

CHAPTER 2

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter explains several theories from experts used as guidelines in conducting this research. This chapter consists of theories regarding the definition of pragmatics, cooperative principle, violating, context, and movie script. This chapter also provides a list of previous related studies as a comparison to distinguish this research from previous related studies.

2.1 Pragmatics

Levinson (1983:9) states pragmatics refers to the study of relationships among languages as well as contexts that are either grammaticalized or coded in language structures. Therefore, pragmatics involves context-dependent features of language structure and principles of language use and understanding that have no relation to language structure. Pragmatics is also generally functional in nature taking cognitive, social, and cultural perspectives on linguistic phenomena in terms of their use within behavioural forms (Verschueren in Huang, 2017:3). According to Searle et al. (as cited in Levinson, 1983:6), pragmatics is simply one of the words, with sociological and cognitive another, which give the impression that something quite specifically and technically related is being talked about, when in fact these words have no such clear meaning.

On the other hand, Wijana (as cited in Yuniarti, 2014:227) states that pragmatics is a field of linguistics that studies the external structure of language, specifically how language elements are used in communication. Thus, the meaning that is examined in pragmatics is contextually bound meaning, or, in other words, it examines the speaker's intention. The main object studied in pragmatics is the speaker's intention, and it is also related to context. According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatics is the study of meaning in a contextualized form. It maintains that pragmatics requires an interpretation of what people intend in a certain context and how those contexts affect what is said. In addition, pragmatics also takes into consideration how speakers manage what they would like to say according to who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances.

Based on the definition above, I further identify pragmatics as the study of meaning in the form of language in association with social and cultural contexts in the form of utterances or conversations in a communication process. In addition, pragmatics affects the process of using a language that forms an understanding of how the context used influences the communication process, especially in providing information to the interlocutor.

2.2 Cooperative Principle

Grice introduces the cooperative principle as a guide to building a conversation that involves participants providing utterances that are related to the context. According to Grice (as cited in Levinson, 1983:101), the cooperative principle defines a contribution as being in accordance with what is required, which at that stage must be in accordance with the purpose or direction received from the ongoing conversation. In the cooperative principle proposed by Grice, it is emphasized that in language activities between the two parties, the speaker and the listener, there must be a connection with the cooperative principle to avoid deviations in the utterance delivered. The cooperative principle also emphasizes that the speaker, in their contribution, must provide clear utterances to achieve good interaction and communication so that the utterances and information provided do not confuse the listener.

Grice expects the cooperative principle to create an effective communication process and the contribution between the speaker and the listener in a communication process to achieve the expected purpose. Furthermore, in the cooperative principle, Grice (1975) introduces maxims as principles or rules in communication where speakers are expected to provide clear, concise, honest, and relevant utterances to interlocutors in order to avoid misunderstandings in a communication or conversation process. Grice identifies the four basics of conversational maxims as follows:

2.2.1 Maxims of Quantity

The maxim of quantity emphasizes contributions in a conversation to be as informative as possible without providing too much additional information than is

required. Try not to say less or more. Grice (1975:45) assumes the maxim of quantity as:

1. Give your contribution as informative as necessary (for the purpose of the current exchange).
2. Do not try to be any more informative in your contribution than is necessary.

Maxim quantity emphasizes the element of quantity in the utterance delivered by the speaker. The speech conveyed must be clear, concise, and not long-winded, so that the utterance conveyed is in accordance with the purpose of the information being provided.

2.2.2 Maxims of Quality

The maxim of quality refers to the contribution in a conversation that requires participants to tell the truth. Finegan (2007:289) states that both speakers and writers are only expected to say what they genuinely believe to be truthful and to provide evidence for what they say. A further side to this point is that speakers are aware of this expectation; they know that their hearers expect them to adhere to the maxim of quality. Furthermore, Grice (1975:46) categorizes the maxims of quality as follows:

1. Do not tell people what you truly believe is not true.
2. Do not say something without good evidence.

Be truthful when it comes to contributing to the conversation to avoid what you believe is wrong and try to contribute what is right.

2.2.3 Maxims of Relation

The maxim of relation focuses the speaker on conveying utterances relevant to the context of the conversation. According to Finegan (2007:288), the maxim of relation aims at guiding speakers to manage their utterances to make sure that they are relevant to the context in which they are expressed. In this case, the speaker must say relevant things when making their utterances. The speaker must convey something clearly related to the topic being discussed so that the relevance of the conversation context is easily understood by the interlocutor.

2.2.4 Maxims of Manner

Maxims of manner are characterized by clear and disciplined directives, which suggest speakers must avoid ambiguity and vagueness and be orderly in their utterances. According to Finegan (2007:288), speakers are expected to make utterances concisely and unambiguously. Grice (1975), outlines the maxim of manner in general with a certain clarity, and in particular:

- (i) avoid uncertainty
- (ii) avoid ambiguity
- (iii) be brief
- (iv) be orderly

Therefore, participants are expected to make a contribution directly, not vaguely, and try not to be ambiguous in conveying utterances.

