

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Pragmatics

Many definitions of pragmatics written by the experts can be found. Yule (1996: 3) states that pragmatics is a study of contextual meaning. Pragmatics is a part of language studies that looks at how we use language in social situations to communicate well. It goes beyond just the grammar and words themselves. Pragmatics explores how the context and intended meaning affect the way we talk to each other. By studying pragmatics, we learn how to understand and have meaningful conversations by considering things like the situation, social factors, and what we really mean when we speak.

Meanwhile Levinson (1983: 5) views pragmatics as a study of language from the perspective of its users, especially in relation to the choices they make, the limitations they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects of the use of the language on other participants within the interaction. When we talk to each other, we do not just pay attention to the words we hear. We also think about things like the situation we are in, how we know the person we're talking to, what they mean, and the rules of how we should act. Pragmatics helps us understand how all these things affect what we understand and mean when we talk.

Additionally, Thomas (1995: 22) says that pragmatics looks at how people understand each other when they talk. It considers things like the situation, what words can mean, and how speakers and listeners work together to make sure they understand each other. Pragmatics goes beyond the simple or direct meaning of what someone says and explores how meaning is created in conversations. It also pays attention to the hidden or implied meanings that can be understood from the way something is said. Moreover, pragmatics also includes understanding how people communicate without using words, such as through their movements, facial expressions, and body language. These non-verbal signals can add meaning to what is being said. By paying attention to these signals, we can better understand what

the speaker wants to express and how they feel, which helps us understand their message more accurately.

2.2 Context

In pragmatic linguistics, context is incredibly important in determining the meaning of a conversation or text. Context refers to the surrounding details and conditions that help us understand what someone is trying to convey. It includes things like the words and sentences that come before and after a specific statement, the environment or situation in which the conversation takes place, and the shared understanding and beliefs between the speaker and listener (Leech, 1983: 13). By considering the context, we can gather valuable information and cues that assist us in comprehending the intended meaning behind a communication act.

According to Cutting (2002: 3), the meaning of what someone says can only be understood when we consider the situation they are in. This means that context not only affects the meaning of the words, but it actually decides what the words mean. In simpler terms, understanding what someone is saying depends on the specific situation they are in and the context that surrounds their words. Context is also helpful when we encounter words or phrases that could have more than one meaning. For example, the word "bank" could mean a place where we keep money or the edge of a river. The context gives us clues that help us figure out which meaning is being used. If we are talking about money and business, the word "bank" is probably about a place for financial transactions. But if we are talking about outdoor activities, it is more likely to be about the edge of a river.

Lastly, context in pragmatic linguistics means the information and situation around a conversation or text that help us understand it. It includes the words used before and after, the setting, and what everyone knows and how they act. When we think about the context, we can figure out what someone really means, clear up confusion, and understand language better.

2.3. Cooperative Principles

Cooperative principles are rules suggested by a philosopher named Grice to help people communicate better with each other. They say that when we talk to each

other, we should try to be helpful, tell the truth, stay on topic, and speak clearly. These principles remind us that communication is a team effort, and by following these guidelines, we can understand each other better and have better conversations. Grice himself stated that “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purposes of the talk exchange in which you are engaged to.” (Grice, 1989: 26)

Grice believed that good communication happens when both people talking and listening work together. The cooperative principles are guidelines to help us have smooth and meaningful conversations. They are not strict rules, but more like helpful suggestions that make sure we understand each other. These guidelines are usually called maxim. The four maxims of cooperative principles are as follows, maxim of quantity that the speakers should provide the right amount of information required for the conversation. They should avoid providing too little or too much information, striking a balance between being informative and overwhelming the listener. Maxim of quality, this principle emphasizes that speakers should strive to be truthful and provide accurate information. They should avoid making false statements or sharing information that they believe to be unsupported or lacking evidence. Maxim of relevance suggests that speakers should contribute relevant information to the ongoing conversation. They should stay on topic and avoid introducing unrelated information. The last is maxim of manner, this maxim focuses on the clarity and effectiveness of communication. Speakers should strive to express themselves clearly, avoid ambiguity, and follow the established rules and conventions of conversation. This includes using appropriate language, organizing thoughts logically, and avoiding unnecessary complexity (Grice, 1989: 42).

