

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents a theoretical framework that supports the understanding of the problems formulated in the study. Theoretical frameworks serve as foundational tools in research and scholarship across various fields. The theoretical framework consists of the definition of pragmatics, context, Grice's cooperative principle, the principle of flouting, and previous related study.

2.1. Pragmatics

The term pragmatics was first introduced by Charles Morris in his semiotic studies in 1938. Morris (1938: 29-30) defines pragmatics as the study of the relationship of signs to interpreters, emphasizing the dynamic interaction between signs and their users. Yule (1996: 4) defines pragmatics as the study of how speakers convey meaning and how hearers interpret it in context. Pragmatics focuses on how language is used to achieve communicative goals and how context affects the meaning conveyed. Brown and Levinson (1987: 13) define pragmatics as the study of how language is used to achieve communicative goals in social contexts. They focus on the concept of "face" and how speakers use language to maintain or threaten the face of the hearer.

According to Levinson (as cited in Pratiwi, 2021:6) pragmatics is a study of language from a functional point of view, that is defining that pragmatic is a language study that analyses linguistic structures that refer to non-linguistic problems. A language study that attempts to explain aspects of language structure by referring to non-linguistic pressures and reasons. Thus, pragmatics focuses the factors of language examined as non-linguistic and that is to say they are interactions between people.

According to Grice (1975:41) pragmatics is the study of the use of language in communication, particularly in relation to the context in which it is used and the inferences that can be drawn from it. Grice defines pragmatics as the study of how

speakers use language to convey meaning that goes beyond the literal meaning of the words. Pragmatics focuses on how speakers use implicature to convey meaning. Grice is known for his contributions to understanding meaning in context through implicature. He emphasizes that pragmatics involves "the principles governing conversational implicature—how people recognize what is meant even when it is not explicitly stated" (Grice, 1975:49).

According to Mey (1993: 4-5), pragmatics is defined as the study of how language is used in social contexts to achieve communicative goals. Mey emphasizes that pragmatics focuses on how speakers use language to achieve their goals and how hearers interpret the meaning conveyed in a specific context. Mey also states that pragmatics is not just about studying the literal meaning of words, but also about studying how meaning is influenced by social, cultural, and situational contexts.

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) understanding the meaning of a word often depends on the context in which the word is used. 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.

According to Grice (1975: 45). in pragmatics, context is defined as the set of circumstances surrounding a communicative act that influences its meaning.

Context influences the meaning conveyed by the speaker and interpreted by the hearer through the cooperative principles. Grice argues that successful communication relies heavily on the context in which conversations occur, which includes background knowledge, the physical environment, social relationships, and shared assumptions between speakers and listeners. In the simple meaning, speakers and hearers have assumptions about the context that are shared, enabling effective communication.

According to Mey (1993: 39-40) "the totality of conditions under which a linguistic expression is used. This includes the social, cultural, and situational context in which the language is used, as well as the speaker's and hearer's knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions.". Mey defines context in pragmatics as a dynamic rather than a static concept. He argues that context is not merely about reference or understanding but plays a crucial role in shaping the deeper meaning of utterances. The same sentence can carry vastly different interpretations depending on the situation in which it is spoken. For example, the phrase "It's been a while since we visited your mother" spoken in a living room by a couple likely conveys a straightforward intention to visit. However, if the same phrase is uttered in front of a hippo enclosure at a zoo, it could take on an entirely different, humorous meaning. This demonstrates how context adds depth to speech and influences linguistic phenomena such as presuppositions, implicatures, and other context-oriented features.

According to Halliday (1978: 32) context influences language meaning through three aspects:

- a) Field: The subject matter or topic being discussed affects vocabulary and sentence structure.
- b) Tenor: The relationship between the speaker and hearer, whether formal or informal, influences linguistic choices.
- c) Mode: The medium of communication, such as spoken or written language, affects the way meaning is conveyed.

Halliday's functional approach emphasizes the role of social context in shaping language.

According to Hymes (1974: 55) developed the SPEAKING model to analyse how context influences language use in communication. Each letter in the acronym SPEAKING represents a component that shapes the meaning of speech in different situations:

- S – Setting and Scene
 - ~ Setting refers to the physical time and place where communication takes place (e.g., a classroom, a park, a courtroom).
 - ~ Scene refers to the psychological or cultural atmosphere, such as whether the situation is formal, informal, serious, or humorous.
- P – Participants
 - ~ The people involved in the communication event, including the speaker, listener, and any other participants.
 - ~ It also includes their social roles, such as teacher-student, parent-child, or friends.
- E – Ends
 - ~ Refers to the goals or outcomes of the conversation.
 - ~ This includes both the intended purpose (e.g., to persuade, to inform) and the expected result (e.g., agreement, understanding).
- A – Act Sequence
 - ~ The order or structure of what is said and how it is said.
 - ~ This includes the content of the message and the form or style in which it is delivered.
- K – Key
 - ~ Refers to the tone, manner, or mood of the speech, such as serious, sarcastic, enthusiastic, or sad.
 - ~ It helps listeners interpret the speaker's intention more accurately.
- I – Instrumentalities
 - ~ The channel of communication used (e.g., spoken, written, face-to-face, online),
 - ~ and the language varieties involved (e.g., formal language, slang, dialect, code-switching).

