

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the meaning of language based on its usage context in specific communication situations. In other words, pragmatics examines how speakers and listeners understand the meaning of utterances not only based on linguistic structure (such as grammar and vocabulary) but also based on situational context, shared knowledge, communicative purpose, and the relationship between the speaker and the listener.

According to Yule (1996, p. 4), pragmatics is the study of meaning expressed by speakers, not merely the meaning of words or sentence structures. He states that: "The study of speaker meaning is known as pragmatics." Furthermore, Yule also emphasizes that pragmatics involves interpreting what is meant by the speaker based on the context of communication, not just based on the linguistic structure used.

Meanwhile, Levinson (1983, p. 5) defines pragmatics as: "pragmatics is the examination of the grammaticalized or encoded relationships between language and context." Levinson's definition shows that pragmatics encompasses aspects of language that cannot be fully understood without considering the social and cultural context in communication.

Furthermore, Griffiths (2006, p. 1) states that: "pragmatics is concerned with the use of language in context and the impact that context can have on the interpretation of meaning." From these various opinions, it can be concluded that pragmatics functions to understand how meaning is produced, interpreted, and used in communication based on contextual factors such as place, time, speech purpose, and the social relationship between the speaker and the listener.

2.2 Cooperative Principle

In ordinary conversations, speakers and listeners usually follow a rule called the Cooperation Principle. This means that they try to help each other so that the conversation runs smoothly and is easy to understand. For example, the

speaker tries to give clear and appropriate information, while the listener tries to listen well and respond appropriately. This principle helps both parties understand each other and keeps the communication effective. Levinson (as cited in Taufiqi et al., 2021, p. 2) explains that conversation is a form of communication that takes place casually and freely between two or more people. Usually, conversations like this occur outside formal situations, such as in religious services, law courts, schools, or other official environments. This means that conversations do not follow strict rules as communication in formal institutions, but tend to be spontaneous and natural.

According to Grice (as cited in Hossain, 2021, p. 32), stated the cooperative principle, “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. Grice argued that in everyday communication, speakers and listeners naturally follow this principle of cooperation to achieve good understanding. Hossain (2021, p. 32) states that in pragmatics, the main purpose of communication is to share or exchange information. Usually, people cooperate so that the messages they convey can be understood including the hidden meaning behind their words. Therefore, conversation is considered a form of cooperation between two parties who have the same goal by understanding each other. Paul Grice’s theory of cooperative principles strongly leads towards pragmatics as a theory of conversational discipline.

In order for conversations to run smoothly and messages to be received clearly, we need to follow certain rules called maxims. These maxims are guidelines in speaking, such as telling the truth, giving enough information (not less and not too much), speaking in context, and delivering in a clear and understandable way. By following these rules, people involved in a conversation can understand each other well, so there is no confusion or misunderstanding. Conversely, if these rules are ignored, the conversation can become unclear, confusing, or even fail to convey the true meaning. Therefore, the rules of maxims help keep conversations purposeful, understandable, and beneficial for everyone involved.

Grice proposed four principles to explain how people cooperate when they speak: there are maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The four underlying maxims are detailed as follows:

2.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

People should speak with enough information. This maxim emphasizes the importance of conveying the right amount of information. This means that when speaking or writing, one should provide enough information for the needs of the conversation. The information should not be too little to cause confusion, nor too much to confuse or distract the other person (Setlur and Tory, 2022, p. 4).

Kazuha : “What did you do last weekend?”

Wonhee : “I went to the beach with my family.”

Wonhee gives just enough information to answer the question without being too short or too long. She does not answer just “I went out” (too general) and also does not immediately explain all her activities from morning to night (too much information). This is in accordance with the maxim of quantity: speak moderately, not less, not more.

2.2.2 Maxim of Quality

People should be truthful when speaking. Convey information that is true and reliable. Do not convey something that is known to be false or doubtful, unless accompanied by an appropriate explanation or disclaimer. If someone speaks without sufficient basis or evidence, it can be considered a violation of the quality maxim (Setlur and Tory, 2022, p. 4).

