THE ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL HUMOR IN KOLSTED'S BLACK PARODY FILM DIE HART 2023: A PRAGMATIC APPROACH

1. Iqra Noureen
M.Phil Scholar, Department of English, The Women University Multan
Email: Iqranoureen1999@gmail.com
2. Ashvah Lodhi
M.Phil Scholar, Department of English, The Women University Multan
Email: hassonfazi414@gmail.com

Abstract:
Implicatures play a significant function in bringing humor or varying the degrees of significance in a statement. Similar to this, flouting has started to appear often in our day-to-day interactions. The main objective of this paper is to examine Kolsted's Black Parody Film Die Hart 2023's cooperative concepts. This study is qualitative in nature. The purposive sampling approach was used to gather the data for this reason. The framework proposed by Grice (1975), who outlined four guidelines for speakers to follow when conducting a conversation, has been used in this study. The current study investigates the ways in which the movie characters have flouted the Gricean maxims. The results show that 19 utterances include 37 implicatures. The quality maxim has been violated more often than the others out of these 37 implicatures, appearing at a ratio of 13/37. The maxim of quantity with a ratio of 12/37 occurs. The maxim of relevance ranks third with a ratio of 10/37, while the maxim of manners ranks last with the lowest ratio of 02/37. To determine the scalar implicatures and speech acts in the chosen movie, this study can be further extended.
Keywords: Communication, Co-operative Principles, Conversational Implicatures, Implied Meaning, Pragmatics

1. Introduction

The process of communication happens every day. The manner in which communication takes place, such as through the use of words (verbal communication), body language, the rise and fall of intonation, etc., is known as discourse. According to the Merriam Webster Dictionary, communication is "a process by which individuals exchange information through a common system of symbols, such as voice, text, or image." "People convey their ideas to the listeners via the use of speech. Cook (1989) makes a hint that "philosopher Paul Grice (1975) first proposed, in a limited form, the idea that conversation proceeds according to principle, understood and applied by all human beings." The concept was further upon as the "cooperative principle" (p. 29). The presumptions that the speaker would adhere to or obey throughout communication are known as the cooperative principles (1989, p. 29). According to Yule (1989), p. 29, the speaker is expected to be truthful (the maxim of quality), succinct (the maxim of quantity), relevant (the maxim of relevance), and clear (the maxim of style). Furthermore, Brown and Yule discussed the cooperative concepts of Grice in "Discourse Analysis" (1983), "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage, at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or the direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p.31). "Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange)," advises Quantity Maxim. Don't include more information than is necessary in your submission."; Quality: "Avoid saying anything you think to be untrue. Don't mention anything for which you don't have enough proof.; Connection: "Be relevant." ; Style: "Be perspicuous, avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), be orderly." (Page 32 of Brown & Yule, 1983).

These conversational or cooperative concepts are typically disregarded by the speakers. The conversational implicatures happen when these rules are broken or disregarded. Yule (1996) defines implicatures as "the additional conveyed meanings" (p. 35). It is important to take implicatures seriously when they occur. The listeners and readers are given the implicit meanings by these allusions. Merriam Webster defines the inferred meaning as "to express indirectly," "a suggested meaning or the indirect meaning."

A humorous action television series called "Die Hart" has been chosen for this study. The show portrays Kevin Hart as a fictionalized version of himself who is sick of being stereotyped as a comic sidekick. He enrolls at a prominent action star school run by a crazy director (John Travolta) in an attempt to become a major action star. While making light of the action genre and Kevin Hart's own career, the show follows him as he makes his way through the demanding and ridiculous training at the academy.

1.1 Statement of Problem

A few studies have been conducted on this film, but none have looked at the film from a practical standpoint. In light of the cooperative principles proposed by Grice, the current study examines this film and identifies four maxims that the film's protagonists disobey.

1.2 Significance

There are a number of reasons why the study of conversational comedy in Kolsted's black parody film "Die Hart 2023" is important. First of all, by illuminating the use of humor and its effects on viewer reaction, the study advances our knowledge of comedy in movies, especially as it relates to black humor.

Furthermore, the pragmatic method of the research provides interesting information about the language and communication components of comedy, which enriches our knowledge of how humor works in the dialogue of the movie. It can give a sophisticated understanding of the complexities involved in producing and interpreting comedy and the implications of this for filmmakers, authors and researchers with an interest in the creation or analysis of comic content. The approach may also have wider relevance to cultural studies, since humor often reflects and reinforces society norms, attitudes, and viewpoints. The study of a comedy in a black parody movie could reveal a hidden social commentary that would help to go further on the investigation of cultural processes.

