

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

As individuals, communication is essential to do every day in our lives. Language is the main requirement when communicating. It consists of formal and conventional language. Language can be performed in various ways, including speech, writing, and gestures. Effective communication involves more than simply delivering ideas. It is about figuring out the sentiment and reasons behind the facts. Participants must accurately communicate a message and listen so that they can get the overall meaning of utterances and to make all the participants feel heard and understood. The speaker and the listener must work together to understand and be understood to have successful communication (Dimmick, 2017). Language use is the key to have good communication. One of the principles in communication is cooperative principles.

The cooperative principle is well recognized for facilitating the communicating parties in excellent communication (Yule, 1996). In addition to having perfect communication between the speaker and hearer, they must prevent misunderstandings. In addition, the speaker must lead the listener to understand the meaning of the conversation even if there is a hidden purpose of the speaker's utterance.

Grice (1989) states the Cooperative Principle as follows: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by

the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.” Moreover, he mentions the types of maxims into four maxims that are known as follows: a) Maxim of Quality is an attempt to offer a real contribution rather than one that you perceive to be untrue. As a result, do not tell lies. b) Maxim of Quantity, do everything possible to make your participation as exciting and informative as possible. Ensure your contribution is not more or less detailed than it needs to be. c) The Maxim of Relevance urges the person to express something relevant to the context of communication. In conclusion, don't say anything that is out of context. d) Maxim of Manner, to make your participation organized and precisely, the participant must avoid using confusing words and obliquely expressing themselves.

The analysis of maxim violation became an issue of this study because numerous factors can cause individuals to violate the cooperative principle. It fascinates the researcher to learn more about this subject. People violate the maxim because they have a specific purpose and the situation in conversation. This study aimed to find the type of violation maxim in the movie, discover the reason behind the conversation that makes participants violate the maxim, and determine the most prevalent sorts of violation of the maxim in the film.

However, all the communication is succeed when the four maxims above are included. For instance, violating the four maxims can be found in the movie as an entertaining purpose. For this data research, a film was chosen because it typically depicts real-world events. It is also frequently described as real life with the dull bits removed, so the scriptwriter made the movie dialogue seem as natural as possible. Hornby's definition of the term "movie" (2010: 434) A film is a tale of

a collection, stories captured as a series of moving images and broadcast on television or at the cinema. Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that a movie is a type of literature that includes a story, a play, history, culture, incidents, science, and other elements that are captured on video and broadcast in cinemas, television, theatres, or other forms of broadcast media for the primary purpose of entertainment. The phenomena are represented more distinctly in movies due to meaning, environment, facial expression, and other influences.

This study used *Emily in Paris* Season 1 as the data source to analyze the violation that occurred by the main character. One of the dialogues among the main character that violated the types of maxims is as follows:

Gilles Dufour : *Are you hungry? Would you like to get coffee or something?*

Emily : ***Oh actually, I have to go to my office.***
(Emily in Paris 2020, Season 1 Episode 1, 06:38:00)

The dialogue above was taken from *Emily in Paris* Season 1 movie. This conversation is between Gilles Dufour as the rental agent and Emily as the main character of this movie. Emily is breaking the relevant principle. Emily has a hidden meaning to refuse the invitation from Gilles. Here, she uses the hidden meaning like the conversation above. Emily was not relevant to the topic. In addition, Emily only needs to say “Yes or No” to answer the invitation of Gilles. Indirectly Emily makes the subject of the conversation unmatched.

Since the movie’s maxims violation is challenging and interesting to analyze, this study profoundly explores the maxim violations and why the characters violate the maxims in the conversations.

1.2 Problems of the Study

Several problems that occurred were written in the following form, based on the study's background explanation:

1. What kinds of maxim violations occurred in the main character's conversation in *Emily in Paris* Season 1 main character's conversation?
2. What are the reason motivating the maxim violations by the main characters in *Emily in Paris* Season 1?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

According to the concerns that have been stated in this study. This research has several objectives, such as:

1. To discover the type of maxim violations done by the main character in *Emily in Paris* Season 1.
2. To analyze the reason motivating the main characters' to violate the conversational maxim in *Emily in Paris* Season 1.

