

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter discusses an explanation of what pragmatics is and the contexts. This chapter also discusses cooperative principles which are suitable to analyse the utterances spoken by the characters of “The Gentlemen” to reveal what kinds of maxim they violated, how they did it and why do they violate it. Also, discusses violating maxims. Moreover, last, I put some of the previous related studies.

#### 2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of language use in relation to context. Pragmatics is typically defined as the study of how statements make sense in a given context. According to Crystal (1987, p. 62) Pragmatics is a factor that governs the language of what you want to choose in a language pool that you may meet whenever used in social interactions, and that is the other factor. It deals with the impact on people. Therefore, the pragmatic factor that influences the choice of grammatical structure is the meaning we create by presenting vocabulary through such sound patterns and procedures intended as a means of communication (Crystal. 1987, p.62). Associate it with the meaning of words that people use in social situations and the choice of words in context. The study of speaker meaning is called pragmatics. Students study pragmatics to learn how to interpret the speaker's meaning.

Yule (1996, p.4) defines pragmatics as the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of these forms. Yule defines as the study of how people use language in social contexts and how meaning is conveyed beyond the literal interpretation of words. Yule emphasizes that pragmatics is concerned with the way language users understand and interpret messages based on shared knowledge, cultural conventions, and the context in which communication occurs.

The study of pragmatics focuses on the connection between communication, context, and meaning. In Paul Grice’s article “Logic and Conversation” (1975), argues “some kind of cooperative principles must be assumed to be in operation. Sub-categories of Pragmatics: Speech act Theory, Felicity Conditions,

Conversational Implicature, The Cooperative Principle, Conversational Maxims, Relevance, Politeness, Phatic Tokens, Deixis”. Through pragmatics, contextual meaning is exploited and analyzed to discover the “real” meaning.

In pragmatics, it is so called a context, context can be defined as the combination of the physical, social, cultural, and linguistic factors that shape the meaning of an utterance.

## **2.2. Context**

A situational context or context of situation is important in communication. Context is one of the factors that give an effect to people how they use the language. Yule (1996,21) states that context simply means the physical environment in which a word is used.

The importance of taking of context into account is also well expressed by Hymes (in Brown & Yule, 1983:37) who views the role of context in interpretation as limiting the range of possible interpretation and as supporting the interpretation.

Cutting (2002: 3) classify three types of contexts in communication:

- a) The situational context; what speakers know about what they can see around them.
- b) The background knowledge context; what they (speaker and hearer) now about each other and the world.
- c) The co-textual context; what speakers know about what they have been in saying.

In conclusion context is a set of ideas, situations, events, or information in a speech situation, and help the speaker interpret or understand the intent of the speaker which include the setting and scene, the participants, ends, act sequence, instrumentalities, norms of interaction and interpretation, and genre.

## **2.3. Cooperative Principle**

The cooperative principle and its associated maxims serve as guidelines for cooperative and effective communication. They are based on the assumption that

individuals engaged in conversation have a shared goal of mutual understanding and cooperation.

there are also some actions towards cooperative principle. Grice (1975) said that there are the other 4 moves in the direction of cooperative principle, which can be to take a look at the maxim way that to comply with obey the maxim, to violate a maxim manner that no longer observing a maxim with the purpose of deceptive the interlocutor, to flout a maxim means that now not looking at a maxim with the purpose that the interlocutor is aware of it, and to opting out a maxim means that refusing to be worried at all. but there also are different moves closer to cooperative principle that are infringing method that the speaker is fail to take a look at the maxim due to the fact the lack of awareness, and suspending a maxim this means that in certain situation there is no expectation that the maxim can be determined yet the non-observant motion will not generate any implicatures (Thomas, 2013).

From the explanation in the preceding paragraph, it is clear that maxim is divided into. namely observance and non-observance maxim. Observance maxim is whilst the speaker follows the rule of thumb of conversational maxim. while non-observance maxim is while the speaker does no longer following the rules of conversational maxim. furthermore, it is better to get to recognize greater about every of the cooperative principle's partition.

According to Grice (1975), the principle of cooperation is to contribute to the conversation as needed, at the stage in which it takes place, according to the accepted purpose or direction of the conversational exchange. To understand the concept of cooperative principles, let's take a look at scenario proposed by Yule (1996: 36). There is a woman sitting on a park bench and a large dog lying on the ground in front of the bench. A man comes along and sits down on the bench.

Man : "Does your dog bite?"

