CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

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

2.1.   Pragmatics

Pragmatics is often described as the study of language use, not language structure. The term of pragmatics was first introduced by Charles Morris as one of the three components of sign science (semiotics). Morris (1938: 29-30) defines pragmatics specifically as the study of the relationship of signs to interpreters. Pragmatics is roughly defined in current linguistics as the study of language use in context. There are many linguists, especially those concerned in pragmatics defined the pragmatics differently.

Levinson (1983: 5-7) views pragmatics as the study of language usage. Pragmatics is the study of those principles that will account for why a specific set of sentences are odd, or not possible utterances. That set (Levinson, 1983: 5-7) might include:

> *"Come there please!"*
>
> *"Aristotle was Greek, but 1 don't believe it"*
>
> *"Fred's children are hippies, and he has no children"*
>
> *"I order you not to obey this order"*
>
> *"As everyone knows, the earth please revolves around the sun"*

The description of the anomalies shown by these sentences might be delivered by pointing out that there are no, or at least no, ordinary contexts in which they could be suitably used. Although an approach of this classification may be quite a good way of illustrating the kind of principles that pragmatics is concerned

with, it will hardly do as an explicit definition of the field - for the simple reason that the set of pragmatic (as opposed to semantic, syntactic or sociolinguistic) anomalies are presupposed, rather than described. In other words, pragmatics is the deconstruction of language from a functional perspective, that is, it attempts to explain elements of linguistic structure by reference to non-linguistic pressures and causes.

The wider definition comes from Yule, according to Yule (1996: 3), pragmatics is concerned with four dimensions of meaning: pragmatics is the discipline that studies meaning as it is communicated by a speaker or writer and interpreted by a listener or reader. It also studies contextual meaning, which is the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context affects what is said, This text explores two areas of study: how listeners can make inferences about what is said to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning, and how speakers determine how much needs to be said based on the assumption of the listener's relative distance. The language used is clear, concise, and objective, with a formal register and precise word choice. The text adheres to conventional structure and formatting, including consistent citation and footnote style. It is free from grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and punctuation errors. The content of the improved text closely follows the source text and does not introduce any new aspects.

From the theories above, pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies what a speaker implies and what a listener infers based on factors such as the situational setting, the individuals' mental states, the preceding dialogue, and other things. Pragmatic is an important thing in the study of language, it can help the speaker and listener's point of view to avoid misinterpretation.

2.2. Context

When delivering and understanding speech in communication, both speakers and listeners are influenced by several elements outside the language itself, which are behind the occurrence of the speech. This is known as context. Context is one of the factors that influence how people use language. According to Asher (1994: 731), context is one of those linguistic terms that is constantly used in all

sorts of contexts but never explained. It has a relationship with meaning and is important in pragmatics. Finnegan et al. (1997: 345) state that an essential element in the interpretation of an utterance is the context in which the utterance is spoken. Context can influence the speaker in using the language. Yule (1996: 21) states that context simply means the physical environment in which a word is used.

Mey (1993: 39-40) defines context as a dynamic rather than a static concept, context is more than just a matter of reference and understanding of things. It gives deeper meaning to utterances. The utterance *"It's been a while since we visited your mother"* uttered in the living room by a couple, has a very different meaning from that uttered by a couple standing in front of the hippo enclosure at the zoo, which could be taken as a joke. Context also adds depth to speech. It is also crucial in assigning appropriate values to phenomena like presuppositions, implicatures, and the complete context-oriented feature set. In the past, linguists analyzed sentences regardless of context, today linguists consider context in understanding the meaning of sentences.

So, context refers to information that helps readers accurately interpret the meaning of a text. Context can take many forms, including background information or details about the circumstances, environment, or time frame of an action.

