



Volume 1 Issue 1 Year 2025 Pages 10-20
e-ISSN 3090-6245 | DOI: 10.70152
<https://journal.akademimerdeka.com/ojs/index.php/matcha/index>

An Analyzing of Non-Observance Maxim Types in “24 Jam Bersama Gaspar” Movie

Nessa Yuanita

Institut Prima Bangsa, Cirebon, Indonesia
Corresponding author's email: yuanitanessa@gmail.com
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70152/matcha.v1i1.134>

Abstract: This present study aims to analyze the non-observance maxims of one selected film. In addition to that, this current study is conducted to investigate the conversational implicature can generate in the film. The analysis of non-observance of Grice's maxims in movies is rooted in the field of pragmatics, particularly focusing on how communication unfolds beyond literal meanings. The movie 24 Hours with Gaspar is used as the object of research, providing relevant data and highlighting the role of language in human communication. This study is descriptive qualitative to collect, analyze and report the data. Earlier, the researcher watches to find dialogues related to non-observances maxims. Afterwards, the researcher remarking and identify the dialogue and calculating the amount of the data. Lastly, the researcher analyzes and categorized the related dialogues based on Grice's theory, determining the most dominant type, and write a conclusion. The researcher found 5 dialog involving non-observance maxim, which are: opting out quantity, violating relation, violating quantity, floating quantity and floating relation. Those data were differentiated in 2 conversational implicature namely generalized and particularized..

Keywords: Cooperative principle, Movie, Non-observance maxim

INTRODUCTION

This present study aims to analyze the non-observance maxims of one selected film. In addition to that, this current study is conducted to investigate the conversational implicature can generate in the film. Pragmatics, which focuses on how communication develops beyond literal meanings, is the foundation for the study of Grice's maxims' non-observance in films. Grice's Cooperative Principle offers a framework for understanding effective communication and consists of the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. To achieve a variety of narrative goals, including creating humor, constructing irony, or expressing more profound thematic elements, characters in films frequently disregard or transgress these maxims. The ability to uncover underlying character dynamics, investigate implicit meanings, and improve audience engagement through implicatures makes analyzing non-observance of maxims in movies urgent. Analyzing

maxim violations provides important insights into how characters relate to one another in movies where dialogue is designed to reflect both natural and heightened forms of communication, analyzing maxim violations provides important insights into the relationships between characters and the ways in which nonliteral exchanges shape plotlines. Non-adherence to maxims is a crucial tool for comprehending character development, audience interpretation, and thematic emphasis within cinematic narratives because movies, as research subjects, offer a controlled setting where the intentional use of language can be examined for its effects on storytelling. To achieve all the objectives, a 24 Jam Bersama Gaspar film is selected for this study. The reason this film is chosen as a data source is because it contains relevant data for this research. 24 Jam Bersama Gaspar is one of the latest netflix movies released in 2024. This film tells the story of a detective's journey in following various puzzling clues to uncover the mystery of disappearance of a childhood friend. This movie is 1 hour contains conversations between the actors that can be analyzed for non-observance maxims. Conversation is one of language use. The act of communicating is the means by which two or more people interact with one another, with the speaker and the listener. Spoken language is essential to human communication in many ways. Individuals communicate with one another in order to share various forms of expression and information. Meaning and ideas are transferred in a way that makes up the essential content of a conversation. Without meaning, language is meaningless. Interlocutors must thus cooperate with one another in order for communication to be successful so that they can both understand what is being said and meant. To ensure that they communicate cooperatively with one another, they should abide by this rule.

