

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this second chapter, the writer will discuss the theoretical basis used to analyze the data from *The Hustle* film script for research needs. The theories used in this study are the theories introduced by Herbet Paul Grice which focus on flouting of the principles cooperation and conversational implicatures contained in the movie script *The Hustle*.

2.1 Definition of Pragmatic

Pragmatic is a branch of linguistics that focuses on studying and studying a speech between speakers and speech partners to communicate which is influenced by the context of the conversation so that it does not cause misunderstandings. According to Levinson (1983:7) pragmatic is the study of language from a functional perspective, that is, that it attempts to explain facets of linguistic structure by reference to non-linguistic pressures and causes, meaning that pragmatic is a language study that explains linguistic structures that refer to non-linguistic problems. Therefore, pragmatic focus examines the factors of language in a non-linguistic manner and these factors are social interactions. According to Crystal (1987: 120) that “pragmatics studies the factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effect of our choice on others. in theory, we can say anything we like. In practice, we follow a large number of social rules (most of them unconsciously) that constrain the way we speak”, it means that pragmatic is the study of the factors that regulate the choice of language we use in social interactions and the influence of our choices on others. In theory, we can say whatever we like, but we also have to follow the social rules that govern how we speak.

In addition to focusing on studying language factors, pragmatics also focuses on interpreting the meaning of speech according to the context of the situation. This is in accordance with what was said by Leech (1993: 8) that “Pragmatics as the study of meaning in relation to the situations of speech”, it means that pragmatics is the study of meaning relating to situations of conversation. This statement is reinforced by Purwo (1990: 16) who defines pragmatics as a study of the meaning of utterance

using context-bound meaning. In this case pragmatics is using language by considering the context, namely its use in communication events

2.2 Cooperative Principle

The principle of cooperation in conversation was pioneered by Herbert Paul Grice in William James Lectures, delivered at Harvard University in 1967. In his theory of implicatures, Grice proposes two sub-theories, namely regarding the meaning of communication and concerning the use of language. The principle of cooperation is a sub-theory of language use. The sub-theory of language use is intended as an attempt to guide conversation participants to be able to have a cooperative conversation (Leech, 1993)

The principle of cooperation regulates what conversation participants (speakers and listeners) must do to make the conversation sound coherent. A speaker who does not contribute to the coherence of the conversation is not following the cooperative principle. The principle of cooperation reads: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice, 1975:45). What this means is to make your contribution of conversation and information as needed at the time of speaking, based on agreed objectives or the direction of the conversation you are in. Levinson (1983:102) summarized the cooperative principle as the specification of what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, cooperative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly, and clearly while providing sufficient information. From the explanation above is to describe how the cooperative principle works, and Grice formulated guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation. The guidelines are known as the maxims of conversation. It should be underlined that Grice (1975) introduces quantity, quality, relation, and manner as categories of flouting maxims.

2.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

According to Yule (1996:37) “in conversation, participants are required to contribute only the information that is needed and does not make

an informative contribution than is needed". Based on this explanation, it can be interpreted that maximizing the quantity of speakers are required to provide the required information and must not provide information that is insufficient or excessive. The participants make contributions as informatively as is required for the current purpose of the exchange. They should not make their contribution more or less informative. It means that participant's contributions in talk exchange should be informative as it's needed. The participants also should not inform the information more informative in a conversation. Therefore, each participant should give neither too little information nor too much. The speaker who gives too little information risk the hearer not being able to identify what the meaning of your speech because it is difficult to understand. Otherwise, the speaker who gives more information than hearer needs risk will make them boring.

For example, reasonable speakers would certainly choose speech (1) over speech (2):

(1) *The blind man turned out to be a masseuse*

(2) *The person who couldn't see it was a masseuse*

Speech 1 is considered more effective and efficient, and contains truth values. Everyone understands that a blind person cannot see. Thus the element of being unable to see in speech (2) is considered excessive. The existence of elements that cannot be seen in (2) is considered contrary to the maxim of quantity because it only adds things that are clear and need not be explained again. Another example can be found in the English sentence from Beatrice (1997) in his book *Reading Power*, as follows:

(1) *John put on his raincoat, picked up his umbrella from the table near the door, turned off the lights, put out the cat, got ready for his ten-minute walk to the bus-stop*

(2) *John went out*

In a proper speech sentence (3) is considered too long. Therefore, to express the same concept, utterance (4) tends to be used more.