2.3. Cooperative Principle

In order to communicate successfully, humans must comply with certain modes of interaction. Each interlocutor in each conversation must follow specific conversation norms in order for communication to be successful. Grice (1975: 45-47) created a cooperative principle based on these parameters that everyone must follow in order for communication to be successful. The cooperative principle stated by Grice is as follows: make your conversational contribution as necessary, at the stage in which it occurs, to the purpose or direction of the accepted conversational exchange in which you engage.

Grice (1975: 45) proposed four conversational principles. This set of maxims is a guideline for people who are in conversation with others in order to achieve the purpose of the conversation efficiently, maximally, and rationally. For this purpose, they must speak truthfully and not try to deceive, be relevant, by giving

answers that are appropriate to the topic, be clear not giving vague and ambiguous answers, and provide information as needed with contributions that are informative in accordance with the purpose of the conversation. Grice calls these categories as: quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

2.3.1. Maxim of Quantity

The category 'quantity' relates to the amount of information that should be given, and underneath it are the following maxims: make contributions that are as informative as needed (for the purpose of the content of the conversation), and do not make contributions that are more informative than needed (Grice, 1975: 46). This category (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:

Elveno : Where is the nearest *warteg*?

Kenzie : It is across the grocery mart.

Elveno asks Kenzie where the nearest *warteg* (local restaurant) is and Kenzie knows where the nearest *warteg* is to where they were talking, which is across from the grocery mart. It is because Kenzie's answer is informative and explicit that the nearest *warteg* is across from the grocery mart. Kenzie gives information as an expectation, he said directly that the nearest *warteg* is across from the grocery mart.

2.3.2. Maxim of Quality

Under the category of 'quality' is the supermaxim: try to make contributions that are true, and two more specific maxims such as, don't say what you believe to be false, and also don't say something for which there is insufficient evidence (Grice, 1975: 46). This category (maxim of quality) suggests the speaker to be true. The speaker must say what he believe to be true, and do not say something lacks evidence.

Example:

Abran puts his dirty clothes on the table, then he goes to take a shower. Sara looks at her clothes and immediately puts them in the washing machine. After Abran finishes showering, he asks Sara, his mother.

Abran : Where are my clothes?

Sara   : I put it in the washing machine.

Sara really puts Abran's clothes in the washing machine, so it is completed the maxim of quality because Sara tells the truth. When Abran asks her about his clothes that are gone on the table, Sara answers it truthfully that she puts Abran's clothes on the washing machine.

2.3.3. Maxim of Relation

Under the category of 'relationship', it must be 'relevant'. Although the maxim itself is short, its formulation contains a number of issues that are of great interest to Grice: questions about what kinds and foci of relevance there might be, how topics change during the exchange of speech, how to allow for the fact that the subject of speech is legitimately changed, and so on (Grice, 1975: 46). This category (maxim of relation) suggests the speaker to be relevant. The speaker need to contribute as relevant as the topic of conversation.

Example:

Ibnu : How was the food?

Ara   : It was fantastic.

The conversation above is clear enough, between the question and answer are relevant, and it is complete the maxim of relation. When Ibnu asks, Ara's answer is related to the question. Ibnu asks about the food that they ate before and Ara answers that it was fantastic relates to Ibnu's question.

2.3.4. Maxim of Manner

Finally, under the category of 'manner', which Grice understands as referring not (like the previous categories) to what is said, but rather to how what is said is to be said, Grice includes the supermaxim 'Be perspicuous' and various maxims such as: Avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid

unnecessary prolixity), be orderly (Grice, 1975: 46). This category (maxim of manner) suggests the speaker and listener to be clear. It means that the utterance must directly, avoid ambiguity, brief and orderly, refers to what it is expressed.

Example:

Tasya : Where did you buy that bag?

Arum : I bought it in Senayan City.

Tasya : In which store in Senayan City did you buy it?

Arum : At Charles & Keith.

This conversation is clear and without any misinterpretation. Between the question and the answer are brief, avoid ambiguity, and refer to what is expressed. Tasya asks the question about where Arum gets the bag and Arum answers it clear that she buys her bag in Senayan City. Another question from Tasya, she asks in which store in Senayan City Arum buys the bag and Arum answers that she buys it at Charles & Keith.