The cooperative principle is a collection of four basic conversational guidelines that specify how individuals should conduct themselves in order to have the most relational and cooperative dialogue possible. In addition to providing adequate information, participants should speak in an honest, pertinent, orderly, informative, and clear manner. According to Grice (1975), The cooperative principle consists of the four: maxim quality, quantity, manner, and relevance. Each maxim respectively means: to be truthful, provide as much information as required, avoid unnecessary ambiguity, and be relevant. However, people don't always consciously apply the cooperative principle in their day-to-day interactions. In certain circumstances, people in a conversation may choose to disregard the cooperative principle for a variety of reasons, such as avoiding offending, preserving face, responding to detractors, or making jokes. This called by non-observance maxims. The non-observance of maxims divided into 5 types, namely: flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending. According to Grice (1975), a speaker who blatantly disregards a maxim without intending to mislead or deceive is guilty of flouting it. The speaker violating the maxims when s/he will be liable to mislead the hearer to have such implicature. A speaker who is weak in a language, such as a child or a non-fluent foreign language learner, may infringing this maxim. When a speaker is unable to respond to their partner as expected for any reason—for example, ethical or legal reasons—they may choose to opting out of the maxim. If there is no expectation that the maxims will be followed, it is possible to suspend them in the interim. Because the maxims are culturally specific to a given event, the speakers disregard them. When the speaker withholds information and the listener begins to wonder what is being discussed, they are breaking the rule of quantity. Inaccurate information provided by the speaker constitutes a break the rule of the quality maxim. The speaker purposefully takes this action because they do not want the hearer to receive accurate information. When a speaker purposefully shifts

the topic of the conversation to divert the listener, they are breaking the relational maxim. A speaker who makes ambiguous or obscure references in order to deflect a question and prevent a succinct, well-organized response is breaking upon the maxim of manner. As stated by Thomas (1995), quoted in Zahra & Suyudi (2023), a speaker who lacks proficiency in a language, such as a child or a foreign language learner, may violate the maxim. This can also happen when the speaker feels anxious, apprehensive, or excited, which could cause their performance to falter. When the speaker chooses not to follow the maxim, it suggests that they are not willing to comply with its requirements. If there is no expectation that the maxims will be followed, it is possible to suspend them in the interim. Because the maxims are culturally specific to a given event, the speakers disregard them.

The word implicature is, technically speaking, derived from implicate, which means “accuse someone involved in action that breaks the law.”. Grice (1975) defined implication as “to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean as different from the speaker’s actual words. Simple implicature, according to Wardana et al. (2020), is an implied or indirect meaning brought about by what is said. Moreover, implicature also known as the nonobservance of conversational maxims is the speaker's intention that is communicated despite not adhering to the cooperative principle of conversation, stated by Rachmah et al. (2022). The reason for the implication was the speakers' lack of cooperation with one another. Because implicature also known as conversational implicature depends on the context of the conversation, the listener's comprehension of it may be inadequate. Grice (1975) argues that while speakers typically opt to comply, they have the option to disregard or disregard this principle. When a maxim is purposefully broken, it's usually done so to convey a particular meaning and create a very specific effect. This is called a conversational implicature. There are two kinds of implicature proposed by Grice (1975), which are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is basically not based on cooperative principle or maxims, encoded in the lexicon or grammar, not dependent on context for their interpretations. Meanwhile, conversational implicature is just be mate in special context of an utterance. It is inferred via the cooperative principle or maxims (observed, violated or flouted). Actually, the implicature of an utterance is opposite from what the speaker has said. Using Grice as the primary theory, the author of this study hopes to learn more about the conversational implicature used in the film 24 Jam Bersama Gaspar.

There are several studies on non-observance maxims that are as conducive as previous studies. The first is Thamrin et al (2022) entitled “An Analysis of Non- Observance the Maxim in Knives Out Movie Script”. This research is qualitative in nature and collects data by watching movies then classifying the types of non-observance maxims according to Paul Grice’s concept. Based on the result of this study, the most frequently found data in data sources are flouting. Second, The Non-Observance Maxim Performed By The Character In Knives Out Movies by Gunatika et al (2021). In this study, the researchers used the document analysis method combine with mixed method and found 50% flouting relevance data, 37,5% violating quality, and 12,5% violating maxim of relevance. Third, A study in analyzing Non-Observance of Maxims and The Implicature in Shang-Chi Movie (Bulain et al, 2015). This research is qualitative descriptive study. The study's findings indicate that the characters break the maxim. They do this by consistently flouting the maxim with 24 instances, then violating it with 12 instances, choosing to

