CHAPTER 2
THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents the theories that are used as the basis for conducting research, which must be relevant to the research theme that is being researched. In this chapter, I will include comparison of selected Research with previous research that have been conducted by others. There will be few subsections, based on how much the basis for conducting research.

2.1   Definition of Pragmatic

According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics is the study of the relationship between a language and context that are grammatilized or encoded in the structure of a language. In summary, pragmatics is a study about how the listener gets the intention of what it means even when the speaker does not actually say it because the speaker does not mention the intention directly. Also, Yule (1996) said that pragmatic is a study about contextual meaning. It is actually has connected to the previous expert that in communication, the connection between speaker and the listener has to connect to each other. The reason is that the connection between the speake and listener will make the purpose of the conversation be achieved. Additionally, speech situations are also very important in conversation (Leech, 1983). The meaning of what it means depends on the situation, include the setting, the atmosphere, and the emotion in the conversation. The speaker has to be aware of the speech situation because it can be dangerous to the connection between the speaker and the listener.

When the speaker directly says what it means, the situation may be bad for the speaker. It could possibily insult the listener with the think of the listener may not understand it or underestimated the listener. This is why studying pragmatics is important due to avoid such mistakes in communication.

2.2   Definition of Context

According to Asher (1994: 731) context is one of those linguistic terms which are constantly used in all kinds of context but never explained. It has the

relationship with meaning, and they are important in pragmatics. Context refers to the circumstances, conditions, and surroundings in which something occurs or is understood. In language, context can be defined as the meaning behind what the speaker said. Its purpose is to clarify the intention of the speaker in the conversation. Moreover, to understand the words spoken by the speaker, the listener must also understand the context from the perspective of the speaker. Finnegan et al. (1997: 345) state that the essential element in the interpretation of an utterance is the context in which it is uttered. The context can be used as the speaker utter an utterance in a way that the hearer can understand the utterance and makes the utterane be clearer without any misunderstand or miscommunication.

Additionally, Priadi (2015) stated that it is obvious now that context is necessary to make a precise presupposition. In otherwords, understanding context is the key to achieve the goals in communication, and to find out certain relationship amongs the conversation that happens between the speaker and the speaker since it is purpose is to direct the listener to have the same assumption as the speaker in the conversation.

2.3   Cooperative Principles

To achieve successful communication, humans are supposed to follow a certain mode of interaction. For this purpose, Herbert Paul Griece, the linguist, discovered a mode of interaction for succesful communicaction called Cooperative Principle (CP) and maxims based on ordinary language philosophy. It is also used by many famous researchers like Yule (1996) and Grundy for its influence in the field of pragmatics.

In general, it is assumed that during communication, speakers express their utterances with the intention to inform the hearer. They expect the hearer to understand their message and thus make efforts to ensure their message is relevant, clear, concise, and straightforward to avoid misunderstandings. As a result, Grice defined the cooperative principle as a fundamental aspect of effective conversational communication. This principle states that a speaker should make their conversational contribution as required at the stage at which it occurs, by the

accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange. In other words, speakers should say what they need to say, when they need to say it, and how it should be said.

Grice proposed that conversational cooperation is demonstrated through a set of conversational maxims that speakers feel the need to follow. These maxims are principles of rational communication that guide speakers in their interactions with one another. Although they appear to be rules, they are broken more often than grammatical or phonological rules. These maxims describe specific rational principles observed by people who follow the cooperative principle in pursuit of effective communication. Grice categorized these maxims into four categories :

2.3.1 Maxim of Quantity

Ensure that your contribution is as informative as necessary. This maxim has specific 2 rules that need to be followed :

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

2.3.2 Maxim of Quality

Ensure that your contribution is not more informative than necessary and that it is true. This maxim has specific 2 rules that need to be followed :

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

2.3.3 Maxim of Relation

Be relevant with the utterance you are going to utter. Do not get too out of context. This maxim has 1 specific rule that needs to be followed:

1. Be related to what is happening or being discussed.

2.3.4 Maxim of Manner

Speak clearly and straightforwardly so that people can understand you without getting confused. This maxim has 4 specific rules that need to be followed :

1. Avoid obsecurity expression.
2. Avoid any ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

The purpose of Grice's maxims is to ensure that conversations adhere to the right balance of information, maintaining a truthful, relevant, and clear tone. These maxims serve as guidelines for effective communication, helping speakers convey their messages accurately and efficiently. The main role of these maxims is to facilitate smooth conversations by encouraging speakers to be truthful, relevant, and clear in their statements, without introducing unnecessary subjective matters. These maxims are essential for productive conversations and are often followed by speakers who value clarity and honesty in their interactions.

