

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter contains with theoretical framework and previous related studies. In theoretical preview, I present theories related to my research. It explains definition of pragmatics, context, cooperative principle, violating, flouting and implicature.

2.1 Pragmatics

According to Yule (2010:128) pragmatics is a study of invisible meaning, or how we recognize what it means, even if it is not spoken or written. Speakers and writers need to be able to rely on a lot of common assumptions and expectations when trying to communicate. Some lessons were learned from the analysis of these assumptions and expectations as to how much more we are going to be communicating than we say.

Also, whenever you cannot explain a phenomenon in language using regular, accepted linguistic theories, then you must have recourse to something else, something that is supposedly as undefined as it is tangible, namely pragmatics. Pragmatics says that if we know what we are doing as language users, it is okay to take languages in a variety of unusual ways. So, if there is a reason for it, or if it is for a purpose, we can let ourselves be semantically shocked. (Mey (1993:4-5)

Pragmatic is the meaning of utterances beyond their literal meaning. In pragmatics, we can analyze the use of language in our daily lives, we can analyze other meanings that speakers say.

2.2 Context

According to Widdowson (as cited in Pranowo, 2020:257) "those elements of the situation of actual use of language that are considered as relevant to its meaning" is how the contexts are defined. In another way, context refers to the symbolic structure that enables one to comprehend pragmatic meaning in which linguistic codes correspond with their symbolic elements. Therefore, the speaker's pattern of speech contains the actual situations.

According to Yule (2005:114) usually, we interpret this on the language context. When the word "bank" appears in a phrase with words like "steep" or "overgrown," it is easy to determine which kind of bank is intended. Furthermore,

we can determine from the language context which kind of bank is meant if we hear someone mention that she needs to go to the bank to receive some cash. In general, people have the ability of interpreting words based on the physical context.

When we are talking about something with people, we need a clear context so as not to cause confusion in the conversation. We need context to help us to make the conversation easier to understand. The conversation will not proceed exactly as intended if there is no context.

2.3 Cooperative Principles

The communication has to be unambiguous, the words have to be devoid of ambiguity or irrelevant meaning and there must be no lies contained in it. Because of it, Grice (1989:26) explains that we have to make a contribution to the conversation we are engaged in, such as that which is required by an agreed purpose or direction of exchange at any given moment.

Grice's theory similar with the statement of Wijana (as cited in Al Ahda, 2022:8) who explains that the speaker is trying to make his speech relevant to the audience, succinct and understandable, solid and clear, and always on the subject to avoid wasting the other person's time. Speakers usually carefully consider all of the practical elements involved or which may be involved in the process of communication in order for words to be conveyed understood by the interlocutor. A statement by Yule (1996:37), you must contribute to the conversation in the way that is necessary considering the determined goal or purpose of the conversation interaction at that specific moment in time. In cooperative principle, there are four sub-cooperative principle called maxims.

2.3.1 Maxim of Quantity

According to Yule (1996:36) maxim quantity refers to the situation in which you have to give only the required quantity of information in your contribution and avoid from giving more than is necessary. The example of maxim of quantity is:

Joel: "Does Issa have any siblings?"

Netta: "Yes, she has two sisters."

When Netta responds to a question from Joel, Netta gives an informative response. Netta is responding to Joel exactly as Joel requests. Netta is trying to be as helpful

as they can. Therefore, it may be inferred by Joel that Issa has two sisters and she does not have any brothers.

2.3.2 Maxim of Quality

According to Yule (1996:37) maxim of quality is when you make an effort to make a true contribution. Do not state information that you cannot provide enough evidence to support or that you think are false. It means we have to tell the truth to everyone that needs some information about it. The example of maxim of quality is:

Elle: "Austin and Isabelle look like a couple."

Leon: "Yes, they have been dating since a month ago. Isabelle told me about that last week."

From the example above, Leon gives Elle a correct information, Leon is not lying about Austin and Isabelle who have been dating since a month ago because Leon knows it from Isabelle. So, Leon is telling about the truth.

2.3.3 Maxim of Relation

According to Yule (1996:37) maxim relation is when you have to be relevant by saying something or giving some information to the interlocutor. You should not be irrelevant when doing communication to the interlocutor, you have to stick to the topic of your conversation. The example of Maxim of Relation is:

Sheyna: "Are you visiting family this weekend?"

Narnia: "I have a term paper due on Monday."

Sheyna has an interpretation that Narnia will not visit family this weekend and the reason is Narnia has a term paper due on Monday. This interpretation is an implicature because if we can see that Narnia does not actually directly answer Sheyna's question and if we think only about the literal meaning of Narnia's answer, it does not have a relation about the question.

2.3.4 Maxim of Manner

According to Yule (1996:37) maxim of manner is when we have to be perspicuous. We have to avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief, avoid unnecessary prolixity, and be orderly. The example is when someone says "Today is February 14th, it means today is Valentine Day." They give a clear

information about the date, which is on February 14th people celebrate Valentine Day. There is no ambiguous in that words.

