

An Analysis of Non-Observance the Maxim in *Knives Out* Movie Script

Tamrin¹, Muarifuddin², Arman³

^{1,2,3} English Literature Study Program, Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Humanities
University of Halu Oleo

Corresponding Email: tamrine16@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is a pragmatic approach to the study of an analysis of Non-Observance the Maxim in *Knives Out* Movie Script. The objectives of this research are to find out the types of Non-Observance a Maim in Movie Script, and to find out dominantly types of non-Observance used by all the character's utterances. The researcher used a content analysis qualitative method to describe and analyze the selection of non-Observance which are watching movies and then classifies them according to Paul Grice's concept types of non-Observance. The researcher used content analysis which focused on classifying the types of non-Observance and the dominantly types of Non-Observance in *Knives Out* movie carried out by all the characters. The researcher found that the characters use all types of non-Observance. First, flouting {Quality (3), Quantity (8), Relation (1) Manner (-)}. Second is Violation, they are {Quality (4), Quantity (3), Relation (1), Manner (-)}. Third is Opting Out, they are {Quality (-) Quantity (1) Relation (1) Manner (-)}, Forth is Infringing, they are {Linguistics Performance (-), Culture Impairment (-) Cognitive Impairment (1)}, and the last is Suspending (1) Based on the data above, it reveals that all characters in their utterances dominantly used the non-Observance of flouting with the total of 13 data.

Keywords: *cooperative principle, movie script, pragmatic, types of non-observance*

INTRODUCTION

Humans are Individual creatures. They are also social creatures that cannot be separated from other people's language and communication. A social being is a creature that cannot live alone to talk to other people. Social beings are animals that cannot live alone and are always dependent on others. Therefore, with our language we can interact or communicate with each other. Language is very important for us in living our daily lives. According to B. John Carrol, language is any systematic sound of speech, used or can be used in interpersonal communication, used collectively by humans, and is a fairly exhaustive classification of things, processes, and events in

the human environment. Based on the various definitions above, it can be concluded Through language, humans can adapt to the customs, behavior, manner of society, and at the same time to blend themselves with all forms of society.

Linguistic object is Language while language is a tool for communication that must be understood by speakers and interlocutors so that communication can run smoothly and as expected. The principle of cooperation, according to Grice (1975), asserts that basic communication is the communication that speech participants require the most in various types of good communication. Language is the subject of linguistic research. Language is a technique of communicating or interacting with people, and it is also known as communication. Linguistics is a study of language or a science that studies language as an object of study. Definition according to Lim (1975:3) Linguistics is the study of language as a science. Linguistics also offers frameworks or theoretical approaches that might be characterized as scientific procedures; in this case, human and social research scientific methods. Linguistic analysis is done in a methodical way, based on certain broad notions of language structure.

Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, focusing on their choices, the limits they face while using language in social interactions, and the influence their choices have on other communicative actors (Crystal 1985 in Kasper 1997). On the other hand, pragmatics, according to Yule, is the study of utterances given by speakers and understood by listeners (1996:3). Pragmatics, on the other hand, is the study of meaning in context. It involves considering how the speaker arranges the information he or she wants to convey. Finally, pragmatics is the study of how the listener interprets the speaker's implied meaning. Finally, pragmatics is the study of relative distance assertions. This study is expected to focus on the relationship between language forms and their users. In addition, the researcher is interested in pragmatics and wants to learn more about it. Grice stated in one of the most fundamental works in pragmatics that a discourse has a principle known as the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle argues that participants expect each

other to offer a "conversational contribution as is required, at the time it occurs, by the widely understood purpose or direction of the talk exchange," according to (Grice 1975). The cooperation principle hypothesis may be applied to a wide range of pragmatics products, including movies. The film has several character dialogues, it is one of the media that may be used as a communication study object. The cooperation principle hypothesis may be used in this discussion as well. Many individuals like watching movies, but not everyone understands the value of the words made by the characters, particularly those who exemplify the cooperative notion. Various values, such as moral values, social values, educational values, and other values, may also be found in the picture. This film is interesting to investigate as a research topic. The researcher discovers a linguistic phenomenon in this video, namely the Cooperative Principle, which includes the violating maxim.