2.4   Theory of Flouting

Flouting the maxims, according to Grice (1975:30), means that speaker blatantly and deliberately fails to fulfill the certain maxims because the speaker wants to express the implicit meaning hidden behind the literal meaning. The implicit meaning hidden behind the flouting is called implicature which refers to what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean differently from what is literally said.

In present, movie has become the most common subject for this type of research, where searching for the characters in the movie use flouting in their conversation with the other characters. They use implicature behind their literal meaning. It is almost like ambiguity, but it is not ambiguity. It may be similar, but the difference with ambiguity is that the true meaning behind the implicature is not that out of the context from what the topic of the conversation is about. It is usually just a slight twist from the literal meaning.

In summary, character fiction in movies has become the easiest way to do this kind of research, but it does not mean that it is impossible to take the research with real life situation. Sometimes we also use it in our daily life, especially in a certain situation where it is a must to use flouting in the speaking.

In communication, a speaker aims to convey a message to the listener and expects the listener to understand and respond accordingly. However, if the

listener's response does not align with the speaker's expectations, or if the response exceeds the speaker's expectations, it indicates a violation of the maxim, known as flouting of utterance. This flouting leads to the creation of a conversational implicature, where the utterance is interpreted to convey a meaning beyond the literal words spoken (Meyer, 2009:56)

Grundy (2000:78) emphasizes that flouting a maxim is a salient way of encouraging the listener to draw an inference and recover an implicature. In this context, the flouting of the maxim of conversation, which is a part of the cooperative principle, results in implicatures that can be observed in everyday conversations and movies.

2.4.1   Flouting of Maxim Quantity

According to Grice (1975), you should contribute as much information as necessary by following the Maxim of Quantity. This information will not be more than what the hearer needs to know. In other words, the information shared should not be excessive and should align with what is required for the partners. Sections that do not contain the necessary information for partners can be considered a violation of the quantity maxim in Grice's cooperative principle. Here are some examples :

A   : "Can you tell me about your trip?"

B   : "It was good."

In this example, B's response "It was good" flouts the maxim of quantity by providing insufficient information. A more informative response would have included details about the trip, such as the destination, activities, or experiences, which could be way better to share of information about the trip.

A   : "How was your day?"

B   : "Fine."

In this example, B's response "Fine" is a flouting of the quantity maxim as it is not as informative as required. A more informative response would have included details about B's Day, such as what they did or any significant events.

A   : "Can you tell me about your trip?"

B   : "I went to a place."

In this example, B's response flouts the quantity maxim by providing insufficient information. A more informative response would have included details about place B visited, such as the name, location, or any interesting features.

A   : "What did you do over the weekend?"

B   : "I did stuff."

In this example, B's response flouts the quantity maxim by providing minimal information. A more informative response would have included details about what B did over the weekend, such as activities, events, or experiences.

2.4.2   Flouting of Maxim Quality

According to Grice (1975), you should never say something you don't have proof for or that you think is incorrect in maxim of quality. Speakers should not say anything that they believe to be false or for which they lack adequate evidence. Flouting the maxim of quality occurs when a speaker deliberately says something that is untrue or unsupported by evidence. The resulting implicature is that the speaker is not trying to deceive the listener, but the listener must look for another set of meanings of the utterance (Thomas 1995:67). The flouting of the maxim of quality can be observed in various contexts, such as in indirect, contradictory utterances, or figures of speech like irony, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, tautology, and hyperbole. Flouting the maxim of quality can also be used for comic effect, where the resulting implicature goes beyond the literal meaning of the words spoken. Here are some examples :

A   : "My friend got a promotion."

B   : "Really? When did this happen?"

A   : "Oh, it was a while ago."

In this examples, A's initial statement flouts the maxim of quality by being unclear about the exact date of the promotion. While it is true that the friend got a promotion, the lack of specificity about when this occurred makes the statement less than truthful and supported by adequate evidence.

B   : "I heard they're having a big sale at the store."

A   : "Really? When?"

B   : "I don't know, but you should check it out."

In this example, B's statement flouts the maxim of quality by lacking adequate evidence. There is no concrete reason to believe that there is a big sale at the store, making the statement less truthful and supported by adequate evidence.

A   : "We decided to take a different route."

B   : "Why?"

A   : "Oh, it was a last-minute decision."

