

CHAPTER 2

FRAMEWORK OF THE THEORIES

This chapter discusses the framework of the theories which support the understanding of the problems formulated in Chapter 1. The framework of the theories consists definition of pragmatics, Grice's cooperative principle, flouting maxims, implicature, and literature review. The theoretical framework discusses extensively things researched based on theories and research results that have been there before. It is a form of ideas or concepts, definitions, and propositions that are related to my research.

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistics. Pragmatics is a study focused on contextual meaning and the relation of signs to their users and interpreters. Contextual meaning in pragmatics is when someone has a conversation, people not only say explicitly. Usually, they use signs such as eyes, hands, and feet to interpret, but not all readers recognize them. Pragmatics will help to find indirect meaning to avoid misinterpretation.

According to Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2021, para 2), the different theorists have focus on the different purpose of utterance, usually, philosophers use declarative sentences as paradigmatic. There many theories about pragmatics and different theorists focused on different purposes because pragmatics have branches. Pragmatics is concern with the facts that are relevant to determining the utterances and focus on the contextual meaning such as speech acts or implicatures.

According to Levinson (1983: 5), he defines that pragmatics is the study of language use, that is the study of relation between language and context which is basic to an account of language understanding which involves the making of inferences which will connect what is said to what is mutually assumed or what has been said before. Pragmatics is the study of the relation between language and contextual meaning involving inferences with what the speaker said and what the

assumed or what the topic of conversation before to know the meaning of the conversation, so the reader can answer the question from the speaker correctly.

According to Leech (1983:36), he states that pragmatics involves problem-solving both from the speaker's point of view and from the hearer's point of view. Pragmatics also can solve the problem between speaker and hearer about the point of view. The problem of the speaker is how to deliver the meaning by utterance to make a good result. And for the hearer to get the meaning of what speaker said collected with the expression and the topic before, so they have good communication and avoid misinterpretation.

According to Yule (1996: 3), he states that pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning, the second definition. The third definition, pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than said. The last definition is that pragmatics is the study of expression of relative distance. Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning by the speaker, and how to have good communication to avoid misinterpretation. Pragmatics is the study to make a good conversation and related to the expression to get meaning in conversation.

From the theory above, pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language, situation, and meaning for the speaker and hearer to have good communication. Pragmatics also can help the speaker and the hearer's point of view to avoid misinterpretation by using the expression and the topic before.

2.2.Grice's Cooperative Principle

The cooperative principle is a principle of conversation states that conversation is expected to give a needed contribution to achieving the purpose of the conversation. in order to communicate successfully, both speaker and reader in every communication must follow certain conversation rules.

According to Grice (1989), he states that make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged. the cooperative principle must follow the rules to make a conversational contribution such as

required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

According to Grice (as cited in Ria, 2017), Grice's theory of the cooperative principle holds that both speaker and listener have to approach a conversation with the purpose of avoiding misunderstanding. The cooperative principle is when the speaker and listener have an approach conversation to avoid misunderstanding.

Grice develops the classification of maxims to make conversation successful, according to Grice (in Leech, 1983: 7-8), there is a general assumption underpinning all utterance interpretations. There are four guidelines to construct good conversation related to thoughtful; maxim quality, maxim quantity, maxim relation, maxim manner. Grice makes the classification of maxims in 4 types, first is maxim of quality: try to make contributions to be truthful. Second is maxim quantity: make contribute informatively and required, third is maxim of relation: make contribution to be relevant. And the last is maxim of manner: avoid ambiguity and perspicuous.

From the theory above, a misinterpreted conversation can avoid if the speaker and the hearer are followed 4 types of maxim. This will make a conversation more truthful, informative, relevant, and avoid ambiguity.