Woman : "No"

(The man reaches down to pet the dog. The dog bites the man's hand).

Man : "Ouch! Hey! You said your dog doesn't bite."

Woman : “He doesn’t. But that’s not my dog.”

The woman's initial response creates an expectation based on the Maxim of Quality that her dog is present and does not bite. However, the unexpected turn of events reveals that the dog that bit the man is not, in fact, her dog. The woman's response in the end clarifies the situation, but it involves a play on words and a misdirection. So, the humour in this exchange arises from the violation of the Maxim of Quality, as the information provided by the woman turns out to be misleading.

Grice explained in conversation, participants strive to make their contributions meaningful, informative, truthful, and relevant. The principles of cooperation consist of four principles. Maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner. Each of these maxims has its own role in making the conversation as collaborative as it needs to be. More on this below.

### **2.3.1. Maxim of Quantity**

The maxim of quantity is a rule that makes a speaker's contribution as informative as possible (Grice, 1975). The speakers are expected to provide sufficient information. Sufficient information means that the speaker is expected to provide information related to the question, only providing the necessary information, no more or less. This means that when someone asks their name, their partner can only say their name as an answer.

Speakers should provide enough information to make the conversation informative, but not excessively so. They should offer the right amount of detail and avoid being overly vague or excessively verbose. Here is the example:

(1) A : “Where’s your parents?”

B : “upstairs.”

A : “How are their condition right now?”

B : “They’re fine.”

A : “Have you eaten?”

B : “Yes, I have.”

(2) A : “Where’s your parents?”

B : “Upstairs, they’re fine right now, I’m not hungry thanks.”

In the example number 1, example number 1 is more cooperative than number 2. B in the example number 1 gives a contribution, which is required by A in every steps of communication. However, B in (2) is uncooperative since B contributes excessively, as seen by how their condition, the food; which is not required by A in that conversation response. It provides the necessary information without excessive elaboration.

It is possible to suspend the Maxim of Quantity in order to deceive a conversation partner. For example:

Context : Abdul is organizing a surprise party for his friend, Budi. Budi's sister, Farhan, wants to find out about the plans without giving away the surprise.

Farhan : “What are you and the others doing for Budi's birthday tonight?”

Abdul : "Oh, just a small gathering at a restaurant, nothing special."

Abdul’s utterance is uncooperative and violating the maxim of quantity because Abdul does not share information Farhan needs, however the purpose of Abdul’s utterance is that Abdul does not want to give Farhan about the party because Abdul wants to misleading Farhan to maintain the surprise.

Another example of the violation of maxim of quantity that does not give the appropriate information is:

Fuad : “When is your birthday?”

Rizka : “July.”

In the conversation above, the answer given by Rizka seems too short since Rizka does not give the exact date of her birthday. However, Fuad should consider that Rizka In fact, cooperates in this conversation, and the violation maxim of quantity is caused by Rizka's intention to follow the cooperation principle.

Another example of violation of maxim of quantity that could trigger anger.

Yanto : "Why were you late for the meeting?"

Anton : "Traffic."

In the conversation above, Anton's response is very brief and lacks detailed information. Yanto might interpret this response as a violation of the maxim of quantity because it doesn't provide enough information to explain the lateness adequately. Yanto may feel frustrated or angry because the response seems insufficient and doesn't address the expectation of a more detailed explanation, considering the importance of the meeting.

### 2.3.2. Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality has a relation with the quality of the speakers' contribution in conversation. Speakers are expected to say only what they believe to be true and to have evidence for what they say. Crystal (1994 : 117) "the maxim of quality states that speakers' contribution to a conversation ought to be true. They should not say what they believe to be false, nor should they say anything for which they lack of adequate evidence".

Speakers should strive to be truthful and provide accurate information. They should avoid saying things they believe to be false or for which they lack adequate evidence.

A : "Did you eat the last piece of cake?"

B : "No, I didn't. I didn't even touch it."

Person B's response adheres to the maxim of quality by providing a truthful statement and denying eating the last piece of cake.

another example shows that the speaker follows the maxim of quality by saying the truth.

Nanda : "What do you need right now, sir?"

Anto : "I need 2 bottles of water please."

Here, B has followed the maxim of quality by saying what he wants.

### 2.3.3. Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relevance is the speaker to speak relevantly according to what context the speaker and hearer get in a conversation. According with Grice explanations in Levinson (1996, 102). The maxim of relevance: make your contributions relevant. Speakers are expected to organize their utterances in such a way that are relevant to the ongoing context. The maxim of relevance according to Crystal (1994, 117) states that “contribution should clearly relate to the purpose of the exchange”.

