

An Analysis of Grice's Maxim Violation in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* Movie by Jon Watts

Novi Kurnia Sari¹

¹English Literature Study Program, Language and Literature Department
Faculty of Humanities University of Halu Oleo
Corresponding Email: nhovikurnia96@gmail.com

Abstract

This thesis is intended to analyze the violation of Grice's maxim which is found in the utterances of conversations between characters in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* movie by Jon Watts. The objective of this study is to find out the violations of Grice's maxim in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* movie. Those are the violation of quantity maxim, the violation of quality maxim, the violation of relation maxim, and the violation of manner maxim. After data reduction, it can be seen that the number of the four types of Grice's maxim violation in the movie is 20 turns. Violation of quantity maxim is 5 turns. Violation of quality maxim is 5 turns. Violation of relation maxim is 5 turns. Violation of manner maxim is 5 turns. The dominant violation from Grice's maxim type is the violation of maxim relation. The violation of Grice's maxim in the movie is created in order to make the conversation seem as natural as real life and not too formal for the speaker and the addressee.

Keywords: *cooperative principle, pragmatics, spider-man: homecoming, violation*

INTRODUCTION

Language is one of the ways which has an important role in human life. In general, communication is a tool of language to have the output of language itself. Nowadays, sometimes the use of language is not simply based on the principle of well-formed syntax, but also for the communication matter so the communication can keep running without misunderstanding. From this basis, it can be understood that communication can still run even if not using an orderly language syntactically. That is why pragmatics as the study of speakers' meaning is really needed. One of the studies of pragmatics is Grice's maxim of cooperative principle. Grice (1975) in Yule (1996: 37) formulated 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. Therefore, there is a kind of cooperative principle that the speakers and the addressees have to do so the communication can run smoothly. In addition, in our daily life, many people that have a conversation sometimes make utterances that are unrelated to the topic, have ambiguous meaning, or are not necessary to say. It

makes the conversation not really run smoothly. This has reached the violation of cooperative principle where the speakers and the addressees do not create a cooperative conversation. If the speakers and the addressees do not give cooperative reaction in a conversation, it will violate Grice's cooperative principle. The research question of the study is "What are the violations of Grice's maxim found in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* movie?". The purpose of the study is to find out the violations of Grice's maxim in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* movie from its conversations. Those are violation of quantity maxim, violation of quality maxim, violation of relation maxim, and violation of manner maxim. This research can be used as a medium in pragmatic teaching and can contribute to the development of pragmatic study, especially in Grice's maxim violation. It also can give a better understanding in the analysis of Grice's maxim violation in movies.

RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher used a descriptive qualitative method. Bogdan and Biklen (1982: 28) state that in qualitative research, the data are collected in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers. In addition, the researchers have to analyze the data with all the richness of their knowledge as closely as possible. In this research, the researcher focused on analyzing the violation of Grice's maxim that appeared in the conversation between characters in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* movie through the screenplay of the movie. To collect the data, the researcher followed some steps. The steps are watching, pausing, annotating, screen shooting, coding, and data reduction. To analyze the data, the researcher used descriptive analysis, such as describing the context of the data, presented the data into conversations and images, explained the whole data, and made the conclusion based on the data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Violation of Quantity Maxim

In this maxim, Grice (1975) in Yule (1996: 37) states *make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purpose of the exchange), do not make your contribution more informative than is required*. The main point of this maxim is the amount of information that is given by the speaker to the addressee. We have to be informative. In other words, do not be more informative than is required, not more and not less. Therefore, the violation of quantity maxim is

making the contribution more informative than is required. It can be seen in *Data 1* and *Data 2* below.

Data (1)

Duration (00:05:41)

Happy : *Who are you talking to?*

Peter : *No one. **Just making a little video of the trip.***

In the conversation above, when Happy hears Peter talking to someone while holding his phone, he becomes suspicious and then asks Peter with whom he is talking to because Peter should not tell anybody if he is on a mission. Peter answers “*No one*”, but he continues it with the utterance “***Just making a little video of the trip***”. Happy only asks about who Peter is talking to, he does not ask about what Peter is doing. Therefore, by adding that utterance, Peter violates the maxim of quantity which he gives more information than what it should be. However, Peter gives too much information in order to make it clear to Happy that he does not talk to anybody because he just records a video for himself.