When we follow these cooperative principles in our conversations, we can build trust, have better communication, and understand each other more. These principles show that communication is something we do together, where both people talking and listening are important. Grice's ideas about cooperative principles have been very important in studying how we use language when we talk to each other. They help us understand that context, what we mean, and what we understand are all very important in how we communicate.

2.4 Violating the Maxims

Violating maxims means not following the rules or guidelines that help make conversations cooperative and effective. It happens when someone does not do what is expected in terms of being truthful, giving enough information, being relevant, or being clear. For example, if someone gives a vague or misleading answer instead of being honest or specific, they are violating a maxim. (Cutting, 2002: 40). Violating maxims can also occur in the four maxim principles:

2.4.1. Violating Maxim of Quality

Violating the maxim of quality happens when the speaker intentionally gives false information as the answer. According to Cutting (2002: 40), when a speaker violates the maxim of quality, they are not being sincere and may intentionally give incorrect or false information to the listener. This means that they are not being genuine in their communication and are misleading the listener by providing inaccurate or unreliable information. For example:

Husband : How much did that new dress cost, darling?
Wife : Less than the last one.
(Cutting, 2002: 40)

In this conversation, the wife does not adhere to this maxim by providing an answer that is intentionally misleading and vague. When the husband asks, "How much did that new dress cost, darling?" he is seeking specific information about the cost of the dress. However, the wife's utterance, "Less than the last one," does not directly address the husband's question with a truthful answer. Instead, it says that the new dress was cheaper than the previous one, but it fails to provide the actual cost, which is the information the husband was looking for.

2.4.2. Violating Maxim of Quantity

According to Cutting (2002: 40), violating maxim of quantity happens when the speaker gives too much or too little information the hearer needs. By violating the maxim of quantity, if the speaker gives too little information, the hearer would not be able to comprehend the full meaning and context of the speaker's answer.

Moreover, if the speaker gives too much information, the hearer may be bored. For example:

- A** : Does your dog bite?
B : No.
A : (Bends down to stroke it and gets bitten) Ow!
B : That isn't my dog. (2)

(Cutting, 2022: 40)

In this conversation, B's utterance, "No," to A's question, "Does your dog bite?" violates this maxim. When A asks, "Does your dog bite?" they are seeking to know whether the dog in front of them is prone to biting. This question calls for a clear and informative utterance because it has safety implications for A.

B's utterance, "No," is factually correct; however, it is insufficient to convey the complete picture. B should have provided additional information or clarification, such as, "No, my dog does not bite, but that dog over there does," to ensure that A has all the necessary information to make an informed decision about whether it is safe to approach the dog in front of them. As a result of B's incomplete utterance, A is led to believe that the dog in front of them is not a biter, which turns out to be incorrect and results in A getting bitten. This miscommunication and violation of the maxim of quantity could have been avoided if B had provided a more informative and complete utterance to A's initial question.

2.4.3. Violating Maxim of Relevance

Cutting (2002: 40) states that violating the maxim of relevance occurs when the speaker gives irrelevant information to the asked question. For example:

- Husband** : How much did that new dress cost, darling?
Wife : I know, let's go out tonight. Now, where do you want to go?

(Cutting, 2002: 40)

In this conversation, the husband asks about the cost of the new dress, a specific and clear question, but the wife's utterance diverts the conversation to a different topic, going out for the night. The husband's question is about the cost of the new dress, which is a financial matter and a topic of immediate concern. The wife's utterance, "I know, let's go out tonight. Now, where do you want to go?" is

unrelated to the husband's question about the dress's cost. Instead of providing a direct answer or addressing the husband's question, the wife introduces a new topic about their evening plans.

