

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part is theoretical review. It deals with the description of Pragmatics, Cooperative Principles, and Detective Pikachu Movie. The second part is the conceptual framework and the analytical construct. It shows the concepts which are referred in conducting this study and draws how this research is conducted.

A. Pragmatics

In linguistics, pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and the context that underlies the explanation of language understanding. Understanding of language refers to the fact that in order to understand a language expression or utterance, it is also necessary to have knowledge outside the meaning of the word and its grammatical relationship, namely its relationship to the context in which it is used. Pragmatics is one of the linguistic disciplines that has an important role because by learning and mastering it, one not only understands the formal structure of a language, but also the functional structure which concerns how these formal structures function in the act of communication. Yule (2006: 3-4) in his book mentions four definitions of pragmatics, namely:

1. Field that studies the meaning of the speaker or the speaker's intent.
2. A field that examines meaning according to its context.
3. Areas that exceed the study of the meaning conveyed, more than what is said,
and

4. A field that examines the form of expression according to social distance that limits participants to engage in certain conversations.

According to Levinson in Edi (2012) pragmatics is defined as follows:

1. Pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and the context that underlies the explanation of language understanding. The meaning or understanding of language refers to the fact that in order to understand a language expression or utterance, knowledge outside the meaning of the word and its grammatical relationship is required, namely its relationship to the context in which it is used.
2. Pragmatics is a study of the ability of language users to associate sentences with appropriate contexts for these sentences.

Pragmatics is the study of the meaning of speech in certain situations. The properties of language can be understood through pragmatics, namely how language is used in communication. Van Dijk in Djajasudarman (2012: 60) has a very close relationship between pragmatics and speech acts because speech acts are the center of pragmatics. The utterance of a sentence to state that the intent of the speaker is known to the listener. Pragmatics learns the meaning of speech asking what someone means by a speech act and associating the meaning with who speaks to whom, where and how.

B. Cooperative Principle

Communication or conversation carried out in everyday life requires collaboration between speakers and speech partners. Cooperation is very necessary in conversation, so that ongoing communication can be well established and does

not cause misunderstanding. The speech partner can understand what the speaker talks about and gets the information he needs.

The base theory that support the cooperative principle as this research is stated by Grice (1989), which he stated:

“Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice, 1989: 26).

Cooperative is a term used in linguistic literature to show human behaviour in a conversation (Davies, 2007). Pragmatics would not function properly without realizing figurative or hidden meanings in the current conversation. Conversations function when we have an addresser and destination. If we have X and Y and they participate in the conversation, X ask Y about something and he expects Y to cooperate with him and answer his questions or statements, which must be relevant to what X is asking or saying. Therefore, they try to communicate with each other. In other words, they work together, but it produces what Grice calls; ‘implicature’ (Al-Saedi, 2013).

Even though cooperative principle needed to be present in a communication, in a particular situation with a certain condition or context involved, a speaker might intentionally flout it (Grice, 1989). The reason as to why someone would violate a maxim may vary, ranging from a possibility that they may wanted to hide the truth, to save face, they feel jealous, to satisfy or cheer the hearer, to avoid hurting the hearer, or to simply convince the hearer.

C. Flouting of Maxims

Flouting of maxims is an act of violation committed by a speaker in a conversation that deviates from the principle of cooperation or the rules of language use. Flouting of maxims often occurs in everyday conversation. Speakers sometimes deliberately do flouting of maxims, because speakers have goals and objectives to be achieved and expect their interlocutors to understand what the speaker means. Cutting (2008: 36) suggests that the flouting maxim is unostentatiously. The speaker deliberately supplies insufficient information, says something that is insincere, irrelevant or ambiguous and the hearer wrongly assumes that they are cooperating.

According to Thomas (2013) flouting happens if “speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with deliberate intention on generating implicature” (p.65). In flouting, the speaker does not provide the information required by the maxim. But still the listener can reach the meaning because of the implicature.

According to Grice (1991), there are 4 maxims that are required in conversations in order to have an ‘effective exchange of information’. Those maxims are Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner, which classified as follows.