2.4. Violation of Maxim

Interlocutors in a dialogue have a tendency to follow all rules in order to communicate effectively. However, there are specific occasions in which people fail to respect the maxims; they may deliberately or inadvertently fail to follow the maxims due of their goal of interaction. According to Grice (1989: 30), a participant in a discourse can fail to fulfill a maxim in a variety of ways and one of them is someone may quietly violate a maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead.

According to Grice (1989: 28), violation occurs when speakers intentionally omit to apply certain maxims in their conversation in order to cause misunderstanding on the part of their participants or to achieve some other purpose (deception). A speaker is said to have violated the maxim by giving blatantly false information so that the interlocutor is left with only the literal meaning of the utterance. According to Grice's basic theory, there are four categories of maxim

violation. They are: violation of the quantity maxim, violation of the quality maxim, violation of the relation maxim, violation of the manner maxim.

2.4.1. Violation Maxim of Quantity

Violation of the maxim of quantity is caused by the utterances being conveyed that are not as informative as necessary, some are exaggerated or subtracted for whatever purpose is communicated. Cutting (2002: 40) states, when a speaker violates the maxim of quantity, the speaker is not giving the listener enough information to know what is being talked about because the speaker does not want the listener to have the full picture. The speaker is not implying anything, but rather being economical with the truth.

Example:

Naswa : How much money did you take from my wallet?

Nayla : I just took a few.

Nayla knows exactly how much money she took from Naswa's wallet, yet she intentionally does not give her enough information, for reasons best known to herself. Nayla has violated the maxim of quality because she does not mention how much money that she takes from Naswa's wallet. Nayla has given less information than is required.

2.4.2. Violation Maxim of Quality

Violation of the maxim of quality is caused by the truth of the facts in the speech conveyed, whether it is true or false, if conveying information that does not have sufficient evidence, it can become a hoax. Cutting (2002: 40) says, a speaker can violate the maxim of quality by not being sincere and tend to give wrong information to a hearer. If the speaker violates the maxim of quality, they are not being genuine and providing the listener the wrong information.

Example:

Khansa : What do you think of my drawing?

Gendis : It is wonderful!

Khansa asks Gendis' opinion of the drawing she made, and Gendis answers that the picture Khansa made is wonderful. But the truth is that everyone knows that Khansa cannot draw, and Gendis lies about her opinion so that Khansa will not be offended. Gendis has violated the maxim of quality because she is lying about her opinion of Khansa's drawing. She does not want Khansa to be offended by saying the truth.

2.4.3. Violation Maxim of Relevance

Violation of the maxim of relevance is caused by the utterances being conveyed are not relevant to what is being discussed. Usually used to divert the conversation that someone want to avoid. Cutting (2002: 40) defines that violating in maxim of relation happens when speaker try to distract and change the topic to another one.

Example:

Scarlet : Do you still love me?

Chan   : Do you still remember the day we met?

Scarlet asks Chan whether he still loves her or not, but Chan does not answer Scarlet's question but seems to avoid the question asked by Scarlet. Chan's answer is considered as violating maxim of relation because his answer is irrelevant to the question. It is definitely that he is trying to avoid the topic.

2.4.4. Violation Maxim of Manner

Violation of the maxim of manner is caused because the utterances conveyed are not conveyed clearly, and can create ambiguity. Cutting (2002: 40) defines that violation of the maxim of manner occurs when someone gives ambiguous and vague reference in order to avoid a brief and orderly answer in a conversation.

Example:

The old lady answers the interviewer's question in a way that could be said to be violating the maxim of manner, in that she says everything except what the interviewer wants to know:

X   : What would the other people say?

Y   : Ah well I don't know. I wouldn't like to repeat it because I don't really believe half of what they are saying. They just get a fixed thing into their mind.