In this example, A's statement flouts the maxim of quality by being unclear about the reason for the change in route. While it is true that the decision was made at the last minute, the lack of specificity about the reason makes the statement less than truthful and supported by adequate evidence.

A   : "How was the movie?"

B   : "It was the best movie ever made in the history of cinema!"

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of quality by using overstatement. While it may be B's opinion that the movie was very good, the statement "the best movie ever made in the history of cinema" is an exaggeration and not supported by evidence. This flouting of the maxim of quality can be used for comic effect, where the resulting implicature goes beyond the literal meaning of the words spoken.

2.4.3 Flouting of Maxim Relation

The maxim of relation states that each party must contribute appropriately to the topics being discussed in order to foster good cooperation between the speaker and the hearer. Grice (1975) states that to follow this rule, the speaker must be assuming that what they are saying relates to what has already been said. In other words, a speaker's contributions should clearly relate to the purpose of the exchange. Therefore, if a speaker does not give a relevant contribution, it means that the speaker has broken the rules of the relevance maxim. Here are some examples:

A   : "What's your favorite color?"

B   : "I don't know, what's yours?"

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of relation by not addressing the question asked by A. Instead, B shifts the focus to their own favorite color, which is not relevant to the conversation.

A   : "Can you help me with this math problem?"

B   : "Sure, what is the problem?"

A   : "I don't know, can you solve it for me?"

B   : "I'm not sure, let me think."

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of relation by not directly addressing the request for help with the math problem. Instead, B asks for the specifics of the problem, which does not provide any assistance in solving it.

A   : "What's your plan for the weekend?"

B   : "I don't know, what's yours?"

A   : "I'm not sure, what do you think?"

B   : "I don't know, let me think."

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of relation by not addressing the question asked by A. Instead, B shifts the focus to their own plans for the weekend, which is not relevant to the conversation.

A   : "Can you help me with my homework?"

B   : "I love pizza."

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of relation by not addressing the request for help with homework. Instead, B provides an unrelated statement about their love for pizza, which is not relevant to the conversation. This flouting of the maxim of relation results in a lack of clarity and relevance in the conversation.

2.4.4 Flouting of The Maxim Manner

According to Grice (1975), in order to follow maxim of manner, the speaker must be making a point that relates to what has already been said. In other words, the maxim of manner emphasizes the importance of being clear and unambiguous in communication. Speakers are expected to avoid obscurity of

expression, ambiguity, unnecessary prolixity, and disorderliness in their speech. This maxim ensures that the message is conveyed in a way that is easily understood by the listener, leading to effective communication. Here are some examples :

A : "Can you tell me how to get to the nearest gas station?"

B : "Well, you could take a left at the big tree, then go straight for a while, and then turn right at the blue house, or you could just use Google Maps."

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of manner by being unnecessarily prolix and disorderly. Instead of providing a clear and concise answer, B gives multiple directions that are confusing and difficult to follow.

A : "What did you think of the movie?"

B : "The cinematography was a visual feast for the eyes, the acting was superb, the plot was intricate and well-crafted, and the soundtrack was a masterpiece of musical composition."

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of manner by being overly verbose and using unnecessary prolixity. Instead of providing a clear and concise answer, B uses excessive language that is difficult to follow and does not directly address the question.

A : "Can you pass me the salt?"

B : "The salt shaker is located on the table to your left, next to the pepper shaker, which is also a cylindrical container with small holes on the top or dispensing the seasoning."

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of manner by being overly verbose and using unnecessary prolixity. Instead of providing a clear and concise answer, B gives a detailed description of the location and appearance of the salt and pepper shakers, which is not directly relevant to the request.

A: "Can you pass me the salt?"

B: "If I were a saltshaker, I would jump into your hand right now.

In this example, B's response flouts the maxim of manner by using a figure of speech (metaphor) that is not a clear and direct way to pass the salt. Instead of a simple and direct response, B's statement is ambiguous and does not directly address A's request, leading to a violation of the maxim of manner.

2.5   Theory of Implicature

According to Yule (1996:35), implicature is an additional conveyed meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the cooperative principle. There are two types of implicature: conversational implicature and conventional implicature. However, this discussion focuses on conversational implicature, which is related to the research. Yule (1996:40) states that conversational implicature is an additional unsteady meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the cooperative principle.

While Leech (1983:32) assumes that conversational implicature is the indirectness of which is motivated by politeness rather than to what is actually said. Grice divides implicature into conventional implicature and nonconventional implicature (conversational implicature). Thomas (1995) suggests that both of them have an additional meaning away from the semantic meaning had by particular utterance.