1. Maxim of Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true.
 - a. Do not say what you believe to be false.
 - b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

2. Maxim of Quantity:
 - a. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of exchange).
 - b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
3. Maxim of Relation: Be relevant.
4. Maxim of Manner: Be perspicuous.
 - a. Avoid obscurity of expression.
 - b. Avoid ambiguity.
 - c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
 - d. Be orderly.

He also suggest that the flouting of these maxims could potentially convey a different meaning that what literally had been said, which he notes often appeared in sarcasm and ironic in comedy. This different meaning is what known as an implicature. Regarding the said matter, Horn and Ward (2005) concludes that implicature is a distinction between “the said and the meant- the implicated and the unsaid.” Which ironically implied that implicature is basically saying less than concise but meaning more. Grice, as referenced by Levinson (2000:18), also explained about generalized implicatures, as follows:

“I also distinguished . . . particular conversational implicatures that depended on particular contextual features . . . and ones that I thought of as relatively general which I called generalized implicatures. These are the ones that seem to me to be more controversial and at the same time more valuable for philosophical purposes, because they will be the implicatures that would be carried (other things being

equal) by any utterance of a certain form, though, as with all implicatures, they are not to be represented as part of the conventional meaning of the words or forms in question. And I thought that this notion of a generalized conversational implicature might be used to deal with a variety of problems, particularly in philosophical logic, but also in other areas. In these areas there seemed to me to be quite good grounds for suspecting that some people have made the mistake of taking as part of the conventional meaning of some form of expression what was really not part of its conventional meaning, but was rather a nonconventional implication which would normally be carried, except in special circumstances. It is difficult to find noncontroversial cases just because, if this mistake has been committed, it has been committed on such a wide scale.” (Grice 1981: 185).

Each flouting of the aforementioned maxims has a possibility of raising implications, which would convey the true meaning. Flouting can happen to the four maxims; the maxim of quality; the maxim of quantity; the maxim of relation; the maxim of manner. The following are examples of flouting of each maxims:

1. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

According to Cutting (2008: 38), if a speaker is flouting the maxim of quantity, they do not give the hearer enough information to know what is being talked about, because they do not want the hearer to know the full picture. Rahardi K (2005: 53) also reveals something similar to Cutting, that speech that does not contain the information needed by the speech partner or speech that contains excessive information is a flouting maxim of quantity.

Grice (1989) stated that the flouting of the maxim of quantity may happen if the speaker intentionally give more or less information than what is really needed.

Look at the example below:

Boy: What are you going to buy?

Mat: Well, I'm gonna buy some vegetables at the supermarket with my mom's new car.

The example above shows that Mat already giving too much information than what is asked for by Boy. The required information is “*I'm gonna buy some vegetables at the supermarket.*” However, the speaker adds an unwanted information by saying “*using my mom's new car*”.

2. Flouting Maxim of Quality

Going by the definition of the maxim itself, it means that the speaker intentionally did not tell the truth, or simply refuse to say the truth. For instance; Bob had a 50 score on his last exam, and when he got home, his mother asked him about his score.

Mom: How many you got on the last exam, Bob?

Bob: Well, not really bad, Mom.

From the above, Bob intentionally hides the fact that he got 50 on his exam by saying “not really that bad”. Therefore, Bob had flouted the maxim of quality.

3. Flouting Maxim of Relation

Flouting on the maxim of relation will show that the second speaker did not give a relevant answer to the first speaker. For instance: Both Mary and John needed to present their assignment to the teacher today.

Mary: Have you finish your assignment for today, John?

John: I have just came back from my mother las night and did not get enough sleep.

From the excerpt above, John had flouted the maxim of relation, because Mary asked whether he had completed the assignment or not, and the answer that he must give was either a yes or no. However, John answered her question irrelevantly by stating “*I have just came back from my mother las night and did not get enough sleep.*”, which will raise a possible implication that John had not finish his assignment yet, albeit he did not answer it directly to her.