2.2.2 Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality contribution to what address or believes to be true. It means that speakers should tell the right information to hearer. The speakers should not say what they believe to be false, and should not lack adequate evidence. Yule (1996:37) says that *maxim of quality requires each participant to contribute the correct information* meaning that maximizing quality requires the contribution of each conversation participant in providing correct information. Therefore, neither the speaker nor the interlocutor said anything wrong, and every contribution must be supported by sufficient evidence. If in a conversation there are speakers who do not have sufficient evidence of what is being said, there may be some reasons behind it. Pay attention to the following speech :

A: “How many cooperation maxims according to Grice?”

B: “According to Grice's book that I read, there are four maxims in cooperation principles”

A: “What are the maxims?”

B: “Maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim Of manner”

In the example above, (B) contributed correct information, that according to Grice's book he read there were four maxims, namely the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of method (implementation).

2.2.3 Maxim of Relevance

The maxim of relevance requires each speech participant to make a relevant contribution to the subject matter. The maxim of relevance emphasizes the relevance of the content of speech between conversation participants. Each conversation participant contributes to each other that is relevant to the topic of conversation so that conversation goals can be achieved effectively. However, sometimes the explicit responses given do not show any relevance to the subject matter, because there is already the same background knowledge between the speaker and the interlocutor, so

communication can still run. In other words, what is express (explicit) seems irrelevant but, what is implied (implicit) is actually relevant. Cutting (2002: 35) says that *To fulfill the maxim of relations, the speaker must say something relevant with what is said before*. It can be interpreted that the maxim of the speaker relation is required to make a relevant contribution in accordance with what was said before. Yule (1996: 38) explains that to observe the maxim of the relation, the speakers can use several expressions such as *oh, by the way, anyway, or well, anyway*. Example:

A: "There is somebody at the door"

B: "I'm in the bath".

(Joan Cutting, 2002: 36)

When A told B that someone had come at their doorstep and expected B to open the door for that guest, then B said that he was in the bathroom at the time. B's answer implies that he expected A to understand where B was at the moment, so B could not open the door and see who had arrived at that time. Thus, it can be said that the relationship between speech participants does not always lie in the meaning of the utterance, but can also lie in what the utterance implies.

2.2.4 Maxim of Manner

With this maxim, the speech participants are expected to speak directly, not blurry, not taxa and not an exaggeration and coherently. According to Yule (1996: 37) says that "With this maxim, the participants of the discussion are expected to speak directly, not run away, not overdone and coherent", meaning that with the maximum implementation it is expected that the conversation participants speak directly, not ambiguously, not superfluous and coherent. According to Cutting (2002:34) verbal exchange of information in conversations, or interviews, tends to run smoothly and successfully when participants follow a social convention called conversational maxims. Therefore, the grace theory determines what participants should do in an efficient, rational, and cooperative conversation: whereas in the maxim of implementation they must speak

honestly, relevant, and clearly, and provide sufficient information. However, in everyday speech discourse, one can often find a speaker who deliberately ignores this maxim, as seen in the dialogue taken from Parker (1986) below:

A: "Let's stop and get something to eat"

B: "OK, but not M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D-S"

(Parker, 1986)

In the dialogue above the spelling in the speech B aims to make children like Mc. Donald didn't realize that his parents didn't want to eat at McDonald's. A speaker must interpret the words used by the interlocutor. Clearly based on the context that uses. This is based on the principle of ambiguity (ambiguity) will not arise if B tells a directly and clearly that he does not want to eat at that place so that the information provided is clear and does not confuse.

2.3 Flouting Maxim

Flouting maxim is intentionally breaking the maxims in order to convey hidden meanings and lead the listener to find out the implied meaning from the flouting maxim. This form of non-observance of maxims is explained further in the next review. Maxim flouting belongs to the forms of the non-observed Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975: 49). According to Thomas (2013) flouting happens if "speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with deliberate intention on generating implicature". in his definition explains that maxim flouting means the speaker intentionally do not give the right information as required by maxims, but still, the hearer can reach the meaning because of the implicature. The only reason is that the speaker wishes the listener to understand the meaning of the speaker, either the literal expressed meaning or the hidden meaning.