2.2.1. Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality is a maxim that required the truth of information in every speech from the speaker. According to Grundy (as cited in Ibrahim, 2000), maxim quality can be defined as truthful as required. It means that the speaker must give information that is true or they think to be false. And also, according to Black (as cited in Faridah, 2016), this maxim has to do with the truth or falsity of an utterance. Every utterance that comes out from speaker or reader must be truthful. Grice developed classification of maxim quality into: do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

These classifications mean that the maxim of quality suggests the speaker be true. The speaker must say what he believes to be true, and not say something less evidence.

Example :

Julia puts her pen on the table, and she goes to the Teacher's room. David has trouble with his pen and sees Julia's pen on the table and takes it. After Julia back to the class, she asks David who sits beside her.

Julia : Where is my pen?

David : I use it.

David really uses Julia's pen, so it is completed the maxim of quality because David tells the truth. When Julia asks him about her pen that is gone on the table. David answers it truthfully that he uses Julia's pen.

2.2.2. Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity is a maxim that provides the information needed not excessively and not less, precisely. According to Yule (as cited in Ibrahim, 2000), the speakers must make their contribution as informative as required and they are not allowed to make the contribution more informative than is required. When gives information the speaker must contribution as informative as required not too much or less than the expectation. And also, according to Black (as cited in Faridah, 2016), this maxim requires that we offer the appropriate amount information. Every utterance that comes out from the speaker or reader must be informative. Grice developed classification of maxim quantity into: make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of exchange), and do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

These classifications mean that maxim of quantity suggests the speaker to be brief and informative. The speaker must contribute as much information as required and not contribute too much or too little information.

Example :

Mary : Where is the nearest grocery mart?

Jack : It is in front of the hospital.

Mary asks Jack where is nearest grocery mart. Jack understands the nearest grocery mart from the place they are talking in front of the hospital. It completes the maxim of quantity. It is because Jack's answer is informative and explicit that the nearest grocery mart is in front of the hospital. Jack gives information as an expectation, he said directly that the nearest grocery mart is in front of the hospital.

2.2.3. Maxim of Relevance

Maxim of relevance is a maxim that every participant of conversation must make a contribution relevant to the problem of the conversation. According to Yule (as cited in Ibrahim, 2000) the speakers are required to be relevant in saying something. Cutting contended that to fulfill this maxim, the speakers are expected to say something relevant to what is said before. Maxim of relevance required the speaker to be relevant in saying something and relevant to what is the topic before. Grice developed classification of maxim relevance into: be relevant.

This classification means that maxim of relevance suggests the speaker to be relevant. The speaker must contribute as relevant as the topic of conversation.

Example:

Gerrad : How was the movie?

Bella : it was amazing.

The conversation above is clear enough, between the question and the answer are relevant, and it is complete the maxim of relevance. When Gerrad asks, Bella's answer is related to the question. Gerrad asks about the movie that they have watched before and Bella answers that it was amazing related to Gerrand's question.

2.2.4. Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner is a maxim where the participants are expected to speak directly, avoid ambiguity, and not an exaggeration. According to Black (as cited in Faridah, 2016), this maxim refers not to what is said, but how it is expressed. Every utterance that comes from the speaker is referring not to what is said, but how it is expressed. Grice developed classification of maxim manner into: avoid obscurity

of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly.

These classifications mean that maxim of manner suggests the speaker and reader be clear. It means that the utterance must directly, avoid ambiguity, brief and orderly, refers to what it is expressed.

Example :

Mark : Where is your house?

Lily : It is in Kelapa Gading Rerency

Mark : What the number of your house?

Lily : It is Bloc A/ 121

The conversation is clear without any misinterpretation. Between the question and the answer are brief and avoid ambiguity and refers to what is expressed. Mark asks the question about where is your house and Lily answers it clear that her house is in Kelapa Gading Regency. And another question from Mark, he asks what the number of your house and Lily answers it is Block A/121. Lily's answer is directly and clear as what Mark expected.