Data (2)

Duration (00:42:53)

Peter : *Well, look, I think it's a power source.*

Ned : *Yeah, **but it's connected to all these microprocessors. That's an inductive charging plate. That's what I use to charge my toothbrush.***

The dialogue occurs when Peter tries to guess that something in the weapon is a power source. When Ned sees the weapons, he also sees other devices and then he responds to Peter's utterance by saying “*Yeah*”. Then Ned adds utterances that should not be explained by saying “***but it's connected to all these microprocessors. That's an inductive charging plate. That's what I use to charge my toothbrush***”. These utterances clearly violate maxim of quality because Ned gives too much information rather than just providing a simple statement of his agreement. Ned gives too much contribution because he just wants to tell Peter that he also has an inductive charging plate like that to charge his toothbrush.

Violation of quality maxim

This maxim is about how to make our contribution to be true and not make our contribution we believed to be false, and also do not make our contribution lack sufficient evidence or prove. It

can be seen in Grice's (1975) statement in Yule (1996: 37) that says *try to make your contribution one that is true, do not say what you believe to be false, do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence*. Therefore, the violation of quality maxim is making the contribution to be false and lacking evidence as seen in *Data 3* and *Data 4*.

Data (3)

Duration (00:21:30)

Happy : Stay away from anything dangerous. I'm responsible for making sure you're responsible, okay?

*Peter : **I am responsible**. I... Oh, crap. My backpack's gone. Happy :*

That doesn't sound responsible.

The quotation above happens when Happy tells Peter to stay away from anything dangerous because he is responsible for making sure that Peter is responsible. Then Peter says “***I am responsible***” which is an untruth statement because, at the same time, he got his backpack's gone that makes him not responsible enough to keep his backpack. Therefore, Peter violates the maxim of quality because he gives an untruthful contribution.

Data (4)

Duration (00:22:49)

Ned : You're Spider-Man. From YouTube.

*Peter : **I'm not. I'm not.***

Ned : You were on the ceiling.

*Peter : **No**. What are you doing in my room?*

The quotation above shows the conversation between Peter and Ned who are both really in shock. Peter shocks because Ned catches him when he wears his Spider-Man suit and crawls on the ceiling in his room, while Ned shocks because he sees his friend Peter is actually the Spider-Man who has been the talk of the people lately on YouTube. When Ned said that Peter was a Spider-Man from YouTube, Peter denied it by saying “***I'm not. I'm not***”. Peter also denied when Ned said that Peter was on the ceiling by saying “***No***”. and tried to change the topic by saying “*What are you doing in my room?*”. From the quotation, Peter violates maxim of quality by saying untruthful contribution and lack of evidence because Ned clearly sees him wear his suit and crawl on the ceiling. However, Peter gives an untruthful contribution because he does want anyone to know that he is Spider-Man. He has to keep it a secret and only Mr. Stark and his crew

know that.

Violation of Relation Maxim

Maxim of relation is one of Grice's maxim which has something to do with the relation between what the speaker says and what the addressee response. This maxim is concerned with the relevancy of contribution made by speakers in communication exchange. In maxim of relation, Grice (1975) in Yule (1996: 37) states *be relevant*. Therefore, the violation of relation maxim means making an irrelevant contribution to the addressee. It can be seen in *Data 5* and *Data 6*.

Data (5)

Duration (00:13:33)

Liz : *Next question. What is the heaviest naturally-occurring element?*

Charles : ***Hydrogen the lightest.*** *That's not the question. Okay.*

When Liz asks the question "What is the heaviest naturally-occurring element", Charles quickly answers "***Hydrogen the lightest***" which is not the right answer. It even does not relate with the question because the question is "What is the heaviest naturally-occurring element", not "What is the lightest naturally-occurring element?". Therefore, Charles violates maxim of relation because the contribution of what he (the addressee) responses does not have relevancy with the contribution of what Liz (the speaker) gives. Charles gives irrelevant contribution because he presses the bell too fast before thinking the right answer, it makes him misunderstands the question and gives unrelated answer.

Data (6)

Duration (00:16:52)

Peter : *Hey, buddy. Is this your bike? Man*

: ***I have no change.***

The quotation occurs when Peter asks the stranger if the bike that he finds from the thief is his bike or not. It shows when Peter says an utterance "*Hey, buddy, is this your bike?*". However, the stranger replies to him by saying "***I have no change***". That utterance has no relation to Peter's utterance about the bike. Therefore, the stranger violates the maxim of relation which is not

giving a related contribution to the addressee. However, the stranger gives irrelevant contributions because he may assume that the guy who is wearing the Spider-Man costume is just a mascot who just wants to sell the bike to him.