2.4 The Conversational Implicatures

The conversational implicature appears in a conversational act. It is therefore temporary (occurring during conversational acts), and non-conventional (something implied has no direct relation to the spoken speech (Levinson, 1991:II (7). According to Grice (1975:45), there is a set of assumptions that cover and organize conversation activities as a speech act. The principle of cooperation that is spelled out in the four maxims, is regulative. Therefore, normatively every conversation must adhere to it. In summary, the principle of cooperation in the conversation was formulated by Nababan (1987:31) as follows. "Contribute to your conversation in such a way as to be expected, at the level of the conversation concerned, by the known purpose of the conversation or by the direction of the conversation you are following". However, sometimes that principle is not always adhered to. So in a conversation, many awarded "flouting" of the rules / working principles. Flouting of that principle does not mean "damage" or "failure" in the implementation (communication). The flouting, perhaps deliberately by the speaker to obtain the implicature effect of the speech he uttered, for example, to lie, joke, or joke.

Sometimes people exchange their meaning and intention in their communication daily. They do this to get information from their surroundings. They need communication to interact with other people in their social life. In another word, they do conversational interaction. In every their conversational interaction, contained a message or meaning that they want to convey to the interlocutor. There are two ways in expressing meaning that are explicitly and implicitly. Expressing meaning implicitly means that there are more hidden meaning in that conversation, while expressing meaning explicitly means that the actual conversation is stated. In this case, the conversation carries meaning more than what is stated in the speaker's utterance. It is what is called implicature (Saragi, 2011). Conversational implicatures refer to the implication which can be deduced from the form of an utterance, based on certain cooperative principles which govern the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversations, as when the sentence *there's some trash on the floor* it means you

to ought to pick it up to the wastebasket or clean it up soon. Another example of conversation is as follow:

Mother: “Ani, the water is probably already boiling”

Ani: “yes mam, father want to make a coffee or tea?”

By paying attention to her father's habit of drinking coffee and tea, Ani understood the implicatures that her mother meant, but wanted her mother's firmness about her father's choices at that time. Using cooperative principles and previous experiences, Ani immediately conducted a perlocutionary (heading to the kitchen). So the conclusion in a nutshell is, the implication of conversation is a hidden meaning in a conversation that is understood by each participant. Conversational implicatures triggered by “certain general features of discourse” rather than by the conventional meaning or a specific word (Grice,1975). He also stated some features as follows: (1) linguistic exchanges (conversation) are governed by cooperative principle, in the detailed context of Grice’s maxims and its sub-maxims, (2) when one of the participants of conversation is not following the cooperative principles, then the hearer will assume that the speaker have another meaning in their conversation.

2.5 The Hustle

The Hustle is a film Directed by Chris Addison’s remake of the 1988 Michael Caine-Steve Martin comedy “Dirty Rotten Scoundrels,” itself a remake of the 1964 David Niven-Marlon Brando comedy “*Bedtime Story*” takes a basic formula and gives it a gender swap. The film starts in a bar where a guy named Jeremy (Timothy Simons) is waiting for his date, a model-like blonde woman. Instead, he is met by con artist Penny Rust (Rebel Wilson). She pretends that the girl in the picture that Jeremy was waiting for is her sister who was too shy to meet him because she is ashamed of her small breasts, so Penny almost tricks Jeremy into giving her money for her "sister's" boob job. However, another guy that Penny swindled finds her in the bar with the cops, and she runs out of there, managing to hide among trash bags since her dress look like one.

Somewhere in France, a Danish man named Mathias (Casper Christensen) spots an American woman, Josephine Chesterfield (Anne Hathaway), sitting alone at a bar. He approaches her and hears her story about winning a lot of chips at the casino. Mathias offers to sell Josephine his mother's valuable bracelet, only for an Interpol officer, Brigitte Desjardins (Ingrid Oliver), to come by and say that Josephine is an international criminal and that she stole the chips from an old man. In reality, Brigitte and the old man, Albert (Nicholas Woodeson), are in cahoots with Josephine, who is an English woman posing as a dim-witted American to try and con other men. She manages to swipe Mathias's bracelet and swap it with a fake.