2.3.Flouting Maxims

The cooperative principle is the rule to make good conversation but sometimes the speaker does not always follow the rules and they failing to observe the maxims. According to Thomas (1995), he mentions five ways of failing to observe a maxim, including (1) flouting, (2) violating, (3) infringing, (4) opting out, and (5) suspending a maxim. There are five ways of failing to observe a maxim, first is the flouting maxim, flouting maxim is when the speaker blatantly fails to observe maxims because the speaker wants the hearer to look for implied meaning.

Second is the violating maxim. According to Grice (1975), he defines violation very specifically as the unostentatious non observance of a maxim. Violating maxim is when the speaker with intention wants to give wrong information to the hearer.

Third is the infringing maxim. According to Thomas (1995), he explains that infringing maxim of nonobservance could occur because the speaker has an imperfect command of the language (a young child or a foreign learner), the speaker's performance is impaired in some way (nervousness, drunkenness, excitement). Infringing maxim is when the speaker has imperfect command of the target language because of nervousness, drunkenness, excitement, etc.

Fourth is the opting out maxim. According to Grice (1995), he explains that a speaker who opts out from the operation both of the maxim and cooperative principle, he or she may say, indicate or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. Opting out maxim is when cannot, perhaps for legal, political, social or ethical reasons, usually the speaker are forced to provide less information, irrelevant or unclear.

Last is suspending maxim. According to Thomas (1995), the suspending maxim is a case in which the speaker needs not opting out of observing the maxim because there is no expectation for the maxim to be observed. Suspending maxim is when the speaker is not observed, there is no expectation either from the speaker and the hearer.

According to Cutting (as cited in Asih, 2018) he says that when a speaker appears not to follow the Gricean maxim, she is expecting the hearers to infer the meaning implied. The flouting maxim happened when the speaker is not following Grice's maxim and expecting the hearer to find the implied meaning.

Flouting maxim takes place when the speaker decided to not obey the cooperative principle. According to Levinson (as cited in Asih, 2018), the person does not intend to mislead the person who hears it but wants to see the person who hears or see another meaning from the word that the speaker talks. In another theory, the flouting maxim happens when the speaker decided not to obey Grice's maxim. But in other, flouting maxim is when the speaker what to see the person who talks with is know another meaning from what the speaker said, the speaker does not intend to mislead.

From the theory above, flouting of maxims is when the speaker decided to not obey the cooperative principle and blatantly observes maxims because the speaker wants the reader to find the implied meaning for what the speaker said.

2.3.1. Flouting of Maxim Quality

Flouting of maxim quality is when the speaker is blatantly observing maxim of quality. According to Cruse (as cited in Ester, 2017), flouting the maxim of quality is not literally true, but not is likely to mislead hearers because of the context of use in the utterance. It means that flouting of maxim quality is when the speaker lies about something in the conversation not because the speaker actually lies but the context of use in the utterance that makes it an exaggeration.

There are several strategies of how flouting of maxim quality can occurrence. The first is hyperbole. According to Wales (as cited in Ester, 2017), hyperbole is often used to emphasize something (word) or as a sign of great expression or passion. Hyperbole is used when someone talking in great expression or passion, and usually, it is exaggerated. When someone having a conversation, actually they said is true, but they make it too hyperbole and it becomes flouting of maxim quality because of the context of the utterance.

The second is a metaphor. According to Wales (as cited in Ester, 2017), when words are used with metaphor sense, domain of reference is carried over onto another on the basis of same perceived similarity. Metaphor is when the speaker uses another word to describe somethings and sometimes is exaggerated. When someone having a conversation, actually they said is true, but they make it too metaphor and it becomes flouting of maxim quality because not everyone thing the same perceived similarity.

The third is irony. According to Wales (as cited in Ester, 2017), irony is contradiction words and often sarcastic. Irony is when the speaker uses an utterance that has sarcastic meaning. When someone having a conversation, actually they said is true, but they make it too irony cover it with beautiful words and it becomes flouting of maxim quality.