Contributions made in conversation should be relevant to the current topic or direction of the conversation. Speakers should aim to stay on topic and avoid introducing irrelevant or unrelated information. For the example:

Masa : “My bike is overhauled”

Mba : “I’ll help you until we get to garage”

In this dialogue, Mba’s response follows the maxim of relevance. It means that Mba’s response is cooperative. Mba’s contribution has relation with Masa’s utterance. Masa talks about his bike which is overhauled, whereas, Mba hears Masa’s utterance and Mba expresses her utterance which is in relevance with Masa’s utterance.

Speakers sometimes violate or do not follow the maxim of relation. For example:

Kaka : “What did you think of the movie we saw last night?”

Bina : “Let’s eat something now, I’m hungry”

In order to preserve the assumption of cooperation, Bina will have to infer some local reason.

The maxim of relation can sometimes be suspended by a speaker who wants to create a particular impression (O’Grady, et al, 1997: 301), for example:

A: Have you finished that essay yet?

B: It’s been raining a lot lately, hasn’t it? (O’Grady, et al, 1997: 301)

B's utterance violates or does not follow the maxim of relevance by not responding in a relevant way. Grice in Mammariidu (2000: 230) "considers the maxim of relevance is very important is generating implicature".

A: Can you tell me the time?

B: Well, the milkman has come. (Levinson, 1995: 107)

B's answer is not cooperative, because B does not give a relevant response to A. If we assume that B's utterance is relevant and follows the maxim of relevance, the utterance "the milkman's coming" might provide A with the means of deriving a

#### **2.3.4. Maxim of Manner**

Grice in Levinson (1995: 102) states that "the maxim of manner: be perspicuous, and specifically: avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity. Be brief, and be orderly." About maxim of manner, Crystal (1994: 117) states that "the contribution should be perspicuous in particular, that it should be orderly and brief, avoiding obscurity and ambiguity".

Speakers should strive to be clear, orderly, and concise in their contributions. They should avoid ambiguity, obscurity, or using unnecessarily complicated language.

A : "Can you please explain how this software works?"

B : "Well, it's a bit like an intricate dance of algorithms, with a series of complex processes intricately intertwined, resulting in the desired output."

B's response violates the maxim of manner by being overly complicated and using excessive language. It could have been clearer and more concise in explaining how the software works.

Thus, we expect a person's contribution to an interaction to be genuine, neither more nor less than is required, as well as clear and appropriate to the interaction. Grice argues that we assume a speaker is following these maxims and



combine this with our knowledge of the world to work out what they mean by what they say.

For example, a neighbour might say “There is a cat stuck under the 26 gate at number 67. Following the conversational maxims, he assumes the neighbour is telling the truth, is being relevant, and has said no more because she wants to be brief and clear. So, he interpret what she says as an you help me free the cat stuck under the gate at number 67?” (Cook 1989).

The speakers should not use words that the speakers know the listeners will not understand or say something, that the speakers could take it in multiple ways. Here is an example of a maxim of manner:

In informal situation the co-operational speech is like:

*Bu, Biasanya!* (Miss, The usual!)

*Ikan!* (Fish!)

“Fried *Bawal* fish”!

The Maxim of Manner should be brief, avoid obscurity, and ambiguity. The example can be found in Grice (in Fasold,1990:130-131)

- a) Fatur presented a comprehensive report on the project.
- b) Fatur verbally articulated a detailed account of the project's progress.

A speaker opting for (b) isn't necessarily violating the quality sub-maxim, as the essential information can still be effectively conveyed with a statement akin to (a).

Sometimes, the participants of conversation violate the maxim deliberately. Leech (1982:32) states, “it has been reported to me that in certain places a stranger asking a question (for example asking the way to destination) will characteristically be given false answer in preference to an uninformative one”.

#### **2.4. Violating Maxim**

An expert mentioned the definition of violating maxim is the condition when people do not obey the maxims (Cutting, 2008). By doing the violation, the

speakers do not let the listeners to get the true information. In another word, people are indicated to violate the maxim when they fail to observe the maxim to deceive the listener, it can be the result of lying. Beside all of the maxim that already mentioned above, Grice (1975) also stated that violating maxim is fail to observe it, with the assumption that your hearer would not realize that the maxim is being violated. More on this below:

#### **2.4.1. Violating of Maxim Quantity**

As the definition of maxim quantity already described in the cooperative principles part, this part is the place of violating maxim of quantity. In violating maxim of quantity, the speaker does not give the required or enough information to the listeners. Because the speakers try to mislead the listeners in order to deceive them.