Josephine boards a train heading toward the French Riviera, where she spots Penny conning another guy by pretending that she is trying to come up with ransom money for her kidnapped sister. Josephine is impressed by how Penny makes the man buy her a bunch of food. The two then meet in another train car where Penny explains to Josephine that she exploits men who think women are too vulnerable or incapable of caring for themselves. Penny also mentions that she is traveling to the town of Beaumont-sur-Mer to con rich men, but since Josephine lives there and doesn't want competition, she tricks Penny into heading toward Port-au-Prince.

After arriving in Beaumont-sur-Mer, Josephine sees that Penny made it there by tricking a guy named Gregor (John Hales). Josephine has Brigitte arrest Penny by having Gregor identify her while she uses his money to get some kind of water jet pack. While in prison, Josephine goes to Penny's cell and makes her think that Gregor is a member of the Russian mafia and that she will be killed on the outside. She forces Penny to fly back home, but on the plane, Penny is called to the bathroom to meet with Mathias, who tells her that Josephine is also a con artist and that she fooled her as well. Before Penny decides to fly back to meet Josephine, she and Mathias have sex in the bathroom.

Penny makes it back to Josephine's home and requests that she teach her to be as good of a con artist as she is. Josephine agrees and shows Penny some of her tricks for fooling men, as well as other random tasks for self-defense. They

start with a few practice targets, starting with a Southern tycoon named Howard Bacon (Dean Norris). Josephine gets him to propose marriage to her, on the condition that he meet her "sister". She then introduces Howard to Penny, who is made up to look like a repulsive hag. Howard leaves in disgust and leaves Josephine with the engagement ring. Later on, Josephine pays Brigitte and Albert their share, but not Penny. Dismayed, Penny leaves Josephine, while also suspecting her of being a notorious con artist named Medusa. Josephine attempts to con an old man, only for Penny to come in and ruin everything. The two then make a bet to see who will continue. a rich man first. They spot their mark, a young app creator named Thomas Westerborg (Alex Sharp), who is seemingly clumsy and gullible enough to fool.

Josephine tries to catch Thomas at a table in the casino, but Penny comes in pretending to be blind and ends up getting Thomas's attention. The two sit together at another table where Penny tries to convince Thomas to cough up money for an operation for her eyes. Josephine sees that Penny is using her tricks, so she tries to use some of Penny's. Thomas appears to be a nice guy toward Penny, and he tells her how he wants to make improvements to his app in a way that his bosses may not approve of. He then goes to the bar to find a doctor that Penny made up, and Josephine assumes the role of a said doctor so that he can try and get money out of him. He brings her back to the room to "meet" Penny, who is displeased to see her opponent there. Josephine puts her through some "tests" for her made-up condition, which is mostly meant to torture Penny.

The ladies later end up at a nightclub with Thomas. Penny convinces a trio of women that she is blind and that Thomas is her ex who is now with her best friend, Josephine. Penny gets Thomas alone and finds out that Thomas doesn't own his company as she believed and that he is practically broke, but he would be willing to pay the rest of his money for Penny's operation. Penny becomes endeared to Thomas and starts to fall for him, which also makes her feel guilty about conning him.

Josephine finds Penny in her room, and Penny admits her feelings about Thomas to Josephine. Now that things have gotten personal, Josephine decides