Jake : “Did you finish your homework?”

Sunoo : “Not yet. I was feeling a bit sick, so I’ll finish it tonight.”

Sunoo honestly says that he has not finished his homework because he is not feeling well. He does not lie or give a false answer. This shows compliance with the maxim of quality: only say things that are true and believable.

2.2.3 Maxim of Relation

People should provide relevant information when speaking. This maxim emphasizes the importance of keeping the conversation focused and on topic. Irrelevant information can disrupt the flow of communication and make the

conversation ineffective. Therefore, you should only convey things that are directly related to the purpose or context of the conversation (Setlur and Tory, 2022, p. 4).

Eunchae : “Are you coming to the meeting this afternoon?”

Carmen : “Yes. I’ll be there at 3 PM.”

Carmen’s answer is relevant to Eunchae’s question. She directly answers the question about the meeting instead of talking about other topics like “I had lunch with my friend today.” This shows the maxim of relation: the answer must fit the topic or question.

2.2.4 Maxim of Manner

People should speak by providing clear and specific information. This maxim emphasizes the importance of conveying messages in a clear, organized, and non-confusing manner. Use simple language, avoid overly technical terms if they are not needed, and structure sentences in a way that is easy to understand. Also, avoid using language that is convoluted, indirect, or contains ambiguity (Setlur and Tory, 2022, p. 4).

Taehyung : “Where is the nearest bookstore?”

Yeonjun : “The nearest bookstore is on Merdeka Street, about five minutes from here. It's on the left, close to the cafe.”

In this conversation, Yeonjun answers Taehyung's question in a clear, organized, and non-confusing way. He mentions the location of the bookstore specifically, which is on Merdeka Street, and provides additional information that is convenient, such as that it is about five minutes away from where they are and that it is on the left side near the cafe. This explanation is straightforward and easy to understand, so it is very helpful for the interlocutor. This shows that Yeonjun complies with the maxim of manner because he conveys information in an effective, unambiguous, and to-the-point speech style, according to the question asked.

2.3 Maxim Violation

Violation of maxims is a form of incongruity in communication, where someone does not follow the rules in conveying information. In everyday conversations, it is not always possible to follow the cooperative principle. Sometimes, speakers find themselves in situations where they need to ignore this principle. One example is when a speaker purposely gives information that does not relate to the topic in order to confuse or mislead the person they are talking to (Grice, as cited in Munthe, 2021, p. 9). Yule (as cited in Nugroho and Ariffin, 2022, p. 129) states that maxim violation occurs when the speaker does not follow the rules of the maxim in their utterance. This statement refers to the listener who seeks a different meaning from what is said by the speaker. Meanwhile, Cutting (as cited in Nugroho and Ariffin, 2022, p. 129) outlines the types of maxim violations: a violation of the quantity maxim occurs when the speaker does not provide enough information because they want to hide part of the context; a violation of the quality maxim occurs if the speaker conveys something that is not true or only guesses; a violation of the relation maxim appears when the speaker switches to another unrelated topic; while a violation of the manner maxim occurs when the speaker conveys information in a confusing or unclear way and may even just stop talking.

2.3.1 Violating Maxim of Quantity

When someone breaks the maxim of quantity, it means they do not give the right amount of information. Sometimes, the speaker gives too little, which can leave the listener confused or unsure about what is really going on. This can be seen as the speaker being very careful or holding back the truth on purpose (Cutting, as cited in Munthe, 2021, p. 9). On the other hand, giving too much information can also break this rule. If a speaker shares more details than necessary, it might overwhelm or distract the listener from the main point of the conversation.

Jungkook : “What did you eat for lunch?”

Beomgyu : “I ate.”

Beomgyu violates the maxim of quantity because he gives too little information.