By shifting the topic away from the husband's question, the wife's utterance is not relevant to the ongoing conversation, and it fails to acknowledge or address the husband's inquiry. This lack of relevance can lead to confusion in the conversation because the husband's question remains unanswered. In a more relevant utterance, the wife could have provided an answer to her husband's question about the dress's cost first and then, if she wished, transitioned to discussing their evening plans. By doing so, she would have adhered to the maxim of relevance by keeping the conversation focused on the current topic before introducing a new one.

2.4.4. Violating Maxim of Manner

Violating the maxim of manners occurs when the speaker does not give a clear answer and often gives an ambiguous interpretation for the hearer (Cutting, 2002: 40). For example:

Husband	: How much did that new dress cost, darling?
Wife	: A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me.

(Cutting, 2002: 40)

In this conversation, the wife's utterance is unclear and somewhat ambiguous, violating the maxim of manner. When the husband asks, "How much did that new dress cost, darling?" he is seeking a straightforward and concise answer regarding the cost of the dress. However, the wife's utterance introduces a level of complexity and ambiguity by stating, "A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me."

This utterance contains two comparative statements that make it difficult to determine the actual cost of the dress: (1) "A tiny fraction of my salary": This statement does not provide a specific cost but rather a vague description of the dress's price relative to the wife's salary. (2) "Probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me": This statement introduces another layer of

comparison, but it does not directly answer the husband's question about the dress's cost.

The wife's utterance, while creative and possibly humorous, lacks the clarity and directness expected when answering a straightforward question about the cost of an item. It complicates the utterance with comparative statements that make it unclear how much the dress actually cost. This ambiguity in her utterance violates the maxim of manner, which encourages clear and unambiguous communication.

2.5. Flouting the Maxims

Flouting maxims means when the speaker expects the hearer to get the implied meaning of the utterances. (Cutting, 2002: 36). This happens when someone intentionally goes against what is expected or required in terms of being truthful, providing enough information, being relevant, or being clear. They do this to create a specific effect or to convey a hidden meaning that goes beyond the literal interpretation of their words. The study to interpret the hidden meaning in utterances is called the implicature. Grice (1975: 43) came up with the word "implicature" to describe when a speaker suggests or implies something without directly saying it. It means that the speaker is hinting at a meaning that goes beyond the literal words they use. Flouting a maxim is often used for rhetorical purposes or to add emphasis or humor to a conversation. Flouting maxims also occur in the four maxim principles:

2.5.1. Flouting Maxim of Quality

Flouting the maxim quality occurs when the utterance cannot be interpreted literally. There are two ways for the speaker to flout the maxim of quality, first they just do not say something that clearly does not represent what they think and second, they just say something with a hyperbole (Cutting, 2002: 37). For example:

Student : Teheran's in Turkey, isn't it, teacher?

Teacher: And London's in Armenia, I suppose.

(Levinson, 1983 cited from Ibrahim, Z., *et al.*, 2018: 85)

In this conversation between the student and the teacher, both participants are engaging in a form of humor or sarcasm, which involves flouting the maxim of

quality. When the student asks, "Teheran's in Turkey, isn't it, teacher?" they are clearly not seeking genuine information but rather making a sarcastic or intentionally false statement. The teacher's utterance, "And London's in Armenia, I suppose," mirrors the student's tone and responds with a similarly sarcastic and inaccurate statement. This exchange is not meant to convey accurate information but rather to engage in humor or irony. The participants are using the flouting of the maxim of quality to create a playful or sarcastic atmosphere in the conversation.

2.5.2. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Flouting maxim of quantity happens when the speaker gives too much or too little information (Cutting, 2002: 37). For example:

A : Well, how do I look?

B : Your shoes are nice...

(Cutting, 2002: 37)

In this conversation between A and B, B's utterance flouts the maxim of quantity. When A asks, "Well, how do I look?" they are seeking a comprehensive evaluation of their appearance, which implies that they want feedback on their overall appearance, not just their shoes. However, B's utterance, "Your shoes are nice....," is incomplete and focuses solely on one aspect of A's appearance—their shoes.