- N – Norms of Interaction and Interpretation
 - ~ The social rules or conventions that govern the interaction, such as who speaks when, appropriate topics, turn-taking, politeness, and body language.
 - ~ It also includes how the speech is interpreted within the cultural context.
- G – Genre
 - ~ The type or category of speech event, such as a conversation, speech, lecture, joke, interview, or storytelling.
 - ~ Each genre has its own expected structure and style.

According to Levinson (1983: 5): context plays a fundamental role in pragmatics, as it helps determine the meaning of utterances beyond their literal interpretation. Levinson argues that pragmatics is the study of language use and the relationship between language and context, which is essential for understanding communication. He emphasizes that meaning is shaped by the interaction between linguistic expressions and the situational context in which they are used.

2.3. Grice's Cooperative Principle

In pragmatics, the cooperative principle was introduced by philosopher Paul Grice. Paul Grice introduced the cooperative principle in his essay *Logic and Conversation* in 1975. The cooperative principle is a concept to explain how speakers and hearers cooperate in communication to achieve a common goal. The effective communication requires cooperation between speakers and hearers to understand the meaning being conveyed. Grice (1975: 45) mention that speakers and hearers have an assumption that they are cooperating in communication, and that they have a common goal of understanding the meaning being conveyed. This assumption is known as the Cooperative Principle. This concept is based on Grice (1975:41-58) the idea that communication is not just a process of sending and receiving messages, but also involves the process of interpreting and understanding the meaning being conveyed. Speakers and hearers must cooperate to understand the meaning being conveyed, and they must have an assumption that they have a common goal in communication.

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 Quality

Grice (1975: 46), maxim of quality states that speakers should try to make their contribution one that is true, and should not say what they believe to be false or for which they lack adequate evidence. In essence, the maxim of quality requires speakers to be truthful and honest in their communication. This means providing accurate information and avoiding false or misleading statements.

For example:

Maya: "Do you know if the library is open today?"

Jamed: "Yes, I checked the website this morning, and it said they're open until 5 PM."

Based on the example above:

Jamed follows the maxim of quality because his response is truthful and supported by evidence—he checked the library's website for accurate information before answering. This ensures that Maya receives reliable details without confusion. However, if Jamed had replied, "Yes, I think they're open, but I haven't checked," he would be violating the maxim by providing uncertain information without proper verification. This could lead to potential misunderstandings, such as Maya visiting the library only to find it closed.

2.3.2. Maxim Quantity

According to Grice (1975: 45), maxim of quantity states that speakers should make their contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange. In essence, the maxim of quantity requires speakers to provide enough information to facilitate effective communication, but not so much that it becomes overwhelming or unnecessary.

For example:

Alya: "Where is the nearest coffee shop?"

Dimas: "There's a café two blocks away on the left."

Based on the example above:

In this conversation, Dimas follows the maxim of quantity because he provides only the necessary amount of information. Alya asks for the location of the nearest coffee shop, and Dimas answers clearly and concisely, mentioning the café's proximity and direction. However, if Dimas had responded with too much information, such as: "There's a café two blocks away on the left. They serve great cappuccinos, and I love their pastries. It's owned by a family, and the ambiance is cozy with jazz music playing most of the time.". he would be violating the maxim of quantity by providing more details than necessary for Alya's question.

2.3.3. Maxim Relation

According to Grice (1975: 46), maxim of relation states that speakers should make their contribution relevant to the current topic of conversation. In essence, the maxim of relation requires speakers to stay on topic and provide information that is relevant to the conversation. This means avoiding irrelevant or tangential comments that may confuse or distract the listener.

For example:

Emily: "Did you manage to submit the project on time?"

Jake: "Yes, I turned it in just before the deadline. It was stressful, but I got it done!"

Based on the example above:

Jake follows the maxim of relation because his response is directly relevant to Emily's question about the project submission. He confirms that he submitted it on time and adds a little extra detail about the experience, which keeps the conversation flowing naturally. However, if Jake had replied with something unrelated, such as: "I went to the gym yesterday," or "Well, you know how things are," he would be violating the maxim because his response has no connection to Emily's question.