1.4 Limitation of the Study

This research is focused on the violation maxim in *Emily in Paris* Season 1 in this research. Pragmatics is the study's limitations. According to Grice's (1989) concept of the Cooperative Principle, the many sorts of violation maxims that the notable characters commit. To find the reason motivating the main characters to violate the maxim, the writer used theory from Cutting (2002) and supported by Halliday's (1989) theories.

1.5 Significance of the Study

While creating the study of maxims violation, this research provided a theoretical and practical contribution. Those are explained as follows:

1.5.1 Theoretically Significance

Theoretically, this study helped improve the reader's understanding of linguistics, particularly discourse analysis and pragmatics. Furthermore, this study provided readers with a better experience of maxims, particularly the many varieties of maxim violations.

1.5.2 Practically Significance

Practically, this research benefits students who desire to conduct another pragmatics-related study. The aims of this research are likely to discover certain sorts of maxim violations. Furthermore, for a conversation to run smoothly, people should be more mindful of being cooperative in a discussion. Also, to minimize both the listener's and the speaker's misinterpretation.

UNMAS DENPASAR

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, CONCEPTS AND THEORIES.

Chapter two reviews numerous related literature on the subject, the concept used in this study, and the theories that support this research. Some previous research with a similar topic is presented in the literature review since the violation maxim is not the new topic of study.

2.1 Review of Related Literature

It is necessary to evaluate numerous research and undergraduate theses to understand this issue better and analyze it. Several theses and articles written by students are connected to the writer's topic. This study has the potential to help people better comprehend maxims.

The first thesis relevant to this topic research is An Analysis of Maxim's Violation in the Movie "*Finding Nemo*." This thesis was evaluated by Mataram (2017). This study aims to determine what maxims are violated in the movie "*Finding Nemo*" and how social elements are represented in the film's discussions. Some theories were utilized to analyze the data in this study, such as Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) hypothesis, which Yule supported in his book Cooperation and Implicature (1996). He also uses Holmes' theories in An Introduction to Sociolinguistics to analyze social factors (2003). According to the results of this research, the writer discovered that utterances in his data source that

contain the maxim occurred in the movie's discussion. In his thesis, he mentions four various types of maxims. This study discovered 11 different forms of maxim violations. The participant, the venue, the topic, and the role of the conversation exchanges are all social factors that impact this movie study.

The difference between this study and that thesis is in the source of data and the study's objectives. This study was analyzed using the data source from the *Emily in Paris* Season 1 movie. On the other hand, this study examines why the main character violates the maxim. Besides that, his thesis's similarities and this study are that the topic of study is maxim violation.

The Multiple Violations of Conversational Maxims in Lying Committed by the Characters in Some Episodes of Desperate Housewives is a second study related to this topic. Anneke H. Tupan and Helen Natalia wrote this article (2008). *Petra Christian University's English Department, Faculty of Letters*, released this paper. This essay aims to determine why people violate the maxim and the maxims in the *Desperate Housewives* movie. They discovered four conversations that contained violations of all the maxims. They also found that three dialogues involve violations of three different sorts of maxims. Finally, two discussions involve violations of two different kinds of maxims. They're using the theory from Grice (1975) to analyze the violation maxim and Christofferson (2005) to discover why the character violates the maxim.

There are some differences between that article and this research, such as the data source and the theory. This research used the data source from *Emily in Paris* Season 1 Movie. This study used the idea from Cutting (2002) supported by

theory from Halliday (1985) to analyze the study's second objective. The similarity between that article and this research is the topic of Maxim Violation.

Another thesis related to this study is *The Analysis of Non-Observance Maxims Found in Knives Out Movie*. Gunatika (2021) has written this thesis. His research objectives are to determine what kind of non-observance maxims exist in Pragmatics, particularly the Gricean Maxim, and to determine the reason that makes the non-observance maxims occur in the *Knives Out* movie. Grice (1975), who structured the maxim into four parts, provided the ideas employed in this thesis. As a conclusion of this research, the author discovered that the speakers adhered to four maxims. This study found several variances from those maxims as well. The maxims were grouped into four categories: violating, clashing, opting out, and floating. A divergence in the maxims occurs when a speaker attempts to conceal facts and purposefully offers incorrect information. The theories in this thesis are the same as in the previous thesis. They both utilized Grice (1975) to solve the study's difficulty.