Furthermore, he adds that conversational and conventional implicature are different in the case of context. In conversational implicature, what is implied is varied based on the context of utterance. On the other hand, what is implied in conventional implicature is just the same apart from the context.

In conclusion, conversational implicature is designed to explain sentences in which a speaker appears to mean more than they say, and the hearer must assume the speaker means to convey more than is being said.

2.6   Movie Script

According to kooperman (2010:2), A movie script is a written work that the producers and directors use to construct the film and contains dialogue for directing actors. The words and instructions included in a movie script or screenplay are utilized by actors, filmmakers, directors, and producers to make a film. A script for a movie is a written work that outlines the elements needed to tell tales. A movie screenplay is the result of several writers working together,

along with the director or producer, to bring a concept to life. As stated in the previous categories, a movie screenplay is a written work that covers every auditory, visual, behavioral, and linguistic component needed to tell a story as well as speech for directors to use while directing actors. It is also the result of a vision that a producer or director, together with other writers, shared.

2.7   Previous Related Studies

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

The first research, written by Nurhasanah, Anggraini (2020), with the title of "*FLOUTING AND HEDGING MAXIMS IN DISNEY'S ANIMATED MOVIE RALPH BREAKS THE INTERNET*". In the research, it was concluded that the researcher is trying to find out what maxim are flouted and hedged, and to observe how are they flouted in certain conversations. Using grice's theory as the foundation of cooperative principles in the research. The researcher is using the animated movie of Ralph Breaks the Internet as its object to find out how the characters in the movie flouting and hedging. At the end, the researcher concluded that the usage of flouting in the conversation makes the conversation less stiff, while using hedge in the conversaton lessen the impact of the conversation.

The second research, written by Muhammad, Harits (2017), with the title of *"FLOUTING MAXIMS TO CREATE HUMOR USING GRICE'S COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN MOVIE 'THE BIG BANG THEORY'"*. In the research, it was concluded that the researcher is trying to find out the flouting in each utterance uttered by every character in the movie. The researcher also categorizes every data they found in the movie to find out which data can be analysed and related to the theory used in the research. The researcher concluded that the usage of flouting in movies is creating a humorous atmosphere in conversations.

The third research, written by Ramaniar, Elysza (2020), with the title of "*A Flouting Maxim Analysis in Ini Talk Show Net Tv Special Episode: Keluarga Bapak Jokowi*". In the research, it was concluded that the hosts and the guests happened to flout the utterances in their conversation. The researcher found that

the amount of data gathered is thirty-six utterances from the talkshow. The most frequently flouted maxim was the maxim of relation which occurred eighteen times of total maxims and the least type of flouted maxim was maxim of quality which occurred five times.

The fourth research, written by Ulfa, Syahrina (2017), with the title of "*FLOUTING MAXIM USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTERS IN DADDY'S HOME MOVIE*". In this research, it was concluded that the researcher found that the amount of the main character flout is a lot. There are barely 24 (34,2%) utterances out of 70 utterances. The most frequently flouted maxim was flouting of the maxim relation, which is in total of 24 utterances, used by the main character. The reason is because most of the dialogues between the main character and others was unclear. The listener or other characters did not give relevance contribution to the main character or the speaker.

The fifth research, written by Maulinawati, Rizki (2018), with the title of "*FLOUTING MAXIM USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTERS IN DADDY'S HOME MOVIE*". In this research, it was concluded that the researcher found so many characters flout the utterance. The most common flouting that the character used is flouting of maxim quantity, with total of seven flouting of maxim quantities (41,17%). The total of flouting maxim the researcher found was seventeen, the flouting of relevance was five, flouting of maxim quality was three, and lastly the flouting of maxim manner was two. The reason why the flouting of maxim quantity was the most frequently flouted is because there is some conversation that giving information. Moreover, the maxim of relevance also commonly flouted to make the situation more dramatic in the movie. Meanwhile there are only three maxim of quality and two maxims of manner found in the movie because the conversation can unreliable and ambiguous.

Although the related research has been done, this research focuses on the flouting maxims, the use of flouting and implicature that generated in the movie. The research aims to complete the previous research in depth about the cooperative principle. Moreover, the object that is used in this research is unique in my opinion because the genre of "The Menu" (2022) movie script is about food and bevarge type of movie script. However, Seith Reiss and Will Tracy can pull

up some unique ideas that they insert a twist in the movie script. Therefore, this topic is still interesting to discuss.