Besides that, this research also provides researchers, filmmakers or anyone else that is interested in the intricate relationship between language, humour and social dynamics with useful and cultural insights.

1.3 Objectives:

This research attempts to investigate how the movie's characters transgress Grice's four conversational maxims.

To Recognize and Evaluate Funny Elements: In Kolsted's black parody film "Die Hart 2023," look for and recognize the different examples of conversational humor, paying particular attention to the dialogue's linguistic components.

1.4 Research Questions

In what ways do violations or adherence to Gricean maxims contribute to the effectiveness of conversational humor in "Die Hart 2023"?

In what ways the Gricean maxims have been flouted by the characters in Kolsted's Black Parody Film Die Hart 2023?

2. Literature Review

Conversational implicatures in film scripts, literary works and discourse have been explored by numerous studies. Goosebumps by Atmawijaya & Suryani (2019) also used implicature theory by identifying the presence of both conversational and conventional implicatures in the dialogue that helped to establish character relationship and comedy. For instance, Riani & Nasution (2019) also study Peaceful Warrior from Grice's maxims, and they reach the conclusion that characters break cooperative principles deliberately to express emotions.

Labobar (2018) in The Escape (2014) analysed maxims that were flouted to deceive, obscure the truth, to complicate the situation or to create interpersonal connection. Night at the Museum was studied by Andy & Ambalegin (2019), who discovered that deviations from conversational norms increase the plot intrigue. Wahyuningsih & Gustania (2021) analyzed Aladdin in relation to the violation of Grice's principles and Ekman's (2003) deceit theory, which are associated with motives of face-saving, manipulation and dominance. Similar strategic breaches were observed by Wardana, et al (2020) in Coco, for narrative and character driven purposes.

The research also extends to literature, for example a 2019 study of Jane Austen's Emma in which characters employed indirect speech to avoid conflict. Gricean analysis is applied to Lawrence's The Shadow in the Rose Garden by Tian (2021), which shows that the marital dialogue violates maxims. The Bear was explored by Suryadi & Muslim (2019) to show implicatures bear power dynamics and politeness. Flouted maxims in Waiting for Godot were linked by Imami (2017) to the themes of absurdity, and violations in Death of a Salesman, by Al-Aameri & Jamil (2020), to the characters' broken attempt of the American Dream.

Studies of real world discourse are beyond fiction. Lestari (2018) showed that advertisers violate maxims for rhetorical effect and Jiatong (2020) demonstrated how Trump broke diplomatic norms on purpose in his UN speech. According to Agbo & Odo (2021), Nigerian election campaigns were analyzed, where it was revealed that politicians manipulated maxims to influence voters. TV interviews: artists followed cooperative principles more than politicians, who ran away from the questions to hide sensitive information (Muhammad & Karim, 2019).

According to Qassemi et al. (2018) Iranian news reports contain many quality maxim violations aimed at sensationalizing or biasing coverage. Beggars' discourse was studied by Zaidi et al. (2020) who found that beggars violate strategic maxim in order to elicit sympathy and financial gain. Ekah & Akpan (2018) conducted a study of social media chats where there was a pervasive non-observance of Grice's maxims, in which users gave too much, too little, or information that was irrelevant, and so it did not contribute to coherent dialogue.

This study also uses Grice's theory of conversational implicatures to analyze Kolsted's Black Parody Film Die Hart (2023) in a similar fashion. The research investigates how violations of Gricean maxims by characters contribute to miscommunication and misinterpretation of implied meanings in the narrative by looking at how characters violate Gricean maxims.

3. Methodology

This study adopted a qualitative descriptive methodology to examine the violations of Gricean maxims. The data for the textual analysis of the chosen film was gathered by watching the film and emphasizing the dialogues in which the characters failed to notice Grice's maxims. The black comedy film "Die Hart 2023" by Kolsted served as the source of the data for this study. The implicatures' look remained the study's primary emphasis, which aided in the data sampling. The

entire film has been selected for study. Then the chosen talks were examined in terms of Grice's cooperative principles (1975).