Jungkook asks specifically about *what* he ate, but Beomgyu's answer is very

general and uninformative. He should have given a more complete answer, for example: “*I ate chicken rice.*” In this context, Beomgyu is uncooperative because he withholds information that could have been shared.

2.3.2 Violating Maxim of Quality

According to Cutting (as cited in Munthe, 2021, p. 10), when a speaker violates the maxim of quality, it means they are not giving true or accurate information. This usually happens when the speaker purposely tells something false because they do not want the listener to know the truth. In this case, the speaker is being dishonest or lying on purpose.

Heeseung : “Did you finish the homework?”

Sunghoon : “Yeah, I finished it last week.”

(In fact that he hasn't touched the task at all)

Sunghoon violates the maxim of quality because he lies. In this context, Sunghoon does not want Heeseung to know that he has not done his assignment, so he answers Heeseung's question by giving false information as if he has done it last week, but in reality he has not. Thus, Sunghoon is stated to have violated the maxim of quality because he gives information that is not honest.

2.3.3 Violating Maxim of Relation

According to Cutting (as cited in Muthe, 2021, p. 10), when the speaker tries to change the topic of conversation in order to distract the listener, it means that the speaker is considered to have violated the maxim of relation. Usually, this happens in situations when the speaker feels uncomfortable with the topic of conversation or hides something related to the topic at hand to avoid the listener from getting involved in the topic of conversation further.

Jimin : “Hey, did you talk to the manager about our schedule this weekend?”

Sunoo : “By the way, have you seen the new ramen shop near the dorm? The reviews are amazing!”

Sunoo violates the maxim of relation because he changes the conversation to another unrelated topic. Jimin is talking about something important and serious, which is about their schedule this weekend. But Sunoo instead answers by discussing irrelevant things, namely the new ramen shop. This makes the

conversation ineffective because it does not answer the question or continue the topic being discussed. In communication, things like this can make the other person feel ignored or confused.

2.3.4 Violating Maxim of Manner

Violating the maxim of manner occurs when a speaker deliberately speaks in a way that is unclear, vague, or difficult to understand. This type of violation happens when the speaker uses confusing expressions, ambiguous language, or speaks in a disorganized way, making it hard for the listener to grasp the intended meaning. This is often done on purpose, especially when the speaker wants to avoid giving direct answers, hide something, or create distance in the conversation (Cutting, as cited in Munthe, 2021, p. 10).

Jungwon : “How do I get to the dorm from here?”

Taehyun : “Just go that way... then you’ll see... you know, that thing... and turn... like... kind of where it curves.

In the conversation above, Taehyun violates the maxim of manner because he explains the direction in a vague way and gives ambiguous information. Jungwon asks for directions to the dormitory, but Taehyun answers with non-specific words such as “that way”, “that thing”, and “kind of where it curves”. This kind of answer made Jungwon confused because he does not know exactly which direction he means, what object he means, and where it curves. This makes it difficult for Jungwon to understand the meaning of the answer and makes communication ineffective.

2.4 Context

American linguist, Dell Hymes, emphasizes the significance of context through the lens of communicative competence. He asserts that communication arises from the interaction between individuals and their social surroundings. According to him, spoken language should not only follow grammatical norms but also align with the specific social and situational context in which it is used. Hymes identifies eight key elements that shape communicative context: message form and meaning, situational setting, interlocutors, communicative goals, mood, communication channels, language variation, and rules for interaction (Hymes, as

cited in Luo, 2016, p. 17). It can be concluded that communication is a complex process and it is not enough just to understand grammar. To communicate effectively, one must also understand who is being spoken to, the purpose of communication, the appropriate language style, and the social situation. This shows that communication competence includes social, cultural and situational aspects, not just linguistic aspects. So, the success of communication is greatly influenced by the speaker's ability to adapt the language to the context of use.

Anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski coined the term context of the situation to describe the overall environment that influences communication, not only the language (verbal) environment but also the real conditions or situation when a text or utterance is spoken. In addition, Malinowski also introduced the concept of context of culture after realizing that cultural background has an important role in understanding meaning, even more than the sound or text heard directly (Malinowski, as cited in Jiangli, 2021, p. 392). This explanation shows that the understanding of meaning in communication is highly dependent on the social and cultural context. Based on Malinowski's view, the more one understands the culture and social situation of the interlocutor, the more accurately one captures the meaning of the message. Therefore, in cross-cultural communication, awareness of context is key to avoiding misunderstandings and achieving effective communication.

2.5 Previous Related Studies

There are several examples of connected studies from the past that support this research. These studies have similarities and differences with this research. This shows that there is a study that uses the same theory and method but with a different object of literature.

The first previous study is from Pradani and Sembodo (2020) with the title "The Violation of Conversational Maxims in the Movie Series *Divergent*". This study focuses on identifying the types of conversational maxims violated by the characters in the *Divergent* film trilogy and explains the functions behind those violations. The result of the research showed that there are 100 violations in total. The most frequently violated maxim is the maxim of relevance, with 43

occurrences (43%), followed by the maxim of manner with 24 violations (24%), and the maxim of quantity with 22 violations (22%). The least violated maxim is the maxim of quality, which appeared 11 times (11%). The researchers also identified several functions behind the violations, such as keeping a secret, concealing half of the information, avoiding certain topics or questions, and confusing the hearer.

The second previous study is from Nugroho and Ariffin (2022) with the title “The Multiple Violation of Maxim in *Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness* Film”. This study aimed to describe the types of multiple maxim violations based on the cooperative principle found in the film, along with their intended meanings. Using a qualitative descriptive method, the researchers analyzed 20 utterances that reflected maxim violations. The result shows that the speakers violating four multiple maxims (quantity, quality, relation, and manner) totally 11 data (55%), three maxims ((quantity, relation, manner), (quantity, quality, manner), (quantity, quality, relation)) totally 7 data (35%), two maxims (quantity and quality) totally 1 data (5%), and one maxim (quality) totally 1 data (5%). The functions of these violations were identified as avoiding conflict, intimidating someone, and creating lies.

The third previous study is from Putri and Rania (2023) with the title “Violation of the Principle of Maxim Cooperation in the Conversations between Characters in the *Blonde* 2022 Movie”. This research aimed to identify the types of cooperative principle violations committed by the characters and to describe the intended implicatures behind those violations. The study applied a qualitative descriptive method using note-taking techniques to analyze conversations in the movie script. The results showed four types of maxim violations: violation of the maxim of quantity (1), quality (1), relation (2), and manner (1). The most frequent violation was the maxim of relation, where characters expressed utterances irrelevant to the conversational context. The study also revealed several types of implicatures found in the violations, including requesting information, providing information, expressing feelings (such as anger, sadness, or disappointment), and giving commands. The most commonly found implicature was providing information.

The fourth previous study is from Setiawati, et. al (2024) with the title “The Analysis of Maxim Violation in *All the Bright Places* the Movie”. This study aimed to identify the types of conversational maxim violations found in the film, which discusses themes of mental health, family, and relationships. Using a descriptive qualitative method and Grice’s theory, the researchers analyzed the dialogues between the two main characters, Theodore Finch and Violet Markey. The findings revealed 9 violations of the maxim of quality, 3 violations of quantity, 13 violations of relevance, and 6 violations of manner. The study concluded that the maxim of relevance was the most frequently violated, often used to reflect the characters’ emotional struggles and communication breakdowns.

The similarity between my research and the previous related studies above is that all studies used the same theoretical foundation, namely Grice’s Cooperative Principle, focusing on the violation of conversational maxims as part of pragmatics. Each study, including mine, applies a descriptive qualitative method to identify the types and functions of maxim violations found in movie dialogues. However, the difference lies in the object of the research. While the previous studies used objects such as films like *Divergent*, *Doctor Strange*, *Blonde*, and *All the Bright Places*, my research uses a different object, which is a movie script titled *To All the Boys I’ve Loved Before* (2018).