to make their bet interesting by seeing which one of them will win Thomas over first. Josephine leaves and also brings the three women from before to handle Penny for lying to them. She then goes to Thomas's room to try and seduce him, but he insists on keeping things professional for Penny's sake. However, before Josephine leaves, Thomas decides to turn the lights off. In the morning, Penny has to rip her hand off the wall since it was super-glued there. She runs to Thomas's room just before he leaves, and he tells her that she is the one good thing that happened to him there. As he leaves, she tries to stop him but slips and falls. Thomas goes to help her and sees that she is moving her eyes and is not blind, believing this to be the result of good medical treatment. The two then go to Thomas's private jet to say farewell. After it takes off, Josephine goes running after him yelling for the plane to stop. She explains to Penny that after the lights went out, Thomas showed her a PowerPoint presentation on his new app and then asked her to shower before taking her to bed, and then when she got out, all of her clothes and items were gone. Penny tells her that she gave Thomas back \$500,000 that Josephine allegedly stole from him, only for Josephine to say that she gave him that much money to invest in his app, which means that Thomas ended up conning both women. He sends them a message revealing that he was Medusa. Sometime later, Penny is back near Josephine's home where she gives Penny some money for her hard work. They are then met by Thomas, who is giving a tour to a group of people. He approaches the ladies and says that he has made \$6 million so far that year from his new app and he thanks them for it, before adding that the three of them would make a great team. Although they are annoyed, they agree to it, and Penny kisses Thomas. It is now Christmastime. A guy named Todd (Rob Delaney) has been conned by the women, who hide under a Christmas tree because their dresses match the decorations. They meet with Thomas and sail off on a motorboat.

2.7 Literature Review

Researchers found three other studies that are relevant to the current research. The first is a study conducted by Winda Sulistyowati (2013) from Airlangga University with the title *Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Dan Implikatur Percakapan Dalam Film Petualangan Sherina Karya Riri Riza*. The second is a study conducted by Yessinta Yulianti (2020) from Semarang State University with the title *Analisis Implikatur Percakapan Dalam Tuturan Film Laskar Pelangi*. The third is a study conducted by Adven Desi Niatri (2016) from Sanata Dharma University with the title *Implikatur Percakapan Antar Tokoh Dalam Film Marmut Merah Jambu Karya Raditya Dika*.

The first research conducted by Winda Sulistyowati (2013) is qualitative descriptive research. The research was conducted by collecting data resulting from the identification in the film *Petualangan Sherina*. The results of the study are 1) various kinds of conversational implicatures arise due to flouting of the cooperative principle; 2) In *Sherina's* adventure film, it is found that there are floutings of the principle of cooperation, namely maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, and maxim of manner. Flouting of the maxim of quantity are more common because the speaker and the interlocutor do not follow the principle of cooperation; 4) The conversational implicatures found in the film *Petualangan sherina* that arise due to a flouting of the principle of cooperation consist of different kinds of implicatures, such as implicatures that are informing, showing, mocking, refusing, expressing doubts, etc.

The second research conducted by Yessinta Yuliyanti (2020) is a qualitative descriptive study using a pragmatic approach. The data in this study were obtained from fragments of speech in the *LaskarPelangi* film. The results obtained, namely 1) in the film *Laskar Pelangi* found floutings of the principle of cooperation, namely the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. Of the 9 conversational implicature data found, more relevant floutings were found because speakers did not answer their interlocutors with good relevance; 2) conversational implicatures that arise due to flouting of the principle of cooperation consist of different

kinds of implicatures, namely beliefs, expectations, coercion, criticism, and fear.

The third research conducted by Adven Desi Niatri (2016) is a qualitative descriptive study. The data in this study were obtained from conversations between characters in the film *Marmut Merah Jambu* suspected of containing conversational implicatures. The research results obtained are 1) Types of conversational implicatures contained in conversations between characters in the film of *Marmut Merah Jambu* by Raditya Dika are special conversational implicatures (GPA), 13 general conversational implicatures (IPU), and 3 scaled conversational implicatures (IPB); 2) the function of conversational implicatures between characters in Raditya Dika's film *Marmut Merah Jambu*, namely first to build the image of each character (actors) and create humor as a supporting scene. Second, conversational implicatures serve as a channel for messages from the writer and director Raditya Dika to the audience in the form of good advice and warnings related to everyday life (especially teenagers). The three studies above are included in the pragmatic realm, namely implicature. The implicature point of view used in these studies is varied. There are similarities and differences with the research that researchers are doing now. The similarity lies in the use of a pragmatic approach, especially the theory of cooperative principles and conversational implicatures in examining the object of research. The researcher focuses on the principle of cooperation and the implicature of conversation between characters in the film *The Hustle* by Sineas Frank Oz which has never been studied before.