opting out with 5 instances, and finally infringing it with 4 instances. The characters frequently use implicature to protect their egos, get what they want without seeming desperate, emphasize points without coming across as rude or forceful, and deftly persuade others to believe what they said and give orders through subliminal suggestions. Fourth, research by Wardana et al (2020) entitled “Non-Observance of Maxim in Coco Movie: An Analysis of Flouting Maxim”. This study uses a descriptive qualitative method. The result indicates that there are 28 flouting maxims, respectively: quality (3,57%), quantity (21,42%), relation (67,85%), and manner (7,14%). The last previous research by Rachmah et al (2022) entitled “The Non-Observance of Maxims that Trigger Implicature in Cruella Movie (2021)”. Library research as a data collection tools, then it presents in descriptive qualitative. The most frequently found data in data sources are flouting (26) and 30 particularized implicature.

METHODS

This study is descriptive qualitative to collect, analyze and report the data. We use this type of research when we want to explore a topic that has not been studied in-depth before, or when we want to gain a better understanding of a previously studied topic but using a different perspective (Zahra & Suyudi, 2023). It is surely in line with this present study whose aims are to investigate what types of the non-observance are frequently shown and the conversational implicature expressed by the characters of the film. Cooperative principles are continuously transitioning from theory to everyday conversation, which is eventually seen in dramas and films, Zhao (2021). The movie features multiple character exchanges, making it a viable medium for communication studies.

To answer the research question, the researchers conduct some steps inspired by (Zahra & Suyudi, 2023). Earlier, the researcher watches to find dialogues related to non-observances maxims. Afterwards, the researcher remarking and identify the dialogue and calculating the amount of the data. Lastly, the researcher analyzes and categorized the related dialogues based on Grice’s theory, determining the most dominant type, and write a conclusion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, the researchers use Grice to analyze and classify non-observance maxims. This section shows an analysis of non-observance maxims and the implicatures of movie dialogue. Based on the research’s method, the data of this study is a selected movie to answer clearly the research’s problem in finding. 24 Jam Bersama Gaspar consists of three types of non-observance, they are: opting out, violating, and floating.

Non-Observance Maxim

Table 1

Non-Observance of Maxim

Data	Type of Non-Observance	Type of Maxim	Conversational Implicature
Agnes: Kamu yang menemukan kuburan-kuburan massal itu?	Opting out	Quantity	Generalized

Gaspar: Seorang detektif tidak pernah membocorkan pekerjaannya.			
Kirana: Aku membantunya mengumpulkan bukti- bukti.Kik: Apa yang di acari?	Violating	Relation	Particularized
Kirana: Jejak harimau campa, Aum!			
Agnes: Lalu apa yang akan kamu lakukan?Mengambil kotak itu?	Violating	Quantity	Particularized
Gaspar: Aku sudah mengawasinya, hanyaperlu memastikan beberapa hal. Pemiliknya terlalu berbahaya untukdihadapi dengan tergesa- gesa.			
Gaspar: Kenapa banyak sekali bohla mlampu di sini?	Flouting	Quantity	Particularized
Tati: Bachtiar S. Abdillah, suami saya, pergi waktu saya sedang beli bohla m. Dan ketika saya kembali, dia tidak pernah pulang lagi. Makanya saya selalu beli bohla m, dengan harapan, ketika saya pulang, dia ada di rumah.			

From the table above, it clearly shows that there are 5 dialogues from the movie contain 3 types of non-observance maxims. Those 3 non-observance maxims are opting out, violating, and flouting.

Opting out

This type indicates that the speaker needs to provide as much information as they can. It indicates that neither more nor less information than is necessary should be provided by the speaker (Grice, 1975). In this movie, Non-Observance of maxim type Opting out found in onedialogue. In one scene shows Agnes come to Gaspar to make sure about some information thatshe got. The dialogue indicates opting out because Gaspar intentionally breaking rule of cooperative principle by saying “*Seorang detektif tidak pernah membocorkan pekerjaannya*”.