The reason why researchers choose this movie as an object is because after watching the movie, the researcher indicated that in the movie, there are many utterances from the characters that contained Cooperative Principle, especially the Non-Observance of the Maxims. The reason why the writer applied the Non observance of the maxims because the Non observance is one of the theories to analyze the implied meaning of utterance and also because there are many utterances es that contains the non-observance that are still not exposed in this Knives out movie script. So that the phenomenon of the above review, the researcher is interested in conducting research with the title "An Analysis Of Non-Observance The Maxim in "Knives Out" Movie Script (Grice's Theory)

RESEARCH METHOD

In this Research, the researcher applied a qualitative content analysis method to analyze Knives Out movie script using Cooperative Principle theory by Paul Grice because this research uses a script that uses non-numerical format data. The qualitative content analysis method also was used to facilitate the data that first collected all relevant data and categorized them based on Content analysis Method by Moleong then analyzed to answer the research questions. From the description above,

the researcher can state that qualitative content analysis used to analyze the data to answer the research question is what is the Non-Observance the Maxim in Knives Out movie script and which type is dominantly used in non-Observance the maxim.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

According to the data validation, the researcher has found 25 data non-Observance the maxim in Knives out movie script. The researcher attempts to analyze the data using Pragmatics study, especially cooperative principle by using the classification of Non-Observance by Paul Grice, they are flouting, Violation, opting out, infringing, and suspending. The table below showed all the data from the research

No	Types of Non-Observance	Kinds of Non-Observance	Sub Total	Total
1.	Flouting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Quantity • Relation • Manner 	3 8 2 -	13
2.	Violation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Quantity • Relation • Manner 	4 3 1 -	8
3.	Opting Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Quantity • Relation • Manner 	- 1 1	2
4.	Infringing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linguistics Performance • Culture Impairment • Cognitive Impairment 	- - 1	1
5.	Suspending	-	1	1
Total			25	25

Table 1. Non-Observance

Flaunting

Flaunting where the speaker is blatantly disobeying the maxim, not with the intent to deceive or mislead, but because the speaker wishes to prompt the listener to look for a different or additional meaning. to, the meaning of expression. He called this additional meaning "conversational meaning" and called its generation "ignoring

aphorisms' '. Defiance occurs when the speaker blatantly fails to adhere to the maxim at the level of what is being said, intentionally insinuating.

Quantity

Quantity is when the speaker provides too little or too much information than is really needed.

Data 5/00.04.43/Flout/Quantity/004

Meg : How are you doing.?

Marta : Not very good. Alone, lots of just this (the crying) and not knowing what to do next.

Meg : Anything you need, you're part of this family

Marta.

Marta : Thank you.

Based on the data above, the dialogue occurred when Marta and Meg were in front of Harlan's house. They hug, and are both instantly crying. They laugh. Seen from the context of the situation in the dialogue above the Type of Non-Observance. while the print in bold is the floating maxim of quantity. In this utterance, Marta gives more information or response than needed by saying "Not very good. Alone, lots of just this and not knowing what to do next." In fact, it is enough to say Not very good, it has completed Meg's question without more and lack of information, the opposite of that maxim quantity requires each participant to make an adequate contribution or according to what the interlocutor needs. so that from Marta's speech the researcher can conclude that Alice does the Flouting maxim of Quantity.

Violation

Many commentators incorrectly use the term 'Violate' for all forms of non-observance of the maxims. But in his first published paper on conversational cooperation (1975), Grice defines Violation very specifically as the unostentatious non observance of a maxim. If a speaker violates a maxim s/he 'will be liable to mislead' (1975: 49).

Quality

The violation of the maxim Quality is when the speaker lies or says something that is believed to be a statement that is not true with an indication of changing the actual information.