3.1 Framework

Conversational maxims of Grice are a good place to start for the analysis of language and communication in films in the domain of cinematic analysis. In his four maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner, Grice gives us a systematic way to understand the unspoken rules of communication that make it work. This approach, when applied to films, enables researchers and critics to explore the subtleties of character relationships and find out more dimensions of meaning in the conversation. Quantity maxim explains the role of conversation length in storytelling and suggests that the role of information rich sequences and short sequences should be investigated in finding a balance. Quality considerations look into veracity and correctness of character interactions that would shed light on the reliability of information presented. Relation looks at the relevance of the conversation to the main story and manner considers the stylistic choices such as expression, tone, tempo, etc. in communication in a scene. Grice's conversational maxims are used to analyse film in the sense that film analysis is a rigorous task that allows a better understanding of the deliberate choices and subtle cues that filmmakers use to express meaning through language.

4. Data Analysis

Efficient communication can only take place if all parties involved understand these conversational guidelines. These ideas are sometimes referred to as Gricean maxims or Gricean principles. These adages are mentioned in Kolsted's dark comedy "Die Hart 2023." The method of purposive sampling was used to get the data.

Utterance1:

"Kevin: Let me ask you a question.

Agent: Yeah?

Kevin: Do you think I'm good in the movie?

Agent: Come on, Kev, I'm your agent. Of course, I think you're good in the movie. You know who else thinks you're good in the movie? The studio. Now, go knock 'em dead. Big smiles, big laughs, you're America's funny man." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this Conversation the agent breaks the maxim of quality when he adds, "Of course, I think you're good in the movie." Even while the agency might not truly think this, it is his duty as an agent to encourage the actor and give him confidence.

The agent breaks the maxim of quantity by being unduly ambiguous. With words like "big smiles, big laughs," the answer is more of a general comfort than it is specific criticism or information about the actor's performance. This isn't the kind of discourse about the performance of an actor that one would expect to be educational.

By offering something other than a direct answer to the actor's query, the agent inadvertently breaks the maxim of relevance. Instead of answering the actor's question regarding their performance directly, the agent directs the actor's attention to the studio's external validation and pushes them to perform for the public. The agent also refers to the actor as "America's funny man" which is totally irrelevant to his question.

Utterance2:

"Kevin: Excuse you. Watch it, man.

Waiter: My apologies, sir.

Director: Mark Wahlberg would not scream at a party server.

Kevin: Oh, I didn't scream. I didn't scream.

Director: An action star is tough, confident, unfazed by minor details that disrupt the average person.

Kevin: Yeah, I-I was unfazed. I wasn't fazed at all from that." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance it seems that the filmmaker breaks the maxim of relevance when he said, "Mark Wahlberg would not scream at a party server." This statement of filmmaker was totally irrelevant to the situation.

The director and Kevin both have a hand in possibly breaking the maxim of quality. Kevin says, "Oh, I didn't scream," in denial of having screamed. I refrained from yelling. Considering that his tone and behavior implied differently, this may be interpreted as a denial that contradicts giving accurate facts. Although the filmmaker focused on the characteristics of an action star, it is possible to interpret this remark as a generalization that oversimplifies the complexity of human behavior. It might not truly depict the range of reactions that actors—even action stars—could have in different circumstances.

Utterence3:

"Ron: Welcome to Ron Wilcox Action Star School. I'm Ron Wilcox, and that was your first lesson.

Kevin: Gettin' hit in the head with a bat?

Ron: Oh, you are naive. That was a prop bat. It that was made of plastic.

Kevin: Wasn't goddamn plastic. I've been hit with a bat before, I know what a metal bat fuckin' feel like. All right.

Ron: Hey, Mr. Van De Velde told me to tell him if you complain about anything being too difficult.

Kevin: No. No, no, no, no, no. I'm not complaining. Mm-hmm. I'm not complaining about nothing. I loved that. I thought it was great, to be honest with you, it gave me a rush." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Kevin's comment, "Wasn't goddamn plastic. I've been hit with a bat before, I know what a metal bat fuckin' feel like." might be seen as a possible transgression of the maxim of quality. The strong language and focus on his own experience give the impression of a degree of certainty regarding the nature of the bat that may not be true. There may have been a transgression of the obligation to provide accurate information. Kevin was also struck with a metal bat, but he seemed to be OK because he was in acting school, therefore in reality, he wasn't.

Ron's remark " Oh, you are naive. That was a prop bat. It that was made of plastic " goes against the relevance principle. Ron brushes off Kevin's allegation that the bat is metal, calling him foolish and insisting that it's only a pretend bat made of plastic. This answer deviates little from addressing the particular issues Kevin brings up and adds a subjective element.

Utterance4:

"Ron: And that's how Ron Wilcox Action Star School got born.

Kevin: Ron Wilcox A.S.S., for short.

Ron: What the fuck did you just say to me?