The similarity of his thesis and this research is the aim of the study. This study aimed to discover why the violation maxim occurs in the conversation. On the other hand, the difference between his thesis and this study are the topic, data source, and the theory. The issue in his thesis is a little bit different from this study. This study used the violation maxim as the topic. The data source in this study analyzed data from *Emily in Paris* Season 1. Theory from Cutting (2002) was used to explore the second research problem.

The fourth research is an article found in a journal titled *International Conference on Literature: "Literature as a Source of Wisdom."* Sari, Nuraini wrote this article, and Muthalib (2019); the article's title is *An Analysis Of Maxim Violations In A Movie And Their Impacts On Effective Communication*. This article aims to analyze the maxim violation discovered in the movie's characters' statements, the causes for such violations, and how they affect successful communication. Using the qualitative and content analysis method, they found several types of maxim violation occurred in the conversation. The Cooperative Principle and the Effective Communication Theory were used to analyze the data. They discovered 40 utterances with maxim violations, including 19 violating maxim manner, 9 violating maxim quantity, 9 violating maxim quality, and 3 violating maxim relation. The characters disobeyed the maxims for various reasons and in multiple settings. Furthermore, the violation of maxim relation has the most significant impact on communication efficacy, followed by maxim quantity, manner, and quality violations. This research uses the data from a movie titled *Confessions of a Shopaholic*.

The similarity between that article and this research is the research topic, Maxim Violation. Furthermore, the differences are the aims and the data source. This study aims to determine the maxim violation committed by the main character and the cause of the breach. The movie was chosen as the data source titled *Emily in Paris* Season 1.

2.2 Concepts

This subchapter provides various concepts to explain the meaning of some relevant essential points. To avoid the reader's confusion and misunderstanding while reading and comprehending this study. The following thoughts were gathered from several sources to supplement the data analysis. The concepts consist of the essential terms of this research, such as Pragmatics, Cooperative Principle, Maxim Violation, and *Emily in Paris* Season 1 Movie.

2.2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is included in linguistics that investigates how context affects meaning. The meaning of a word or a sentence is explored using pragmatic analysis. It examines a participant's utterance in a conversation the speaker's meaning and the listener's interpretation of that meaning. The study of the link between the language form and the person who makes the utterances is pragmatics, according to Yule (1996). It focuses on characteristics of meaning that are not just influenced by language information but also by physical and social knowledge.

2.2.2 Cooperative Principle

The cooperation principle is one branch of pragmatics' most significant theories. According to Grice (1975), Individuals are encouraged to contribute as required in a discussion under the Cooperative Principle. The purpose and direction of the dialogue define the necessity. The cooperation principle was a crucial underlying assumption of persons when they spoke to one other and encouraged effective communication. It is vital to observe the conversational maxims for

communication to flow smoothly. There are four conversational maxims in cooperative principle: the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner.

2.2.3 Maxim Violation

A violation is defined as the non-observance of a maxim that goes undetected or "silently." A speaker who breaks a rule is more likely to mislead the audience (Grice, 1975). There are four categories of maxim violations: violation of maxim of quantity, violation of maxim of quality, violation of maxim of relevance, and violation of maxim of manner.

2.2.4 Movie

According to Hornby's definition of "movie" (2010: 434), a film is a tale of a collection of stories captured as a series of moving images and broadcast on television or at the cinema. The movie is a kind of visual communication that employs sound and moving images to convey tales or teach people something. The majority of movies are created to be viewed on large screens in theatres or at home. Action, adventure, animation, comedy, documentaries, drama, horror, thriller, romance, and fantasy are among the film's genres

2.3 Theories

This study's theoretical framework depends on some of the suggested hypotheses. Theoretical frameworks, such as Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) and Yule's Cooperation and Implicature (1996), were utilized to evaluate the many kinds of violations of the maxim. This research also employs theory from Cutting

(2002) in the book “Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students” to discover what motivates the main character to violate the maxim and is supported by theory from Halliday (1989).

2.3.1 Types of Maxim

According to Grice (1975), it is vital to recognize these maxims as unstated assumptions we make in conversations, such as the assumption that people would typically provide an acceptable amount of data. We assume they express the truth, are relevant, and make every effort to be as straightforward as possible.

2.3.1.1 Maxim of Quality

This kind of maxim has several requirements as follows:

- a. Never mention something you know to be untrue.

This indicates that the speaker’s utterance is either not permitted to make a false statement or is required to declare what they think to be true. When the speaker comments, the listener must give the correct response.