Figure 1

Scene 1. Agnes comes to Gaspar



The results of the analysis show that the non-observance maxim in the data "seorang detektif tidak pernah membocorkan pekerjaannya" occurs because the detective does not want to provide information that could jeopardize or interfere with his work. This condition can be categorized as a breaking rule of collaboration principle, especially an opting out. Besides that, Gaspar does not give enough information to answer the required question which provides less information indicates non-observance of quantity. This conversation appears to belong to the category of generalized conversational implicature. In this exchange, Agnes asks Gaspar if he was the one who found the mass graves. Gaspar's response, "Seorang detektif tidak pernah membocorkan pekerjaannya," suggests a general principle about the behavior or ethics of detectives rather than a specific comment on the situation at hand. The implicature here is that Gaspar, as a detective, follows a general principle of discretion or confidentiality regarding his work. This implicature arises from the general understanding of the role and ethics of detectives, rather than from the specific context or content of the conversation. Hedging or opting out of the quantity maxim refers to a speaker's attempt to enlighten the listener but providing only partial or incomplete information (Grice, 1975). It is in line with Tamrin et al (2022)'s finding which is "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." The speaker 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. In this data, the implicature that occurs is that the detective does not divulge his work because he does not want to provide information that could jeopardize or disrupt his work. This implicature can be drawn from the context of the conversation and the way the detective speaks. The character (Gaspar) actually can answer it simply by saying "yes, he did or no he did not find the mass grave".

Violating

Considered violates a maxim when the speaker will be liable to mislead the hearer. The researchers found the non-observance of maxim type violating in two scenes. In one scene shows Kirana and Kik talking about the detective Gaspar. Kik is curious about what Gaspar is doing. Then, Kirana answered with jokes which violating the cooperative principle.

Figure 2

Kirana and Kik are talking about Gaspar



The sentences "Jejak harimau campa, Aum!" means that Kirana breaking rules of cooperative principle. In this data, non-observance maxim occurs when the conversation does not focus on the relevant topic, which is what he is looking for, and leads to an unrelated topic, which is the campa tiger trail. This condition can be categorized as a violation of the principle of cooperation, specifically a violation of the principle of relevance, because the conversation does not maintain the relevant topic. The conversation "Jejak harimau campa, Aum!" appears to belong to the category of particularized conversational implicature. The phrase "Jejak harimau campa, Aum!" seems to be an idiomatic expression or a cultural reference that might not have a direct, universally understood meaning. It's likely that its interpretation relies on shared cultural knowledge or contextual cues, further supporting its particularized nature. The phrase may carry a non-literal or ambiguous meaning that requires contextual interpretation. This ambiguity allows for personalized understanding and interpretation based on the specific context of its usage, further emphasizing its particularized nature. When the speaker fails to provide a response that is pertinent to the subject of the conversation, they are in violation of the relational maxim (Grice, 1975). The character (Kirana) intentionally violate the information to hide the truth. This function of violating found in Insani, in line with her research which she found "exactly the same with you". It can be seen that the speaker did not want the maxims to hide the truth about age. In this data, the implicature that occurs is that the conversation does not focus on what topic he is looking for because the interlocutor does not want to discuss about the subject. This implicature can be drawn from the context of the conversation and the way the interlocutor speaks.

The second data of violating maxim is violating quantity. Agnes wondering to Gaspar about the black box and what will Gaspar do with it. Then, Gaspar answered with intentionally giving more information that doesn't relate to topic of conversation.