2.3 Violating

The violating maxim happens when the speaker aims to lie or deceive the hearer for certain purposes. Finegan (2007:289) states that it has become obvious that people occasionally violate the cooperative principle's rules. Obviously, not all speakers tell the entirety of the truth; some are unaware that in Western conversational interactions, efficiency is the preferred standard. He continues further to point out that speakers occasionally make it necessary to violate a maxim due to cultural norms or other external factors. Violating maxims can also occur if the speaker deliberately makes statements that are not in accordance with the evidence of the truth about what is being discussed. Therefore, violating can be categorized as a form of maxim violation that aims to mislead the listener. It can be concluded that when a speaker violates a maxim, the speaker does not give the listener the opportunity to know the truth or meaning conveyed by the speaker.

2.3.1 Violating Maxim of Quantity

According to Grice (1975), speakers deliberately violate the maxim of quantity by giving more information than is provided. Here is an example of violating the maxim of quantity in a journal by Nanda Chairunnisa and Muhammad Natsir (2014:162-163).

Table 2.3.1 The Example of Violating Maxim of Quantity

PHILL	Can't you see the fun part in anything?
STU	Yeah, we're stuck in trafficin a stolen police car.....with a missing childin the back seat. Which part of this is fun? (1)

In example (1), Stu violates the maxim of quantity because he is saying too much more than what is expected. Stu has answered by giving more information than Phil needs, but he does not give the information that Phil needs. He did not provide information about whether he saw the fun part of their situation or not. When Stu said, "Yeah, we're stuck in traffic in a stolen police car... with a missing child in the back seat. Which part of this is fun?" It shows that he is giving additional information in his utterance and not to the point, and that made Phil confused by Stu's answer.

2.3.2 Violating Maxim of Quality

The speaker deliberately violates maxim quality by providing untrue information and deliberately hiding the actual truth. According to Cutting (2005:40), the speaker violates the maxim of quality by not being honest and providing wrong information to the hearer. The speaker violates the maxim of quality if they do not tell the truth and deliberately misled the interlocutor. For example (2), by Cutting (2005):

Table 2.3.2 The Example of Violating Maxim of Quality

Husband	How much did that new dress cost, darling?
Wife	Less than the last one

From the example above, the wife has violated the maxim of quality because, if seen in the context of the husband's question, which asks specifically about the price, the wife's answer does not tell the specific price of the dress. The question is about the price, but instead, she covers up the price of the dress by saying that the price of the dress is cheaper than her last dress. The wife violates the maxim of quality because she is not being sincere to her husband, and she tries to not be

more specific about the price in order to hide the truth about the price and give false information regarding her dress price.

2.3.3 Violating Maxim of Relation

The speaker violates the maxim of relation by giving information that is not relevant to the context. According to Cutting (2005:40), violating the maxim of relation happens when the speaker plans to distract the hearer by switching the topic of conversation to something irrelevant to the first topic. The example (3) of violating the maxim of relation in the journal by Nalita Mareta and Ida Zuraida (2022:47).

Table 2.3.3 The Example of Violating Maxim of Relation

Stephen	Look, I'm sorry you couldn't save your universe, but maybe, you could help to save mine?
Other Stephen	Are you happy, Stephen?
Stephen	What?
Other Stephen	Are you happy, Stephen? It's the question that Christine Palmer asked me at her wedding.

In the conversation above, the other Stephen, as a speaker, violates the maxim of relation. It shows that he tried to break the conversation deliberately with another Stephen, who asked him to save the universe. The other Stephen said twice, "Are you happy, Stephen?" as an expression of anger. He tries to change the topic abruptly, and he also tries to avoid talking about Vishanti's book. In the meaning of the intended message in the conversation, Other Stephen rejected Stephen's request. He tried to change the conversation to Cristine's marriage. In fact, both men have the same feelings for Cristine. The other Stephen is an imitation of Stephen.

2.3.4 Violating Maxim of Manner

Cutting (2005:40) states that the violating maxim of manner appears when the speaker gives a vague utterance by using expressions to avoid a brief and orderly answer. For example (4), the violating maxim of manner in the journal by Ni Wayan Balik Ayu Widiasih et al. (2022:15).

Table 2.3.4 The Example of Violating Maxim of Manner

Luca	Where's your stuff?
Alberto	Yeah, well, you see...
Luca	You are coming, right?
Alberto	Um, I would, but Massimo asked if I wanted to stick around. Move in maybe. And I just thought, uh.... I think he needs me. You know?
Luca	I can't do it without you.

The above example can be concluded to be a violation of the maxim of manner because Alberto uses ambiguous language or his voice is less loud. He gave such a statement because Alberto is still hesitant, and he knows that his goal for the city is not to go to school but to get a Vespa, so Alberto said that maybe he actually wants to be with Luca, but he is also afraid.