- b. Don't mention anything for which you don't have enough evidence.

According to the Quality maxim, the speaker is required to offer facts. Some speakers seek to draw attention to themselves by expressing what they think to be true despite the absence of evidence. The speaker has to speak something based on the fact (Cutting, 2002). The purpose of the Maxim of Quality is to ensure that each speaker provides accurate information or contributions to their listeners.

For the example:

A: *I'll ring you tomorrow afternoon then.*

B: *Erm, I shall be there **as far as I know**, and in the meantime, have a word with Mum and Dad if they are free. Right, bye-bye then, sweetheart.*

A: *Bye-bye, bye.*

(Cutting, 2002: 35)

B replies, **as far as I know** in this case since she isn't sure if she is willing to respond to A's call tomorrow. B is protected from accusation by saying this since she has previously stated that she was unsure. In other circumstances, B has contributed and followed the quality maxim. And the person is supposed to trust what the other person says.

2.3.1.2 Maxim of Quantity

This maxim has two requirements for the speaker, the following:

- a. Make your point of view as specific as possible.
- b. Don't go into more detail than is necessary for your contribution.

The means of these two statements are that the speaker is expected to give the information required, not too much and not less information. Suppose the contribution isn't as informative as it could be. The suggested message was ambiguous. If the input is too informative, it is considered a waste of time.

A cutting (2002: 34) stated that “People who give too little information risk their hearer not being able to identify what they are talking about because they are not explicit enough; those who give more information than the hearer needs risk boring them”

2.3.1.3 Maxim of Relevance

This type of maxim just required the speaker to utterance with the relevant topic given. People should contribute to the conversation in ways pertinent to the topic at hand. You must be relevant to follow such a principle.

“If I am mixing ingredients for a cake, I do not expect to be handed a good book, or even an oven cloth,” states Grice (1989:28). The following analogy is used to show the maxim of relevance.

2.3.1.4 Maxim of Manner

These sorts of maxim have several required, as follows:

- a. Avoid ambiguity in language.
- b. Brief when transferring the idea.
- c. Maintain order.

When the participant asks a question, the other person should respond as clearly as possible and without ambiguity. People must avoid making difficult-to-understand expressions to communicate effectively. Furthermore, unnecessary prolixity or too many words weary the speaker's statement. Look at the following example:

A: *Where is the car key?*

B: ***They're on the table in the hall.***

(Thomas, 1995: 64)

The case above includes the Maxim of Manner as the case above; utterance B provides the fact as straightforward as it requires.

2.3.2 Violation Maxim

Violation maxim occurs when the speaker provides incomplete information, says something incorrectly, provides irrelevant and ambiguous data, and the listener mistakenly believes that they are cooperating (Thomas, 1995)

2.3.2.1 Violation of the Maxim of Quality

Violation maxim of quality happens when the participant utters the untruth facts. Furthermore, when the speaker states a falsehood or provides false information. When the speaker asks a question, the listener responds with false information. Check out the following circumstance:

A: *Will you give me a truthful answer? However, do you think it'll hurt me?*

B: *I promise.*

A: *Is there another man?*

B: ***No, there isn't another man.***

(Thomas, 1995: 73)

In the case above, speaker B was breaking the quality maxim. Speaker B tells untruth information for speaker A because she has an affair with a woman.

2.3.2.2 Violation of the Maxim of Quantity

Violation of Maxim quantity means that the participant is provided ambiguous or unclear information. Additionally, the person is talking too little or too much while returning the information. When the person asks a question, the other participant responds by offering unclear information or talking too much.

Check out the following circumstance:

A: *Does your dog bite?*

B: ***No***

A: *(bend over to pet the dog and get bitten straightforward) Aw! You said your dog doesn't bite!*

B: *That isn't my dog.*

(Cutting, 2002: 40)

The above example contains less information than is necessary. So, speaker B is violating the maxim of quantity.

2.3.2.3 Violation of the Maxim of Relevance

In this context, one of this sort of violation maxim occurs when the speaker is says something irrelevant to the topic, look at the following example:

A: *How much did that new dress cost, darling?*

B: *I know, let's go out tonight. Now, where would you like to go?*

(Cutting, 2002: 40)

According to the example above, speaker B is breaking the principle by saying anything unrelated to the question posed by speaker A. Instead of responding to Speaker A's inquiry, she diverts his attention and asks a new one.

