace.</i>”</p>				-	<p>Gus’ statement about the literal heart of Jesus was not clear. Instead of saying the exact place, he chose to mention that.</p> <p>Hence, by saying unclear statement, Gus has flouted the maxim of manner. However, Gus also has done the second flouting in this conversation. It started with Hazel expected</p>

						Gus to tell her what is going on. Instead of answering Hazel’s question, he irrelevantly said ‘ <i>I love you, Hazel grace</i> ’. As a result, Gus has disobeyed the maxim of relevant.
63	<p>Hazel: “Can I have the key?”</p> <p>Frannie: “<i>Oh. Where you going? We’re gonna eat something.</i>”</p>	-				<p>Hazel’s question was about asking the car key because she wanted to meet Gus.</p> <p>Instead of replying Hazel’s question about the key, her mom asked Hazel back where she is going. Frannie’s contribution was less informative since she did not really answer the question. By being uninformative during conversation, Frannie has flouted maxim of quantity.</p>
64	Frannie: “Why would you say that to me?”					Hazel’s answer ‘ <i>In the ICU</i> ’ was irrelevant

	<p>Hazel: “Because you said that.”</p> <p>Frannie: “What are you talking about?”</p> <p>Hazel: “<i><u>In the ICU.</u></i>”</p>			-	<p>to Frannie’s question in this short conversation. Frannie was asking what Hazel was talking. Therefore, by analyzing Hazel’s answer to Frannie’s question, it seemed there was no relation between the question and the answer. In this case, Hazel flouted the maxim of relevance.</p>
65	<p>Frannie: “Hey, want some company?”</p> <p>Hazel: “No, I’m okay. <i><u>I’m just gonna drive for a bit by myself. Love you.</u></i>”</p>	-			<p>In the conversation, Frannies asked Hazel if she wants some company. Then, Hazel responded by saying ‘<i>No, I’m okay. <u>I’m just gonna drive for a bit by myself. Love you.</u></i>’.</p> <p>However, Hazel’s contribution was more informative based on Frannie’s question. In this case, Hazel has disobeyed the maxim of</p>

						quantity by providing too uch information.
66	<p>Hazel: “Oh. So, you read your fan mail now?”</p> <p>Van houten: <u>“I wouldn’t exactly call him a fan. He detested me. But he was quite insistent I attend his funeral... and tell you what became of Anna and her mother... so here I am. And that’s your answer “omnis cellula e cellula” “Life comes from life”.”</u></p>	-				<p>Hazel’s question in this conversation was if Van houten reads a fan mail now. Instead of replying yes/no answer, Van houted seemed not giving the answer such as is required. However, his response to Hazel’s question was less and it made him flouting the maxim of quantity.</p>
67	<p>Isaac: “Do you know if it hurt or whatever?”</p> <p>Hazel: “Apparently he was struggling for breath for a long time... and then eventually he just went unconscious. <u>It wasn’t great or anything. Dying sucks.</u>”</p>	-				<p>By providing much contribution to the conversation, Hazel has failed to obey the maxim of quantity itself. Saying ‘<i>Apparently he was struggling for breath for a long time... and then eventually he just went unconscious</i>’ is enough to be cooperative in</p>

						the conversation.
68	<p>Isaac: "I know. I know you didn't. Did you get that letter from your author friend?"</p> <p>Hazel: "<i>Ew. He's not my friend. How do you know about that?</i>"</p>			-		<p>Isaac asked if Hazel has already received the letter from Mr. Van houten. Rather than saying yes/no, she tend to answer with irrelevant statement which was not the topic of the conversation. Thus, Hazel has flouted the maxim of relevance.</p>



## CURRICULUM VITAE

### SELF IDENTITY

---

Name : Rahmatia Meylani Habie  
Place, Date of Birth : Manado, 13th May 1999  
Address : Data Tomelo Street, Gorontalo  
regency  
Email : tyahabie17@gmail.com



### ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

---

- 2004 – 2010 **SDN 1 BUNGGALO**
- 2010 – 2013 **MTS NEGERI GORONTALO**
- 2013 – 2016 **MAN MODEL GORONTALO**
- 2016 – 2020 **UNIVERSITAS NEGERI GORONTALO**

### ACADEMIC/NON ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

---

- PARTICIPANT OF MOMB HELD BY BEM OF UNIVERSITAS NEGERI GORONTALO IN 2016
- PARTICIPANT OF COMPUTER AND NETWORK TRAINING HELD BY PUSTIKOM OF UNIVERSITAS NEGERI GORONTALO, 2016
- PARTICIPANT OF SEMINAR PENGEMBANGAN KARIR MAHASISWA, 2018
- PARTICIPANT OF SEMINAR NASIONAL LINGUISTIK

FORENSIK, 2018

- PARTICIPANT OF 5<sup>th</sup> INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS CONFERENCE, 2018
- PARTICIPANT OF KEWIRAUSAHAAN EXPO OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, 2018

---

**ORGANIZATION AND COMMITTEE EXPERIENCES**

---

- COMMITTEE OF CROSS CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING (CCU) BY CLASS OF 2016 ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS UNG, 2017
- COMMITTEE OF DRAMA PERFORMANCE BY CLASS OF 2016 ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS UNG, 2019
- MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY TEAM, 2019
- PRESENTER OF 6<sup>th</sup> INTERNATIONAL STUDENT CONFERENCE, 2019