2.4 Violating

Grice states (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:198) people may discreetly violate a maxim; in such cases, they may be at fault for misleading. Besides Grice, Thomas (as cited in Zebua, et al. 2017:104) states that violating a maxim can be deceptive in a subtle and covert way. When a speaker purposely hides information or says something ambiguous, irrelevant, or false, the hearer believes they are participating.

In addition to Thomas' statement, Cutting (as cited in Arofah and Mubarok, 2021:250) explains that when a speaker knows that the audience will not know the whole truth and will just get the general idea of what they're saying, they can be considered to be "violating" a maxim.

2.4.1 Violating Maxim of Quantity

According to Cutting (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:198) when a speaker does not provide a hearer with enough details regarding the whole scene or topic that is under discussion, they are violating the maxim of quantity. Violating maxim of quantity is when someone gives too much information or less information that makes the conversation between the speaker and interlocutor do not run smoothly. The example of violating maxim of quantity is:

Belle: "Do you know where is the Mixue outlet near from here?"

Nuel: "Yes, I know."

Nuel is being less informative to Belle. Belle is probably wanting Nuel to take her there but Nuel just gives her the information like that. The conversation between Belle and Nuel above is the example of violating maxim of quantity because Nuel does not give Belle an information than is required.

2.4.2 Violating Maxim of Quality

According to Cutting (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:198) a speaker who does not have honesty and has a tendency to provide the hearer with inaccurate information can violate the quality maxim.

Violating maxim of quality is when someone does not tell the truth about something. In a conversation when other people ask about something and the person who is being asked does not give the true information or they have an intention to

tell a lie, that is a violating maxim of quality. The example of violating maxim of quality is:

Elle: “How much did The Boyz’s album that you bought yesterday?”
Issa: “1.500 won.”

The Boyz’s album costs 2.500 won and Issa says that she bought it for 1.500 won, she does not tell the truth to Elle about the cost. Issa violates the maxim of quality because she tells a lie to Elle.

2.4.3 Violating Maxim of Relation

According to Cutting (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:198) the speakers who try to switch focus or change the subject to another topic is violating maxim of relation. The relation of conversation is when we have to stick to the topic of the conversation. We must not go off the topic but if you can not stay on the topic, the conversation will not run smoothly. The example of violating maxim of relation is:

Annora: “Have you finished your math assignment?”
Arielle: “I want to go to the canteen.”

From the conversation above, Arielle does not stay on the topic which is Annora asks her about the math assignment, but Arielle answers Annora’s question with another topic that does not have the relation at all with Annora’s question. Arielle violates maxims of relation because she does not answer Annora’s question in a right way.

2.4.4 Violating Maxim of Manner

Cutting (as cited in Noertjahjo, Ester, et al. 2017:198) explains that giving an incoherent or confusing reference in order to avoid providing an easily understood and coherent response during a discussion is a violating maxim of manner.

Maxim of manner is when someone has to say something clearly and no ambiguous with the utterances they say. If someone says something unclearly and make other people confused about the meaning, it means they violate maxim of manner. The example is when someone says “It is 12 o’clock pm right now.” We do not know what is the real intention of them saying that. Whether they only want to let us know about the time or they have another intention to have a lunch because

that is a lunchtime. That is so ambiguous, not everyone knows the literal meaning of it because they may have implied meaning in their words.

2.5 Flouting

According to Thomas (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:197) when speakers consciously choose to build up implicature by obviously disobeying a maxim at the level of what they say, this is known as flouting. When speakers flout maxims, they do not provide the correct information, but the implicature helps the hearer to make assumptions about the meaning.

According to Sembiring and Ghozali (as cited in Firda, et al. 2021:108) When a speaker finds it difficult to apply one or more maxims in the conversation and it causes confusion, flouting happens. Analyzing failures in maxim use is done with flouting the maxim.

Cutting (as cited in Zebua, et al. 2017:105) explains that it is considered flouting the maxims when a speaker seems not to be following to the rules but instead expects the listeners to understand the implications. Flouting maxim is divided into four floutings, it contains flouting maxims of quantity, flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of relation, and flouting maxims of manner.

2.5.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

According to Thomas (as cited in Noertjahjo, Ester, et al. 2017:197) a speaker who deliberately provides more or less information than is necessary for the context is in flouting the maxim of quantity.

Flouting Maxim of quantity is when the speaker does not give clear information or gives excessive information, but even so, the listener still knows the implied meaning of the speaker's words. The example for flouting maxim of quantity is:

Calista: Where should we collect this English assignment?

Irish: You can check on the University website.

The conversation above contains flouting maxim of quantity because Irish's answer does not help Calista to know where she should collect an English assignment. Irish flouts the maxim of quantity because she does not give a clear information about that, Irish gives an answer for the question from Calista with an implied meaning

which is she wants Calista to check by herself to know where Calista should collect the assignment.

2.5.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

According to Cruise (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:197) flouting maxim of quality is not always true, but it is able to mislead listeners according to the utterance's context. There are lots of ways that the quality maxim can be flouted.

Flouting maxim of quality when a speaker says something but the words cannot be interpreted literally or in other words, there is an implied meaning from the speaker. The example for flouting maxim of quality is:

Samuel: "Will you come to my birthday party on Saturday?"