4. Flouting Maxim of Manner

On the case of the maxim of manner, a flouting may occur if the second speaker answer a question in an ambiguous way and uttered a sentence or a word not in a common way than how it is actually said. As an example: John had taken his girlfriend on a date last night, and Jenny ask where they went.

Jenny: Where do you take your girlfriend last night?

John: Oh, we went to a very beautiful and calm place, where we can sit down and watch the stars on the night sky together while being surrounded by the verdant trees.

In the above conversation, John had flouted the maxim of manner because he did not specifically mention where he and his girlfriend went last night. Instead of mentioning a specific location of where they went, he instead gave a vague description of the place where he went.

From the above examples, it can be concluded that the speaker not only makes choice in what they wanted to say, but also how they wanted to say it. They way what they wanted to say in a particular context for the right duration, from the right place of where they are at the moment, with the amount of amplitude and with the right gestures (Clark, 2004). Of course, the process of such communication may also be affected by cultural differences, as stated by Kochman (1981):

“Cultural differences play a covert role in the communication process. When blacks and whites interact in public meetings, their agenda does not typically include a discussion of the way they are interpreting each other’s behaviour, the reasons they are interpreting it as they do, or the way they are expecting the meeting to evolve” (Kochman, 1981:7).

D. Implicature

People cannot be separated from communication with others, such as chatting. In talking to other people, actually every form of speech implies something to be communicated. The implicature is a proposition that commonly hides behind the speech produced, and is not a direct part of that speech (Parker, 1962: 21; Wijana, 1996:37). In this case what is said is different from what is implied. Hence, Wright (1975:379) proposed that what is meant is not what is said.

Differences in speech and implicature sometimes make it difficult for speakers to understand the meaning of an utterance. But generally, the other person has experience and knowledge, therefore the conversation can run smoothly without any obstacles. Grice (via Nababan, 1987:30) explains that the meaning of implicature as it is stated above called meaning non-natural, which then it is used as the base of conversational implicature. According to Levinson, the problem of conversational implicature is the most crucial one in the study of pragmatics. It happens because the problem of conversational implicature is directly related to the practical usage of language, both verbal and non-verbal (Edmondson, 1981: 38).

According to Brown and Yule (1983: 27), implicature is the elements outside of the text. If it is returned to the initial concept, it can be understood that the relationship between the two propositions, speech and the implication is not an absolute consequence (Parker, 1986: 21). With something like that can really connect the action of the conversation so that the conversation can run effectively. Based on the concepts described previously, implicatures can be defined with the following characteristics: 1. Implications are not stated directly, 2. There is no absolute relationship with the embodied speech, 3. Includes extralinguistic elements, 4. Open interpretation, and 5. Occurs due to obedience or disobedience to the principle of cooperation in conversation.

The similarity of understanding between speakers and speech partners regarding the meaning of speech is a success in conversation. Speakers provide an understanding of a meaning to their speech partners that can be done directly, that is, said directly to their speech partners.

Understanding that is done indirectly, namely by using words that are implied. Brown and Yule (1983: 31) explain that the term 'implicature' is used by Grice (1975) to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says. Rahardi K (2005: 43), also argues that in the implicature, the relationship between actual speech and non-spoken intent is not absolute. The inference of the utterance's intent must be based on the context of the speech situation in which the speech emerges.

Levinson (1983: 97-100) argues that implicature has four basic concepts, namely:

1. Implicature stands as a paradigmatic example of the nature and power of pragmatic explanations of linguistic phenomena.
2. The important contribution made by the notion of implicature is that it provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what is actually said".
3. The notion of implicature seems likely to effect substantial simplifications in both the structure and the content of semantic descriptions.
4. Implicature, or at least some closely related concept, seems to be simply essential if various basic facts about language are to be accounted for properly.

According to Grice (1975: 307) there are two kinds of implicature, namely conventional implicature and non-conventional implicature. Yule (1996: 45) reveals the conventional implicature are not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. They don't have to occur in conversation, and they don't depend on special contexts for their interpretation. Non-conventional implicature Cutting

(2008: 34) suggests that the meaning conveyed by speakers and recovered as a result of the hearer's inferences is known as conversational implicature.