Figure 3

Agnes talks with Gaspar about the black box



The sentence “Aku sudah mengawasinya, hanya perlu memastikan beberapa hal. Pemiliknya terlalu berbahaya untuk dihadapi dengan tergesa-gesa” means that Gaspar doing non-observance of maxim which is violating of quantity. In this data, non-observance maxim occurs when the conversation does not focus on the relevant topic, i.e. what will be done, and leads to an unrelated topic, i.e. about the dangerous owner. This condition can be categorized as a violation of the principle of cooperation, specifically a violation of the principle of relevance, because the conversation does not maintain the relevant topic. In this data, the implicature that occurs is that the conversation does not focus on the topic of what will be done because the interlocutor does not want to discuss about the subject. This implicature can be drawn from the context of the conversation and the way the interlocutor speaks. It is going to be simpler if Gaspar answer it by “Yes, I’m going to rob it”. The conversation “Aku sudah mengawasinya, hanya perlu memastikan beberapa hal. Pemiliknya terlalu berbahaya untuk dihadapi dengan tergesa-gesa” seems to involve particularized conversational implicature. In this conversation, the speaker implies that they have already monitored or observed something, and they just need to ensure a few things. However, they hint that the owner of whatever they are referring to is dangerous and should not be confronted hastily. The implicature here is derived from the specific context of the conversation, where the speaker provides information that is not explicitly stated but is implied based on the circumstances. It's likely that the speaker and the listener share some background knowledge or context that allows them to infer the implied meaning behind the speaker's words. Violating maxim also found in Diary of a Wimpy Kid, research by Harared (2015). “In this case, Andrew violates maxim of quality because he lies about the children that he has. AJ is not aware of that fact. The speaker can be said violating a maxim when they know that the hearer will not know the truth”.

Flouting

The next non-observance maxim is flouting type. When a speaker gives more or less information than is actually required, this is referred to as quantity (Grice, 1975). The data found into two different scenes. First scene shows Tati which in this scene is the informant who’s asked by Gaspar. Gaspar gain information about some bulbs in her

house. Tati answered by flouting the maxim of quantity because Tati giving more information with unrelated long story.

Figure 4

Gaspar gain information from Tati



Sentences “Bachtia S. Abdillah, suami saya, pergi waktu saya sedang beli bohlam. Dan ketika saya kembali, dia tidak pernah pulang lagi. Makanya saya selalu beli bohlam, dengan harapan, ketika saya pulang, dia ada di rumah” means Tati giving a lot of information with long story and Tati doing non-observance of maxim which is flouting of quantity. In this data, non-observance maxim occurs when the conversation does not focus on the relevant topic, which is why there are many bulbs in the house, and leads to an unrelated topic, which is about the husband not coming home. This condition can be categorized as a violation of the principle of cooperation, specifically a violation of the principle of quantity, because the conversation does not maintain the relevant topic. Related to flouting quantity, Tamrin et al (2022) found similar data which is 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 this data, the implicature that occurs is that the conversation does not focus on the topic of why there are many bulbs in the house because the interlocutor does not want to discuss the subject. This implicature can be drawn from the context of the conversation and the way the interlocutor speaks. Bu Tati can simply say “It remind me to my husband” Based on the conversation provided, it seems to exhibit a particularized conversational implicature because it depends on the specific circumstances and details mentioned in the conversation. It may not be readily apparent to someone outside of the conversation or unfamiliar with the context. In this case, the speaker mentions buying light bulbs with the hope that when they return home, their husband will be there. The implicature here is that the act of buying light bulbs is somehow connected to the husband's absence or disappearance. However, this connection is not explicitly stated but rather implied from the context of the conversation.

The last non-observance maxim data is flouting of relation. This kind suggests that the speaker's input should be relevant to the conversation's subject. Agnes brings the man and tell the man about the doctor. Then, Agnes said that the doctor can give some energy drink to the man. The man wondering about that energy drink and ask to Agnes. However, Agnes answered with non-observance of maxim which is flouting of relation.