Her "half of what they are saying" is an obscure reference to the other people's opinion, and "a fixed thing" contains a general noun containing vague reference. She may be using these expressions to avoid giving a brief and orderly answer, for the moment (Cutting, 2002: 41). The old lady answers above has violated maxim of manner because her answer is obscure.

2.5. Movie Script

According to Kooperman (2010: 2), movie script is a document that contains dialogue for directing the actor, and the director and the producer use it to make a movie. A movie script or screenplay containing dialogue and directions for the actors, designers, directors, and producers to make a movie. A movie script is a document that describes the elements needed to tell stories. Movie script is a results from an idea and teamwork from one writer to another, as well as the director or producer.

Based on the above definitions, a movie script is a document that contains the dialogue for directing the actor and outlines every visual, behavioural, and linguistic element needed to tell a story. It is also the result of an idea and collaboration from one writer to another writer as well as the director or producer.

2.6. Previous Related Studies

In supporting this research, there are several previous studies that have similarities and differences with this research. The first related study is a research by Damayanti (2021) with the title "The Flouting of Conversational Maxim by Main Characters in "Maleficent: Mistress of Evil" (2019) Movie Script". This research discusses about flouting of conversational maxim by main character in "Maleficent: Mistress of Evil" (2019) movie by Joachim Ronning. The research approach used qualitative and content analysis for methods of the research. The object of research is transcript "Maleficent: Mistress of Evil" (2019) movie. The

result of the study reveals that all types of maxim are contained in "Maleficent: Mistress of Evil" (2019) movie. It was concluded that there are 20 data classified as flouting maxim of relevance, 12 data classified as flouting maxim of manner, 8 data classified as flouting maxim of quality, 4 data classify as flouting maxim of quantity.

The second related study is a research by Dzikrulloh (2022) with the title "Failures of Conversational Maxim Found in "The Queen Gambit" Serial Script 2020". In his research, it was concluded characters in "The Queen Gambit" have committed 58 kinds of non-observance maxims found in conversation, and among those, there are 25 flouting of maxim of manner, which is the most frequently occurred in the serial, 14 flouting of maxim of relation, 10 flouting the maxim of quantity, 7 violating maxim of quality, 1 violating the maxim of relation, and 1 violating the maxim of manner. Also 2 types of conversational implicature.

The third related study is a research by Nila Kusuma Wati (2015) with the title "An Analysis of Grice's Maxim violation in Daily Conversation: A Study at English Department Students Semester VIII Academic Year 2014/2015". The purpose of this study is to look at how English Department students use Grice's maxims in their regular conversations. 63 students from semester VIII were chosen as subjects for the study. Random sampling was employed to determine the sample. The sample size were four male students and ten female students. In the analysis of data, the descriptive qualitative method is applied. Three procedures were employed to collect data: recording, taking notes, and conducting interviews. After data collection, the recorded conversations (which ranged in duration from 5 to 7 minutes) were sorted and translated. The results revealed that the following maxims were violated: quantity (11 time), quality (7 times), relevance (3 times), and manner (5 times). The causes for breaching the approved maxims are cultural and social. In conclusion, the most commonly neglected maxim was the quantity maxim.

The similarity of my research compared to the three previous studies mentioned above is we use the same approach which is a pragmatic approach. But there are also several differences for instance: the object of the research, and the topic of the research. I want to focus on analyzing the violation of the maxim found

in the movie script, while the first and second studies had the same object by analyzing a movie script, but the topic of the research is different where the research of the first studies focused on analyze the flouting of the maxims, and the second studies focus on analyze failures of the maxims, meanwhile, my research focuses on analyzing the violation of maxims. On the other hand, the third previous studies and my research use the same topic for the research which is the violation of the maxims, but the difference is in the third study the researcher focuses on the violation in daily conversation that conducted by 8th-semester students in English Department, while on my own research, I focus on violation maxim by characters in "Glass Onion: A Knives Out Mystery" (2022) movie script.