Based on the descriptions of the experts above, it can be concluded that implicature has the following intentions:

1. Express concern
2. Expressed admiration
3. Annoying other people
4. Pride yourself
5. Mock
6. Give an offer
7. Obscure information
8. Express anger
9. State the purpose of arrival
10. Melting the situation
11. Cover up information
12. Expressed indifference
13. Change subject
14. Rebut, which will be used as a reference in the discussion



Conversational implicatures appear in conversational acts. Therefore, the nature of implicature is temporary and non-conventional directly with utterance spoken (Levinson, 1991: 117). Implicature is a combination of language with situation where the same speech in different situations may not produce implicature, or it may also suggest implicature (Black, 2006: 25).

E. Movie

Movie are moving images that present a story in which there is a message or message to be conveyed to the audience. Movie can also be regarded as a type of visual communication that uses the movement of images and sound to tell a story or tell the audience about information. Most people think that watching a film is a kind of fun entertainment. Because only by watching a movie people can laugh, cry and even feel scared, this can happen because the audience is carried away by the storyline that the movie deliberately presents. Miyarso (2009: 1) explains that in movie almost all ideas, message ideas or even events can be created and broadcast using motion technology. Movies can tell real things that often happen around humans and fictional things that come from the human imagination.

F. Detective Pikachu Movie

Detective Pikachu Movie is a fantasy mystery film made by director Rob Letterman which was released in 2019. The filming is based on the franchise made by Satoshi Tajiri. One such franchise is a video game of the same name which was released in 2016. In this live action film, Ryan Reynolds plays the voice of Pikachu. Also present were a number of other actors and actresses such as Justice Smith, Ken Watanabe, Kathryn Newton, Suki Waterhouse, Omar Chaparro and Chris Geere.

The story begins with a hired detective named Harry Goodman who mysteriously disappears. The son, Tim, who is 21 years old, is worried about his father and decides to look for him. When Tim finds out that his father had an accident, he is with his friend Jack. At that time Jack invited Tim to go somewhere and asked Tim to catch a pokemon. At first Tim refused, but after Jack persuaded

him, Tim finally agreed to do it. When Tim had put a pokemon into the ball, it turned out that the pokemon rebelled and was forced out of the pokemon ball. Then the pokemon attacked Tim and Jack asked Tim to run with him and run away from the place.

While on the way home after running away from the pokemon, Tim got a telephone which apparently informed his father that there had been an accident. Tim was shocked and immediately went to Ryme City by train. Ryme City is a large, modern city filled with humans and Pokemon living side by side. The team arrived in Ryme City where people have Pokemon or you could say Ryme City is a very modern city where humans live side by side with Pokemon.

When Tim arrived at Ryme City, Tim immediately met Yoshida who was his father's workmate. Yoshida explained the incident that happened to his father, Tim very carefully and explained that his father went missing along with his pokemon who was a pikachu. During the conversation, Yoshida asked why Tim did not have Pokemon, even though he had dreamed of becoming a Pokemon trainer when he was little. Tim did not explain the details and only answered haphazardly. Yoshida also gave some advice to Tim but Tim wanted to hurry to go to his father's apartment.

When Tim arrived in the apartment lobby, he was confronted by an apprentice reporter named Lucy who came with his Pokemon. Lucy intends to find information about the accident that happened to Hary because Lucy feels there is something strange about the incident. However, Tim did not really respond to this and immediately went straight to his father's apartment. After Tim entered his father's

apartment he looked around and found a small bottle and when he opened it, purple smoke came out which turned out to make Pokemon very fierce. Tim continued to look around his father's apartment and heard something from the living room, it turned out that Tim found a pokemon who turned out to be a pikachu and strangely Tim could understand what the Pikachu was saying.

Because the smoke or purple gas opened by Tim was sucked in by the Pokemon around his father's apartment which made the Pokemon fierce and attacked Tim. Then Pikachu and Tim try to escape from the Pokemon's attack. After they managed to escape, Tim found out that this Pikachu was his father's Pokemon. They chat and try to find out what happened to Tim's father.