Data 15/00.19.40/Vio/Quality/020

BLANC : *You tell her. Or I will. Bells ringing?*

RICHARD : *Yes. I know - yes, ha. So. Harlan decided to finally put his mom in a nursing home. Which Linda always opposed. And I was going to wait till we were back home in Boston to tell her, so there wouldn't be a whole scene, but Harlan wanted me to tell her then. That was it. Sorry. Forgot.*

Based on the data above, the dialogue occurred when Richard was sitting in the chair, shouting and being interrogated in the library. Mr. Blanc asked questions regarding A Caterer walks through with a platter who hears shouting through the wall. For just a split second, Richard considers what he is going to say. In the second, we Flash back Based on the context of the situation above, it is a non-Observance type, while the bold type is a violation of quality. In this speech, Richard violates the maxim by intentionally providing false and unverifiable information which causes misleading implications, while the maxim of Quality requires that each participant in the speech provide correct and verifiable information. Richard provided misinformation and could not be verified to Mr. Blanc by saying": Yes. I know - yes, ha. So. Harlan decided to finally put his mom in a nursing home. Which Linda always opposed. And I was going to wait till we were back home in Boston to tell her, so there wouldn't be a whole scene, but Harlan wanted me to tell her then. That was it. Sorry. Forgot." Richard's response is based on the conversation above that Richard provided incorrect information so that the secret about his affair was not revealed by men. So that from the explanation related to the dialogue above, the researcher can conclude that Richard does the Violation maxim of Quality.

Opting out

Opting Out Maxim Opting out happens when a speaker would like to signal her/his addressee of how much s/he will observe the maxim by indicating her/his

unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. Based on Thomas (1995), people sometimes opt out of the maxim in order to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative, for legal or ethical reasons or giving the requested information that might hurt a third party or put them in danger, furthermore.

Opting out of Quantity

Opting out or hedging the maxim of quantity means is when the speaker tries to provide information to the interlocutor, but the information provided is incomplete or only partial.

Data 22/00.12.45/opt/Quantity/013

Linda : Mr. Blanc, I know who you are, I read your New Yorker profile. It was delightful. I just buried my eighty-five-year-old father who committed suicide. Why are you here?

Blanc : I am here at the behest of a client.

Linda : Who?

***Blanc* : I cannot say, but let me assure you this: my presence will be ornamental. You will find me a respectful, quiet, passive observer. Of the truth.**

Based on the data above, the dialogue occurs when Linda is in the chair. Elliott and Wagner turn back to Blanc, who leans forward slightly and speaks in the gentlest southern lilt you have ever heard in your life.

Based on the context of the situation above, the type is non-Observance, while the bold type is Opting out of quantity the maxim. In this speech, Blanc provides information or contributions but he limits the information he will share so that it creates misleading implications, while the maxim of Quantity requires each participant to make adequate contributions and not provide more or less information than necessary. Blanc limits providing information to Linda by saying "I cannot say, but let me assure you this: my presence will be ornamental You will find me a respectful, quiet, passive observer. Of the truth...." of Blanc's response based on conversation above that Blanc limits the information provided by using the expression "I cannot say more". So from the explanation related to the dialogue above, the researcher can conclude that Blanc is opting out of the maxim Quantity.

Infringing

A speaker who does not intend to imply and has no intention to deceive fails to observe the maxim is called "infringe" the maxim.

Cognitive Impairment

This type of infringement occurs when people are unable or unable to speak clearly due to reasons such as being under the influence of alcohol, being too drunk, taking drugs, sleeping and others.

Data 24/01.38.11/Inf/Cognitive Impairment/098

Marta : Fran! Fran! Can you hear me? Fran, give me a sign if you can hear me!
Fran : You
Marta : Me? Fran it's Marta, you called me here, you sent me the email, I'm here. I'm going to call an ambulance and you're going to be ok but can you tell me what happened, did you take something, what's happened to you -
Fran : copy...copy
Marta : What?
Fran : ...stashed...
These words are barely given breath:
Fran : (cont'd) you... did this... won't... get away with this

Based on the data above the dialog occurs during Int. 1209 Columbus Road Marta edges her way in, her eyes still adjusting from the sun. Marta takes a step closer, lifts her phone, and turns on its flashlight. Illuminating the ghostly face of Fran, the housekeeper. Marta, barely breathing, A Spider crawls across Fran's face.