Violation of Manner Maxim

This maxim contains of how the speaker and the addressee can make a clearer conversation like what Grice (1975) states in Yule (1996: 37) that *be perspicuous, avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), be orderly*. The main focus of maxim of manners is to avoid unclear expressions and make simple brief utterances that are necessary so there is no ambiguity and the conversation will run smoothly and orderly. Therefore, the violation of manner maxim is making the contribution unclear and has ambiguity as seen in *Data 7* and *Data 8* below.

Data (7)

Duration (00:09:08)

Mr. Stark : ***Don't do anything I would do, and don't do anything I wouldn't do. There's a little gray area in there. That's where you operate.***
Peter : *Wait, does that mean I'm an Avenger? Mr.*
Stark : *No.*

The dialogue occurs when Mr. Stark gives advice and explains to Peter about what he should do and what he should not do. However, the explanation of Mr. Stark is a little confused. He says “***Don't do anything I would do, and don't do anything I wouldn't do***”. Mr. Stark forbids Peter to do what he would do, it means that Peter should do what Mr. Stark did not do. But at the same time, he also forbids Peter to do what he would not do which is mean that Peter should not do what Mr. Stark did. From the quotation, Mr. Stark clearly violates the maxim of manner by giving an ambiguous and unclear contribution to Peter. The reason why Mr. Stark gives an ambiguous and unclear contribution because he has his own meaning in describing what Peter should do and what Peter should not do. He does not want Peter to do not do what he would not do, like doing crime, and he also does not want Peter to do what he would do, like getting involved in a big war or fighting against high-level crime.

Data (8)

Duration (00:09:31)

Mr. Stark : ***We'll call you.***

Peter : *Do you have my numbers?*

Mr. Stark : ***No, I mean, we'll call you. Like, someone will call you. All right?***

The quotation above happens when Peter asks about when the next mission begins again. Then Mr. Stark just gives an utterance "***We'll call you***". It makes Peter confused because he does not think that Mr. Stark has his number, so he asks Mr. Stark whether Mr. Stark has his number or not. At that time, he was ready to give his number if Mr. Stark did not have it. However, Mr. Stark repeats his unclear utterance following by an explanation utterance "***No, I mean, we'll call you. Like, someone will call you. All right?***" and hoped Peter will understand. From the unclear utterance of Mr. Stark and Peter's confusion, these show how Mr. Stark violates the maxim of manners because he does not give a clear contribution to Peter. Mr. Stark gives an unclear contribution because he thinks Peter will understand his simple utterance.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the study in findings and discussion, the researcher concludes that all of the four types of Grice's maxim violation are found in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* movie. After data reduction, it can be seen that the number of the four types of Grice's maxim violation in the movie is 20 turns. Violation of quantity maxim is 5 turns. Violation of quality maxim is 5 turns. Violation of relation maximis 5 turns. Violation of manner maxim is 5 turns. The researcher also concludes that the violation of Grice's maxim in the movie is created in order to make the conversation seem natural and attractive as in real life. If the conversation does not have any violation, it will seem too formal and awkward for the speaker and the addressee. Therefore, the violation of Grice's maxim is sometimes needed and could not be separated from a certain conversation, included in the movie. The researcher also finds that the dominant violation of Grice's maxim type is the violation of maxim relation which is the most type that was violated in *Spider-Man: Homecoming* movie.

REFERENCES

- Amazon. Spider-Man: Homecoming Plot. IMDb. <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt2250912/plotsummary>. (Accessed on April, 2018)
- Arthanti, N. 2013. Violation of Grice's Maxim in The Garfield "Hangs Out" Comic: Comparison between Source Text (ST) and Target Text (TT). Skripsi. Dian Nuswantoro University. Semarang.
- Bogdan, R.C.& S.K. Biklen. 1982. Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Diastuti, N. R. 2012. The Analysis of Maxims in "Tears of the Sun" Movie. Skripsi. State Islamic Studies Institute (STAIN) Salatiga. Salatiga.
- Grice, Paul. 1975. "Logic and Conversation". In Cole, P., and J.L. Morgan, eds. Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press, 41-58.
- Iskandar, D. 2010. The Gricean Maxim Analysis in the Scripts of The Simpsons Season 5. Skripsi. State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah. Jakarta.
- Kovrlija, Aleksandria. 2012. Linguistics. Interesting Articles. <http://www.interestingarticles.com/languages/linguistics-798.html>. (Accessed on March, 2018)
- Leech, G. N. 1983. Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press. New York. Lyons, J. 2002. Language and Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
- Moleong, L. J. 2001. Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung: PT Penerbit Remaja. Rosdakarya.
- Yule, G. 1996. Pragmatics. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Yule, G. 2010. The Study of Language. Cambridge University Press. New York.