The next day Tim and Pikachu go to Lucy's internship to tell them that Tim found a purple gas which makes Pokemon so fierce. It turns out that Lucy also knows about this gas which is called R gas and Lucy is also finding out about it. Lucy gave a hint that there was an informant who could be asked for information about it. Tim and Pikachu rushed to find the informant. After meeting the informant that Lucy meant, which was a Pokemon. The Pokemon gave instructions for Tim to go to a Pokemon battlefield. However, at the pokemon battlefield Tim didn't get much information. And it turned out that Tim was spied on or followed by someone's envoy.

Tim is very enthusiastic about telling Yoshida that his father hasn't died because Tim found his father's pokemon, Pikachu. But Yoshida convinced Tim that his father had died because of the accident that happened to his father which made it impossible for his father to live. Tim and Pikachu left the place and suddenly they

were picked up by a messenger from someone who was Howard. Howard is the founder and chairman of Clifford Industries who is one of the most influential people in Ryme City, he is diagnosed with a rare disease and is trying to find a cure for it.

Arriving at Howard's place, Tim was welcomed. Howard explains that what happened to Tim's father was part of a collaboration between his father and Howard where Howard asked Hary for help in carrying out a task that led to the deadly accident. Howard said that the mastermind of the incident was the act of his own son, Roger, who was said to really hate Pokemon and did not want humans to co-exist with Pokemon.

Howard shows Tim why his father got into the accident that happened to Mewtwo. Mewtwo is the strongest Pokemon and Howard indirectly orders Tim to find Mewtwo and bring it to Howard. After that, Tim invited Lucy to meet him because Tim had found some clues about what happened to his father. Lucy also invites Tim to visit her father's accident site which is close to a building where the building is the place for Pokemon genetic research which stands on behalf of the Clifford company.

Arriving at that place, which is called PCL, they enter the place and find out about the place and the many Pokemon that seem like an experiment to be made into evolution. Tim and Pikachu find a recording containing Mewtwo's research and it turns out that in the recording there is his father. Tim and Pikachu did not believe that their father was involved in the activity.

Tim intends to return to the city and look for Lucy, but Lucy is caught by Pokemon in that place. They tried to escape from the place but they took the wrong path where they were in a tortilla garden which caused them to be in danger and Pikachu was unconscious because of that. Then Pikachu is brought by the Pokemon who can heal and it turns out that Pikachu is awakened by Mewtwo. After Pikachu realizes, Mewtwo thanks Pikachu because Pikachu has kept his promise to bring Hary's son who is Team to Mewtwo. The incident caused a misunderstanding because Pikachu felt guilty that he was involved in Hary's accident.

Shortly thereafter, Mewtwo was captured by Roger. Pikachu feels guilty and doesn't want to join Tim. Tim returned to town with only Lucy and her Pokemon. Arriving in the city, it turned out that it was already busy with a Pokemon parade held by Howard Clifford where many large gas balloons filled with R. gas had been installed in the parade.

Tim also finds out that the mastermind behind all of this is Howard who wants Mewtwo to be his own revolution so that Howard can be free to go anywhere and do anything with Mewtwo's body controlled by Howard's mind. Roger also turned out to be made a scapegoat by his own father. Tim and Pikachu try to stop the parade because it will cause a huge amount of chaos. After going through various attacks, finally the mess was resolved. Howard was arrested by the police and Roger gave an explanation that his father was very obsessed with being able to make evolution to Pokemon for his own sake.

Mewtwo also explained that he was rescued by Hary and Pikachu from the Clifford research site. However, Hary was attacked by pokemon ordered by Clifford

which resulted in the accident. Hary is badly injured and Pikachu is willing to offer his body to save Hary's mind which causes Pikachu to forget his memories. Mewtwo tells Pikachu to bring Tim to Mewtwo so that they can return or save Hary. And it turns out that all this time in Pikachu's body is Hary's mind. Finally, all the problems were resolved and Tim became living with Hary in Ryme City.