Nicho: "What time?"

Samuel: "11 p.m."

Nicho: "My mom will kick me out and not let me come back home."

The answer that Nicho gives to Samuel cannot be interpreted literally. The implied meaning for the answer that he gives is if Nicho comes to Samuel's birthday party at 11 p.m, Nicho's mom will be mad at him because his mother does not allow him to leave the house at night.

2.5.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

According to Cutting (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:197) flouting maxim of relation is happened by using unrelated opinions, but it expected that the listener will understand by drawing a connection between the current topic and the one that occurred before it.

Flouting maxim of relation is when a person changes the topic conversation and does not stay on one topic, but the other person in the conversation is know about the changes of the topic. The example of flouting maxim of relation is:

Irisha: "Do you know Sunwoo from The Boyz? He is so cool and handsome."

Elleana: "Can we talk about sport instead of that?"

Elleana seems does not stick to the conversation which is Irisha asks about Kpop Idol. Elleana does not answer the question but she says that they need to change the topic for the conversation. Elleana does that because nobody talks about Kpop before and the atmosphere being awkward do Elleana flouts maxim of relation because she wants everyone there can join the conversation.

2.5.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

Cutting (as cited in Noertjahjo, 2017:197) claims that uttering words incoherently, being unclear, and having a tendency toward ambiguity are examples of flouting the rule of manners. Flouting maxim of manner is when the speaker says something but with ambiguous and unclear words. The example of flouting maxim of manner is:

Vicky: "Where will you go after this class?"

Eugene: "I will go to the place where we can find various books."

Eugene's answer does not wrong but she does not give a clear answer to Vicky. She can say that she wants to go to library but she says "the place where we can find various books." Vicky knows the implied meaning of Eugene's words that she wants to go to the library after the class end.

2.6 Conversational Implicature

When we communicate with people, we can directly say what we want or what we mean, but sometimes we do not say it directly and we imply what we want to say, we do not say it in explicit way. It makes people have to think about what we mean, they have to find the meaning of the words we uttered with implicit way. That phenomenon called implicature, there is an implied meaning of our words that we uttered to people.

According to Grice (as cited in Al-Azzawi, 2019:1) explains that assumptions made by listeners and implicatures made by speakers form conversational implicatures, which have implicit meaning (pragmatic inferences). Conversational implicatures have a connection to specific words and phrases used in conversation.

According to Levinson (1983:97) implicature is that it gives an unambiguous explanation of how something can mean (in general) more than what is actually "spoken" (that is, more than what is meant literally by the usual meaning of the linguistic expressions uttered). Consider the following dialogue:

Joe: I have bought seafood fried rice for today's dinner, do you like it?

Abel: I will eat chicken for today's dinner.

In the dialogue above, we can see there is conversational implicature because Joe asks whether Abel likes seafood fried rice or not but Abel does not answer the question meanwhile Abel says that she will eat chicken for dinner. It has implied meaning that Abel does not like seafood fried rice and that is why she says that she will eat chicken for dinner.

2.7 Previous Related Studies

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

The first research is by Muhammad Dzikrulloh Al Ahda (2022) with the title Failures of Conversational Maxims Found in “The Queen’s Gambit” Serial Script (2020). The results of this study are as follows; there are 58 kinds of non-observance maxims found in conversation. Namely, 25 flouting the maxim of manner, 14 flouting the maxim of relation, 10 flouting the maxim of quantity, 2 violating the maxim of quality, 5 violating the maxim of quality, 1 violating the maxim of relation, and 1 violating the maxim of manner.

The second research is by Firda, et. al (2021) with the title “An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in a Talk Show Program in Indonesia.” The researchers comprehended the types of flouting maxims in the talk show, and then the researchers determined the types selected into categories based on guests' utterances. After that, the researchers analyzed the predetermined types. The study found some floutings of the maxims of relation. There were 50% maxims of relation flouted by speakers, and from nine flouting maxims, the four data had the most reasons for appearing in the conversation.

The third research is by Arofah and Mubarok (2021) with the title “An Analysis of Violation and Flouting Maxim on Teacher- Students Interaction in English Teaching and Learning Process.” the result of the research showed that there are four types of maxims that are violated by the teacher and students. These are the maxim of quantity 11 (50%), the maxim of quality 5 (22.73%), the maxim of relation 1 (4.54%), and the maxim of manner 5 (22.73%). The dominant violation was the maxim of quantity with 11 occurrences. Based on the findings, there are three types of flouting maxims in which the most of flouting maxim that is occurred

was the maxim of relation. They are divided into 1 (14.29%) maxim of quantity, 2 (28.57%) maxim of quality, and 4 (57.14%) maxims of relation. In conclusion, the most produced between the violation and flouting was the violation of maxim with 22 (75.86%) of total occurrences. Meanwhile, the proportion of flouting maxim was 7 (24.14%).

The similarity between my research and the preview related studies above is we use the same research discussion, namely violating and flouting which are contained in pragmatics but I still have the difference between this research and the previous researches above, I use different object for this research with the same approach which is violating and flouting maxim found in movie script that I chose.