The last is mock politeness or banter. According to Cutting (as cited in Ester, 2002), she states that mock politeness as a mild aggression which expresses a negative sentiment but implies a positive one. Mock politeness happens when the speaker uses politeness utterance but actually is not sincere. When someone having a conversation, the speaker lies by using politeness and becomes flouting of maxim quality.

Example :

Nana : can I sleep in your house?

Rini : why?

Nana : because my mother's going to **kill** me, I lost my tupperware

In this conversation, Nana's word **kill** is indicated flouting of maxim quality by using hyperbole. The word "kill" in Nana's utterance is an exaggerated statement. Because Nana lost her tupperware, her mother will get angry but not angry enough to kill her daughter. The purpose of using this word is to express feelings and condition of Nana because her mother will get angry.

2.3.2. Flouting of Maxim Quantity

Flouting of maxim quantity is when the speaker is blatantly observing maxim of quantity. According to Thomas (2013), he explains flouting of the maxim of quantity is a situation when a speaker blatantly gives more or informative than the situation requires. It means that flouting of maxim quantity is when the speaker gives information more or less than the expectation.

Example :

Jessica : well, how do I look?

Harry : **your dress is nice**

In this conversation, Harry does flouting of maxim quantity by giving information less than required. Harry's utterance **your dress is nice** is less information because Jessica asks him about her whole appearance, but Harry only appearance in her dress. He does not say directly that the dress or her shoes look

nice, which means that he is not impressed with the rest of what she is wearing. To avoid offending Jessica, Harry decides not to obey the maxim of quantity and just saying that Jessica's dress is nice.

2.3.3. Flouting of Maxim Relevance

Flouting of maxim relevance is when the speaker is blatantly observing maxim of relevance. According to Cutting (as cited in Ester, 2017), she states flouting the maxim of relation as an exchanging topic by using irrelevant comment, but it expected that a hearer knows the meaning by making connection between current topic and the preceding one. Flouting of maxim relevance happens when the speaker gives an utterance that did not relevant to the topic of conversation but expected the hearer to know the meaning by making connection between the current topic and the preceding one.

Usually flouting of maxim relevance happened when the speaker or the reader answer with exchanging topic but expected that they knowing the meaning by making the connection between current topic.

Example :

Jack : we expected a better game

Julian : **I expected better food**

In this conversation, Jack refers to the game but Julian refers to the food. Even though Julian does not seem to cooperate in replying to the statement, Jack still understands that Julian did not agree with his statement. Julian decides not to obey the maxim of relevance to showing his statement about carnival, because the games in the carnival is less than Jack's thinking and another side Julian also thinks that food in the carnival is not delicious.

2.3.4. Flouting of Maxim Manner

Flouting of maxim manner is when the speaker is blatantly observers maxim of manner. According to Cutting (as cited in Ester, 2017), she states that flouting the maxim of manner happens when a speaker does not talk clearly, appearing to obscure and tend to ambiguity. Flouting of maxim manner is when the speaker is

not talking clearly, appearing to obscure and tend to ambiguity and make the hearer have an option to answer. And also, according to Thomas (as cited in Riski, 2017), Flouting maxim of manner occurs when someone responds another person's question or statement in extremely long winded and convoluted statement while she could simple reply directly. Flouting maxim of manner is when the speaker responses to the question or statement in extremely long winded and convoluted while the speaker can simply reply directly.

Example :

Mother: where are you going?

Son : I am going to **get some fun thing**

Mother: ok, but do not be long, dinner's nearly ready

In this conversation, son gives ambiguous utterance, mention **get some fun thing** because he is trying to avoid says playing basketball, so his mother will allow him to get out because the dinner is nearly ready, he fears that she may not allow him to play basketball. Son decides not to obey the maxim of manner to get out from house and playing basketball.

2.4.Implicature

Implicature in pragmatics is an indirect or implicit speech act happened when the speaker's utterance is not part of what is explicitly said.