2.3.4. Maxim Manner

According to Grice (1975: 46), maxim of manner states that speakers should be clear and concise in their communication, avoiding ambiguity and obscurity. In essence, the maxim of manner requires speakers to communicate in a way that is easy to understand, avoiding confusion and misinterpretation.

For example:

Zara: "How do I use this coffee machine?"

Leo: "First, fill the water tank to the max line. Then, insert a coffee pod in the holder. Press the power button, wait for it to heat up, and select your brew size. Your coffee will start pouring within seconds."

Based on the example above:

Leo's response follows the maxim of manner because his explanation is clear, structured, and free from unnecessary complexity. He provides step-by-step instructions that are easy for Zara to follow. However, if Leo responded ambiguously, such as: "Just press some buttons, and it should work," he would be violating the maxim by failing to give clear directions, potentially leaving Zara confused. Similarly, if Leo gave an overly detailed and complicated explanation, like: "So, the machine operates by heating water to a precise temperature, and the internal mechanism applies pressure to extract flavour from

the coffee pod. There's a small sensor that detects the pod type, which adjusts the settings accordingly." he would also be violating the maxim of manner because his response is too technical and unnecessarily detailed for Zara's simple question.

2.4. Flouting Maxims

Flouting Maxims refers to a deliberate and noticeable violation of one or more of Grice's conversational maxims to create an implicature, a meaning that is understood indirectly rather than stated explicitly. Unlike simply violating a maxim (which can cause confusion), flouting is intentional and designed to make the listener infer additional meaning.

According to Grice (1975: 45), conversational maxims are guidelines that help maintain effective communication. However, speakers sometimes flout these maxims to imply something beyond the literal meaning of their words. This concept is closely tied to conversational implicature, where the listener must interpret the underlying message.

2.4.1. 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.

For example:

Emma: "Did you finish your project?"

Daniel: "Oh, of course! I finished it weeks ago, and I even won an award for it."

Based on the example above:

Daniel is flouting the maxim of quality by intentionally providing false information. In reality, he has not finished the project, but he exaggerates to

create an implicature, perhaps he wants to be sarcastic or avoid admitting he has not completed it yet. The listener, Emma, will likely recognize that Daniel's response is obviously untrue, leading her to infer the actual meaning that he has not finished his project at all. This kind of flouting is common in sarcasm, jokes, or irony, where speakers deliberately say something false with the expectation that the listener will understand their intended meaning.

2.4.2. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

According to Thomas (as cited in Noertjahjo, 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.

For example:

Lisa: "How was your vacation?"

Tom: "Well, I woke up at 6 AM every day, had breakfast at exactly 7 AM, then went sightseeing for three hours before lunch. After that, I took a short nap, explored the city again, and had dinner at 7 PM sharp. Oh, and I also tried 15 different types of local desserts!"

Based on the example above:

Tom flouts the maxim of quantity by giving far more information than necessary in response to Lisa's simple question. Instead of just saying "It was great! I explored a lot and tried amazing food," he overloads the conversation with excessive details. The listener, Lisa, might infer that Tom is either enthusiastic about his trip or mocking the question by exaggerating his response.

2.4.3. 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 known about the changes of the topic.

For example:

Professor: "How is your thesis progress?"

Student: "Professor, have you ever tried dim sum at the faculty cafeteria?
I heard it's really good!"

Based on the example above:

The student flouts the maxim of relation by intentionally giving an irrelevant response to the professor's question. Instead of discussing their thesis progress, the student changes the subject to something unrelated (dim sum at the cafeteria). By doing this, the student is likely implying that: They have not made much progress on their thesis. Or They do not want to talk about it due to stress or simply wanting to avoid the conversation. This form of flouting is commonly used when people avoid difficult topics, use humor, or try to steer conversations away from unwanted discussions.

2.4.4. 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.

For example:

Emma: "Did you understand the professor's explanation?"

Jake: "Well, let's just say I feel like I just read an ancient manuscript
written in code."

Based on the example above:

Jake flouts the maxim of manner by responding in an unclear and overly figurative way instead of directly saying whether he understood the lecture. His

statement implies that the professor's explanation was confusing or difficult to follow, but he doesn't explicitly say so.

By choosing to be indirect and exaggerated, Jake makes Emma infer that he likely did not understand the lecture and found it hard to grasp. This type of flouting is commonly used in humour or frustration, where a speaker deliberately avoids a clear answer to suggest something more implicitly.

2.5. 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 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 flouting maxim which is 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 flouting maxim found in movie script that I chose.