2.5.3. Flouting Maxim of Relevance

Cutting (2002: 39) states that the speaker assumes that the listener can understand the unspoken meaning behind their words and can link their statement to the previous parts of the conversation. For example:

A : So, what do you think of Mark?

B : His flatmate's a wonderful cook.

(Cutting, 2002: 39)

In this conversation between A and B, B's utterance flouts the maxim of relevance. When A asks, "So, what do you think of Mark?" they are seeking B's opinion or assessment of Mark as a person. This question implies a focus on Mark's character, personality, or some other aspect related to Mark as an individual.

However, B's utterance, "His flatmate's a wonderful cook," is unrelated to Mark's qualities or characteristics. Instead, it provides information about Mark's flatmate's cooking skills, which is not relevant to the question about Mark. B's utterance contains an implication that B is not impressed with Mark.

2.5.4. Flouting Maxim of Manner

Flouting maxim of manners happens when the speaker says something unclear and the utterance tends to be ambiguous (Cutting, 2002: 39). For example:

A : Where are you off to?

B : I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.

A : OK, but don't be long – dinner's nearly ready.

(Cutting, 2002: 39)

In this conversation between A and B, B's utterance flouts the maxim of manner. When A asks, "Where are you off to?" they are seeking information about B's destination or purpose for going out. However, B's utterance, "I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody," is deliberately vague and ambiguous because in this context B is avoiding saying 'ice cream' and 'Michelle' to prevent his young daughter from getting too excited and requesting ice cream before her meal. It introduces a level of ambiguity and uncertainty by referring to "that funny white stuff" and "somebody" without providing specific details.

2.5 Previous Related Studies

In supporting this research, there are several previous studies that have similarities and differences with this research. Hereby proves the existence of research that uses the same theory and approach with different objects of literature.

The first research belongs to Safitri and Nur (2022), entitled *Violating and Flouting the Conversational Maxims in Situation Comedy 2 Broke Girls: The Two Opening, Season 6, Episode 1*. The researchers were using the qualitative methods to conduct this research and the ground theory of this research is Grice's cooperative principles, conversational maxims, and implicature. This research was analyzing the types and the reason of violating and flouting by the characters. The

result showed thirty-one data; twelve data of violating the maxims and nineteen data of flouting the maxims. All four maxims, quality, quantity, relevance, and manner, are found in this research. According to the researchers, the reasons why the characters violated and flouted the maxims are to hide or cover something and to keep each other's feeling.

The second research belongs to Mangilaya II (2020), entitled *A Rat in A Maze: Analysis of Violation and Flouting of Maxims in Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale*. The researchers were using the qualitative methods for this research and also Grice's theory of cooperative principle as the ground theory. The objectives of this research were to find the types of violated and flouted maxims and the purpose of violation and flouting of maxims to the narrative of the story. The research found only two violations of maxims; quantity and quality. Meanwhile, all four maxims were flouted. Moreover, the purpose of violating and flouting these maxims are to highlight the powerlessness and abuse in the characters, mirroring the social reality claimed by the author, Margaret Atwood.

The third research belongs to Jorfi and Dowlatabadi (2015) entitled *Violating and Flouting of the Four Gricean Cooperative Maxims in Friends the American TV Series*. Qualitative method and Grice's cooperative principles were used in this research. The purpose of this research was to classify the types of violation and flouting of maxims in *Friends* and to analyze the context of the violated and flouted maxims in the conversations said by the characters. According to the researchers, all four maxims were violated and flouted by the characters in order to create humor, sarcasms, and ignorance. The most violated or flouted maxims in the show was maxim of relevance (11 times), quality and quantity (both 10 times), and manner (7 times).

These three previous related studies were using Grice's theory of cooperative principles and maxims. The three researches are suited as a guide on making a new one with different objects of literature which is *Free Guy* (2021) movie script. The newer research that I will conduct is using the violating and flouting of four maxims theory by Grice and by using a new object, this research contributes to make a novelty of analyzing the violating and flouting of the four

maxims by offering some new varieties of conversations in the movie script that possibly is not discovered yet in the previous studies.