2.3.2.4 Violation of the Maxim of Manner

Violation of maxim manners occurs when the participant provides an unclear utterance. Furthermore, when the participant employs ambiguous language and does not communicate clearly and ordered. When the speaker poses a question, the listener responds ambiguously or confusingly. For the example:

A: *How much did that dress cost, darling?*

B: *A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me.*

(Cutting, 2002: 40)

According to the case above, Speaker B violates the manners principle by expressing an ambiguous and unclear viewpoint. To keep her husband from discovering the actual cost of the outfit, the woman violated the maxim of manners.

2.3.3 Context

Context is a situation, environment, or specific place in which an event happens in context. When analyzing the meaning of words, it is an essential part of communication that should be considered. According to Yule (1996:3) “Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning because context determines what is stated by the speaker”. As a result, understanding context is critical in understanding the meaning of the speaker’s statements in a larger sense. A Cutting (2002) specifies three forms of context: situational, background knowledge, and co-textual.

2.3.3.1 Situational Context

This type is about what speakers know about what they can see around them. The situational context is the immediate physical co-presence, where the interaction occurs when speaking. Look at the following example:

Lecturer : *Forty-nine? Why do you say forty-nine?*
 Pupil : *Cos there’s another one here.*
 Lecturer : *Right, we’ve got forty-nine there, haven’t we? But here there are two, okay? Now, what is it that we’ve got two of? Well, let me give you a clue. Erm, this here is forty, that’s four tens, four tens are forty.*
 (Cutting, 2002:04)

The situational context of this following scenario takes place in a classroom, and both the lecturer and the student are pointing at either the chalkboard or an exercise book. The demonstrative adverbs *here* and *there* indicate a figure in an equation. In addition, Halliday (1989:10) mentions three features of the context of the situation as Field, Tenor, and Mode.

1. Field

The field in the theory of situational context by Halliday (1989) is referred to the subject matter, and it may be analogous to some users of the term domain in computational linguistics, such as: what is happening, the kind of social activity that is taking place, when and why is happening. Analyzed the topic discussed during the conversation (Halliday, 1989:77).

2. Tenor

Tenor in this study refers to the social relationships existing between the interactions in a speech situation. Kinds of role relationship obtained among the participants, including the permanent and temporary relationship of one kind or another, both the type of speech role that they are taking on the dialogue and the whole cluster of significant social relationship (Halliday, 1989:77).

3. Mode

Mode describes how language is used in the speech interaction, including spoken, written, written to be told, etc., and the rhetorical mode (expository, instructive, persuasive, etc.).

2.3.3.2 Background Knowledge Context

The second form of context is presumed background knowledge, which might be cultural or interpersonal. Culture refers to the broad knowledge that most people have about various aspects of life. Meanwhile, interpersonal knowledge relates to the speaker's special and sometimes secret knowledge. Look at the following example of Interpersonal knowledge context:

(There was a US television advertisement that featured a telephone dialogue like this)

Her : *How are you?*

Him : *OK.*

Her : *Did you have friends in and get a video last night?*

Him : *Oh, I had friends in, but we just watched a little TV.*

Her : *Ah right.*

Him : *That was great. How do you feel?*

Her : *OK.*

(Cutting, 2002:07)

When she says OK at the end there is a flashback and we see that she won a gold medal in an Olympics event. The utterance of him that *Oh, I had friends in, but we just watched a little TV* means *I had friends in to watch you playing on TV and I know you won*. The amount of interpersonal knowledge that a husband and wife share is evident, which is why any reference to it may be so vague, implicit, and minimum.

2.3.3.3 Co-textual Context

This form of context refers to the speaker's and listener's knowledge of what they have been saying. It is co-text, which is the context of the text itself. It is concerned with lexical and grammatical coherence. Look at the following example:

DM : *I went with Francesca and David.*

AF : *Uhuh?*

DM : *Francesca's roommate. And Alice's – a friend of Alice's from London. There were six of us. Yeah, we did a lot of hillwalking.*

(Cutting, 2002:07)

In the following example, the words 'us' and 'us' are not exophoric since they relate to DM, Francesca, David, Francesca's roommate, Alice's buddy, and Michelle, who are all named elsewhere in the text. The nouns 'Francesca' and

'David' are employed as exophoric references since they allude to persons who are present in the cultural context but have not been mentioned in the text.