Figure 5

Agnes introducing the doctor to the man



“Air putih hangat” means that Agnes answered the question by non-observance of maxim. Agnes flouting it with irrelevant information. In this data, non-observance maxim occurs when the conversation does not focus on the relevant topic, which is energy drinks, and leads to an unrelated topic, which is warm water. This condition can be categorized as a flouting of the principle of cooperation, specifically a flouting of the principle of relevance, because the conversation does not maintain the relevant topic. The results of the analysis show that non-observance maxim in the data “what energy drink?” “Warm White Water” occurs because the conversation does not focus on relevant topics and leads to unrelated topics. This condition can be categorized as a flouting of the principle of cooperation, especially a flouting of the principle of relevance. This conversation appears to belong to the category of particularized conversational implicature. In particularized conversational implicature, the meaning arises from the specific context and content of the conversation. In this exchange, the homeless person asks what kind of energy drink is being offered. Agnes responds by suggesting warm water. The implicature here is specific to the homeless person's query and Agnes's response. It implies that Agnes believes warm water, rather than an energy drink, would be a more suitable or beneficial choice for the homeless person. This implicature arises from the specific context and content of the conversation, rather than from any general rule or principle of conversation. Reason this data indicates violating because they have nothing to do with the security question. Miguel thus disobeys the relational maxim in his statement because they have nothing to do with the security question. Miguel thus disobeys the relational maxim in his statement. The researcher found another example of flouting maxim in Wardana & Anayati (2018) research. “The conversation occurred between Aga (the supporting character) and Raia (the main character) addressed Aga’s curiosity of Raia’s stay of duration in New York, this actually considered as a normal question addressed by an acquaintance but Raia obviously didn’t give a precise respond as expected and this actually has created an implicature which makes the participants look for an additional set of meanings”.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the examination of the film *24 Jam Bersama Gaspar*'s maxim non-observance identified five maxim violations, illustrating the various ways in which characters depart from Grice's Cooperative Principle. A single instance of opting out of the quantity maxim, one violation of the relation maxim, one flouting of the quantity maxim, and one flouting of the relation maxim are among the findings. These variations imply that the movie purposefully disregards maxims in order to strengthen the plot,

establish character dynamics, and provide the viewer with ambiguous meanings to decipher. Furthermore, the study distinguished between two categories of implicatures: particularized and generalized, with the latter being more common. This suggests that a large portion of the movie's dialogue necessitates particular background information in order for viewers to completely understand its intended meaning. Future studies could build on this by examining maxim violations in various genres, cultural contexts, or contrasting maxim non-observance in films and other media, like theater or television shows. To learn more about how maxim violations affect viewer comprehension and engagement, researchers could also look into how the audience interprets these implicatures.

REFERENCES

- Bulain, M., Kurniawan, Y., Linuwih, R., Widya, U., & Surabaya, K. (2023). Non-observance of maxims and the implicature in Shang-Chi movie. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*, 15(2), 305-330. <https://doi.org/10.21274/lis.2023.15.2.305-330>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Cooperative principle.
- Gunatika, I. M. W. A., Candra, K. D. P., & Utami, N. M. V. (2021). The types of non-observance maxims performed by the main character in Knives Out movie. *ELYSIAN JOURNAL*, 1(2).
- Harared, N. (2017). Non-observance of the maxims in Diary of a Wimpy Kid. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 5(1).
- Phoeun, M., & Sengsri, S. (2021). The effect of a flipped classroom with communicative language teaching approach on undergraduate students' English speaking ability. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 1025-1042. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14360a>
- Tamrin, Muarifuddin, & Arman. (2022). An analysis of non-observance the maxim in Knives Out movie script. *ELITE JOURNAL*, 7(1).
- Wardana, M. K., & Anayati, W. (2018). Non-observance of maxims in Indonesia chick literature with the special reference to Ika Natassa's Architecture of Love. *KnE Social Sciences*, 599-608.
- Wardana Kiki, M., Armando Surbakti, D., & Anayati, W. (2020). Non-observance of maxim in "Coco" movie: An analysis of flouting maxim. *The 2nd Bogor English Student and Teacher (BEST)*, 93-96.
- Zahra, T. N., & Suyudi, I. (2023). The non-observance of maxims in dialogues of Harry Potter and the Cursed Child book. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 11(2), 209-218. <https://doi.org/10.35760/jll.2023.v11i2.9169>
- Zhao, S. (2021). An analysis of the conversational implicature of "Little Sheldon" from the perspective of violation of the cooperative principle. *OALib*, 8(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107115>