2.4 Context

In a conversation or situation where communication is taking place, context is needed in the communication process. Context involves contributing to determining whether a meaning, utterance, or expression. According to Roberts (as cited in Horn and Ward, 2006:197), there are three things common about the understanding of context. The first is an actual discourse event that is a verbal exchange; the second understanding is the linguistic content of the verbal exchange of what is actually said; and the third is a semantic notion that is more abstract. Based on these three things, context is a requirement for information exchange in any information contribution process that cannot be separated to obtain understanding in a communication.

Mey (2001:39) states that context is dynamic and is a non-static concept that can be understood as a constantly changing environment in the broadest sense that allows the participants in the process of communication to interact with each other and in which the linguistic expressions of their interactions become comprehensible. It is known that context plays an important role in a communication activity that can be transformed according to participation in

expressing linguistics, so that interaction and communication are easier to understand. In addition, context also refers to a particular person's understanding of a topic of conversation and how this understanding impacts a person's interpretation of utterances, meanings, and information obtained.

2.5 Movie Script

A movie script is an important element that is used as a guide to make a script into an interesting movie to watch. A movie cannot be separated from the script to explain the storyline, characters, places, scenes, time, and dialog that explain the background of the movie. According to Kooperman (as cited in Nurmalia, 2022:18), a movie script focuses on the script's narrative, conversation, formatting, character, plot, theme, momentum, and the written work itself. Furthermore, a movie script contains overall details that will be useful in the process of developing characters, conflicts, and dialogues that make a movie script into an interesting movie.

2.6 Previous Related Studies

In support of this research, there are several previous studies related to this research topic with different research objects. Thus, it can be proven that this study uses the same theory and approach with different literature objects. The first research is by Nanda Chairunnisa and Muhammad Natsir (2014), with their research title "The Violating Maxims of Main Characters in The Hangover Movie's Script." This research focuses on the types of maxims violated by the main characters in The Hangover movie's script. The objectives of this research are to describe the violation and elaborate on the reason for the maxim violation by using descriptive and qualitative methods. The limitation problem of this research is the main characters. The result of this study shows that there are 22 violations of the maxim of quality, 2 violations of the maxim of quantity, 9 violations of the maxim of relation, and 8 violations of the maxim of manner.

The second research is by Nalita Mareta and Ida Zuraida (2022), with the research entitled "Maxim Violation in the Movie Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness." This research aims to identify the violations of the cooperative maxims uttered in conversations and the intended meaning by using descriptive

qualitative research. The data of their research are taken by observation in several steps, such as identifying and marking maxim violations, classifying each data with the cooperative principle's theory, and giving a code to the data. The data results of their research show that there are 20 conversations reflecting violations of maxim in the movie, including: (9) or 45% categorized as violations of maxim of quantity, (6) or 30% categorized as violations of maxim quality, (3) or 15% categorized as violations of maxim of relation, and (2) or 10% categorized as violations of maxim of manner. The most common maxim violation occurring in their research is a violation of the maxim of quantity.

The third research is by Rizko Argi Budiaji (2020), in his research entitled "An Analysis of Violation Maxim in the Home Alone 5 Movie." This research analyzes the types of violations of the maxims committed by the movie characters in "Home Alone 5" and identifies the reasons why the characters violated these maxims. This research uses the summative content analysis method. The result of this research shows that there are (10) violation maxims in the conversation of the movie. The fourth research is by Ni Wayan Balik Ayu Widyaningsih et.al (2022), with the research title "The Types of Maxim Violation Found in Luca Movie." In their research, analyze the types of maxim violations used by the character in Luca movie by using a descriptive qualitative method. The result of this research shows that there are 24 data found with the most often occurring violation maxim of quality. The fifth research is by Chynthianita Septifani Purnomo (2017), with the research title "An Analysis of the Violation of Grice's Maxims on The Boy Movie Script." Her research describes the violation of Grice Maxim's maxims and analyzes the causes of the characters violations of the maxims in the conversation of characters in "The Boy" movie script by using descriptive and qualitative methods. This research shows that there are four types of maxims violated in "The Boy" movie script.

My research has similarities and differences with the five previous related studies mentioned above. The similarities between my research and the five previous related studies are the use of Grice's cooperative principle regarding the maxim violations in the movie script. The differences between this research and the five previous studies are the object of this study. I use the movie script "Fresh"

(2022) as my object of research, and it is different from the first previous related studies that used “The Hangover” movie script as their object of research. The second related study is also different by using “Doctor Strange in the Multiverse Madness” movie as the object of the research. The third related study also has a different object by using “Home Alone 5” as its object using a summative content analysis method with an object that is different from the object I use. The difference between my research and the fourth research is also in the objects used. In their research, they use the “Luca” movie, which is different from the research object that I use. Apart from that, the fifth related research uses “The Boy” movie script as its research object, which is different from the object I use. From the five previous studies, it can be proven that my research using different objects by choosing the movie script “Fresh” (2022) proves the novelty of this research.