Marta Stifles a Scream and leaps back, sucking in air. Marta Swallows. Marta starts - oh my god - and goes to her, checking a pulse, checking her eyes, and lays her on her back. Fran sucks in thin breath, her eyes finding Marta in the glare of the dropped phone flashlight. Based on the context of the situation above, the type is non-Observance, while in bold it is Opting out of Relation the maxim. In this story Fran cannot speak clearly for reasons such as being under the influence of alcohol, being too drunk, and taking drugs. So that it gives rise to misleading implications and cannot be understood by the interlocutor, whereas in a maxim requires each participant to make a contribution that is clear and can be understood by the listener

without being convoluted. Fran spoke to Linda by saying "you... did this... won't... get away with this" from Fran's response based on the conversation above that Fran gave unclear information by saying "you did this" but actually the word "You" is "Hugh" that is Ransom in that dialogue Fran can't speak clearly because she is under the influence of drugs. So, from the explanation related to the dialogue above, the researcher can conclude that Fran is doing Infringing in cognitive impairment.

Suspending

This suspending a maxim occurs when there are a few words or sentences that are inappropriate or taboo to say. This usually happens when a name, place or thing is mentioned. Culture, location, time, and context then also influence the occurrence of such maxim violations. Usually, the listener does not expect the speaker to clarify what the speaker actually means, because the listener already knows what he means. In order for the interlocutor to understand, the speaker looks for pronouns for the taboo words.

Data 25/01.02.18/Suspending/064

WALT : *Jacob was in that bathroom the night of the party.*

JONI : *Is that where you were all night?*

RICHARD : *The hell were you doing in the bathroom all night?*

JACOB : *Nothing.*

MEG : *Swatting Syrian refugees.*

JACOB : *No.*

MEG : *Alt right troll.*

JACOB : *Liberal snowflake.*

WALT : *I don't know what any of that means*

RICHARD : *It means your son's a little creep.*

WALT : *Oh MY son's a creep?*

JONI : *Guys! Walt was in the bathroom...*

WALT : *He was in the bathroom*

RICHARD : *Joylessly masturbating to pictures of dead deer*

Based on the data above the dialogue occurs in the living room. They go off to the library, leaving the family all together in tense silence. For the reading. Based on the context of the situation above, the type is non-Observance, while the bold type is Suspending a Maxim. In this utterance, Richard disobeying the maxims by intentionally expressing inappropriate or taboo sentences to pronounce in the mention of names, places, cultures, objects and situations will also affect the occurrence of

non-Observance with these maxims so that they can lead to misleading implicatures, whereas in maxims it is required that every participant make adequate contributions, no more or less, that are verifiable, and unambiguous. contributed wrongly by saying something inappropriate to say to someone by saying "Joylessly masturbating to pictures of dead deer..." from Richard's response based on the conversation above that Richard gave inappropriate speech for someone to hear because it was taboo which caused Richard to not obey the suspending a maxim. So, from the explanation related to the dialogue above, the researcher can conclude that Richard does not obey the suspending a maxim.

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, the researcher makes a conclusion clearly from the analysis of Non-Observance the Maxim in Knives out movie script. The purpose of this research is to know the types of non-Observance that are used by all the characters in the movie script and what are the types that are dominantly used by them. Based on the findings, there are five types non-Observance expressed by all the characters. In their utterances, flouting is more dominantly used in this movie than the others act with 13 total of data. Flaunts that appear in their utterance are flouting Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner.

The flouting that is mostly used by the character is Quantity. It is used 8 times in this movie, it was spoken by some people and Linda two while others only one each. Then Violation Maxim that found in all character's utterances are Violation Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner with the total of 8 data. There are 2 data Opting out a maxim from the Movie script. Also Infringing that has total 1 data in movie script, they are Linguistics performance, culture Impairment, and Cognitive Impairment. The last is Suspending with only 1 data showing up.

REFERENCES

- Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University. Cambridge England
- Grice, Paul. 1975. *Logic and Conversation In Cole, P. And J. L. Margan, Eds. Speech Acts*. New York Academic Press. New York
- John. B Carol, 1953 *The Study of Language*, (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles Of Pragmatics*. Longman. London
- Levinson, S., C 1983. *Pragmatics Cambridge*. University Press
- Lim, Kiat Boey. 1975. *An Introduction to Linguistics for the Language Teacher*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Mey, J. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*, Blackwell: Oxford UK, 1994), p.38
- Mey, Sajob., L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Second Edition Black Well
- Moleong, L., J. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Remaja Rosda Karya. Bandung
- Moleong. L. J., 2012. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung
- Thomas, J. 1995 *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London and New York
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press