A : "How was your day?"

B : "Fine."

In this example, Person B violates the maxim of quantity by providing an insufficient amount of information. Person B could have elaborated further to provide a more informative response about their day.

#### **2.4.2. Violating of Maxim Quality**

The definition of violating maxim of quality is provide the wrong information, or they do not honestly tell the information. As the definition of maxim quality is provide the true information and also gives the information honestly, here is the definition of violating maxim. In this violating maxim the speaker intentionally gives the wrong information.

A : "Did you eat the last cookie?"

B : "No, I didn't eat it. Well, maybe I did."

In this example, Person B violates the maxim of quality by providing conflicting information. Their response implies that they may have eaten the last cookie despite initially denying it.

#### **2.4.3. Violating of Maxim Relation**

Violating maxim of relation is a maxim happens when the speaker does not answer the question relevantly to the topic of the conversation. Violating maxim of relation happens when the answer is out of topic. The aims to distract the listener and change the topic. As the definition of maxim of relation is to be relevant. Here is the example of violating maxim of relation.

A : "Can you help me fix my computer?"

B : "I just got a promotion at work!"

In this example, Person B violates the maxim of relevance by diverting the conversation to their promotion instead of addressing Person A's request for help with the computer. The response is unrelated and not relevant to the initial question.

#### **2.4.4. Violating of Maxim Manner**

Violating maxim of manner happens when the hearer answers the question by giving an ambiguous answer. As maxim of manner is each of the participant that contribute the conversation should not to be ambiguous, obscure, or disorderly. As in violating maxim the answer of the question is an ambiguous answer and also disorderly answer.

A : "What time is the meeting?"

B : "Well, let me think. You see, I woke up late, then I had breakfast, and then I realized I had forgotten to check the time. Hold on, I'll find my schedule."

In this example, Person B violates the maxim of manner by being excessively verbose, providing unnecessary details, and not directly answering the question. Person B's response lacks clarity and conciseness, making it difficult for Person A to get a straightforward answer.

#### **2.5 Previous Related Study**

There are some previous studies for this field. However, almost all of them are on the conversations of film and talk shows. One of these studies, which was done by Saiul Asropit (2012), addressed the violations of cooperative principles in "in The Naruto Comic Episode 440: A Conversation With The Fourth". In this

study, Saiul found 1 (15%) utterance follow the maxim and 24 (85%) utterances violate the maxim in the conversation between Naruto and Yondaime. Following this were violations of the maxim of manner, quantity, and quality. Saiul find some factor which influence the violation of the maxim, some of the characters are influenced by regretness, a boast, an admiration, a fearless, an anger, a worry, a sadness, and an annoyance.

A study by Adelia and Thomas in Indonesia (2020), identified the characters in *Divergent*. The finding showed that almost all the characters violate cooperative maxims. The characters combine those maxims to tell lie. They were lying to other characters in order to hide the truth and do not want to worsen a situation. Adelia and Thomas said in their conclusion that when people do multiple violations, people have reason for doing violation of maxim.

A study by Tesha Lilia Aritonang (2015), this study was about a violation of maxim on facebook status of university students in North Sumatera. This study analyzed the violation of maxim on facebook status and described the reason why they did it in the conversation. The result showed that the violation maxim of relation appeared as the most dominant type. The next most occurring violations were those of quantity and quality. Tesha said in the paper that there were three reasons why university students on facebook did violation, namely to show respect, change a topic, and create humor.

A study by Kartika Yulianti (2022), this study was about a pragmatic approach that focus on violating maxim. This study analyzed the violation of maxim in the television series. the researcher uses Orphan Black TV Series for the data source, this research focuses on the types of maxim violation and the implied meaning behind the violation. The theory of cooperative principle by Grice is used as the main theory in this analysis. The result in the first season of “Orphan Black” TV Series with the total of violation 16 times each, and misleading the interlocutor becomes the most reason in violating the maxim with 25 times of total appearances.

There were some similarities when looking at those studies above, although they had different context. The first similarity is the result of each studies show that they argued that when people violate cooperative principle, there are some reasons

behind it. The second is the methodology that they used. They used the same methodology; they used transcription, classification data and the result of analyzing data.