According to Levinson (1983), he explains the notion of implicature provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what actually said. Implicature is explained how the utterance means more than what it said.

According to Yule (1996), implicature occurs when the hearer assumes that the speaker is being cooperative and intends to communicate something and that something must be more than just what the words mean. Implicature happens when the hearer assumes that the speaker has something in the utterance more than the words mean.

According to Horn (2006), what a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood. When the speaker communicates the meaning of what the speaker's utterance is different. They have another meaning, more than what a literally.

Implicature is divided into two types which are conventional and conversational implicatures. The first is conventional implicature. According to Grice (1975), an understanding of conventional implication supposes the reader's listener has general experience and knowledge. Conventional implicature is when the implicate of utterance is general meaning, everyone knows it and has the same experience. And the second is conversational implicature. According to Levinson (1991), 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. Conversation implicature is when the implicate of utterance has implicated during conversation and non-conventional is the utterance has no relation between the topic before.

Example from Levinson (1983) :

A : Can you tell me the time?

B : Well, the milkman has come.

Since A does not have a watch, A asks B about the time. B does not know the exact time but B gives information that can provide the time by saying the milkman has come. B tries to obey the cooperative principle by giving a clue that the present time can be indicated by the arrival of the milkman.

2.5.Literature Review

In this literature review, I choose some previous studies written by other authors in order to support this research. Some journals that have the same theme on my research, I will review and see the similarity and the difference. There are three previous studies chosen as follows :

The similarities in the themes that I read before in the journal by Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) entitled “Some Instances of Violation and Flouting of The Maxim of Quantity by The Main Characters (Barry & Tim) in Dinner for Schmucks”, the similarity in this journal is using Grice’s flouting maxim of quantity.

In this journal, the authors not only focused on flouting maxim of quantity but in violation maxim. It seeks to find if there is any occasion in which one party opts out of the conversation. It is noteworthy to take a close look at conversational exchanges in such movies. The findings of this study indicate that in five occasions the characters violated the maxim of quantity. The difference between this journal and my research is this journal analyzes violation maxim by main character in “Dinner for Schmucks” movie and focuses on flouting maxim of quantity and using descriptive qualitative for methods of research.

The journal by Ria, Nababan, Djatmika (2018) entitled “The Influence of Translation Techniques on The Accuracy and Acceptability of Translated Utterances That Flout The Maxim of Quality”, the similarities between my research and the journal are analyzing about flouting maxim of quality used grice’s theory and used content analysis for methods of research.

In this journal, the authors focused on translating the implied meanings in utterances is one of the trickiest situations translators may confront. When a speaker flouts the maxim of quality, they are implying further information that is not represented in utterance. Translators use various translation techniques in order to find the same meaning as the original one in the most appropriate and acceptable from the target text. The difference between this journal and my research is this journal focused on analyzed about flouting maxim of quality between 4 types of Grice’s maxim. The authors focused on translated utterances that flout maxim of quality in movie “Me Before You”.

The third review is journal by Safitri and Faridi (2018) entitled “The Flouting of Grice’s Cooperative Principle by Native and NonNative Speakers of English”, the similarity in this journal is using Grice’s maxims to focus on flouting maxims.

In this journal, the authors were intended to explain the flouting maxims of Grice's by native and non-native speakers of English in "Insight with Desi Anwar" talk show, how the host used repair strategies to overcome the guest who flouting the maxims, the reason for using the strategies, and the contribution of the finding to teaching English as a foreign language. The difference between this journal and my research is this journal used descriptive qualitative for methods of research and the object of research is a transcript talk show.

From some literature review above, these are novelty from my research (1) using 4 types of flouting maxim for my research to analyze the data, (2) explaining Grice's maxims, flouting of maxims, and giving examples, (3) explaining the reason for flouting maxims, (4) using implicature for my research to analyze the data.