Kevin: Did Matt Da--Matt Damon, go here?

Ron: Oh, Matty boy!

Fuck yeah, Matt Damon!

Before he came to me, he was a no name actor from New England. He was nothing. He was a hundred pounds soakin' wet." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this Utterance Kevin could have broken the maxim of relevance by bringing up Matt Damon's attendance at the Ron Wilcox Action Star School. Since the query has nothing to do with the origins of the institution, it comes out as snarky or off-topic.

Also, Ron's thorough response regarding Matt Damon and further information about him, in response to Kevin's inquiry concerning Matt Damon's attendance at the Ron Wilcox Action Star School, may have violated the maxim of Quantity.

Utterance5:

"Ron: Okay, until you graduate, you are forbidden from visiting the outside world. You'll stay here.

Kevin: Say what?

Ron: You got your bed, you got your toilet, you got your sink. All the modern amenities.

Kevin: Okay. It's supposed to toughen me up. Okay, I get it. Yeah, I'm good with that. Yeah, might be a little too good with it." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Ron's remark " You got your bed, you got your toilet, you got your sink. All the modern amenities." might be interpreted as a mild exaggeration and seems as violation of maxim of quantity. Even while they are fundamental conveniences, calling them "all the modern amenities" can be seen as distorting reality for humorous effect. By exaggerating a straightforward scenario, the exaggeration plays with the maxim of quantity.

Utterance6:

"Kevin: Hey, do I know you? Oh. - I do! Fuck! You're the girl from that sitcom with the robot. The robot that was a butler, right? You used to argue with the butler, "Uh-uh, get the fuck out of here". You'd do the thing, "Butler, bitch". Yeah, yeah.

Jordan: Yeah. - That's me.

Kevin: Wow.

Jordan: Well, was. I just quit." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this Utterance Kevin's first inquiry, "Hey, do I know you?" might be interpreted as a little bit of a lie since he instantly says, "Oh. - I do! Fuck!" As he first pretends to be ignorant, Kevin adds a little theatrical flare and excitement in place of giving a direct response, which may be viewed as a little infringement of the maxim of quantity.

Utterance7:

"Jordan: I've just gotta prove to Ron that I've got the chops, that I'm fit enough.

Kevin: You ain't gotta prove that to nobody. You are fit. When you walked in that door I said, "God damn." Not like that. I'm not saying it like that. I don't mean it that way.

Jordan: I'm just here to train--

Kevin: Yeah.

Jordan: not make friends. So, just to be clear." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Kevin's explanation, " Not like that. I'm not saying it like that. I don't mean it that way." starts a self-correction or clarifying moment and breaks the maxim of manner. This can be interpreted as a lighthearted transgression of the decorum norm. Although Kevin appears

to be trying to make it clear that he didn't mean to make a provocative remark, his repeated focus on what he doesn't intend might be interpreted as an awkward or funny diversion from a clearer and less ambiguous statement.

Utterance8:

"Ron: You can't even be an action star without, well, knowing how to work green.

Kevin: I'm very familiar with a green screen. I mean, I've done about 15 movies where we've had a green screen." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Ron is implying that proficiency with a green screen is a must for becoming an action star. He is, however, defying the quality maxim by using a false or overstated claim. It is not the common understanding of the term "working green" that he is indicating, but rather using a green screen.

Also, Kevin's continued use of an exaggerated tone makes his response amusing as well. He defies the rule of quantity by giving an exaggerated figure ("roughly 15 movies") in order to make Ron's claim seem ridiculous. In essence, Kevin is participating in the conversation's hilarious tone by using overly dramatic language.

Utterance9:

"Jordan: Red wire or blue wire?

Kevin: It's gotta be the red.

Jordan: Are you sure? Agent Hart, are you sure?

Kevin: I don't know." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Kevin's Reaction: "It's gotta be the red." is a clear violation of Quality Maxim by asserting something with confidence but without proof. The audience is expecting further details or justification for the decision to use the red wire. Later in the discussion, Kevin's doubt is made clear, but for now, the lack of explanation heightens the suspense and tension. Furthermore, Jordan asked: "Are you certain? Are you sure, Agent Hart?" Jordan appears to be concerned about Kevin's confidence based on his repeated questioning and focus on "Agent Hart". Jordan is continuing to violate the Quality Maxim by casting doubt on Kevin's assurance, which heightens the tension in the scenario.

Utterance10:

"Jordan: Agent Hart, I can't believe we just diffused that bomb. We just saved thousands of lives, maybe millions.

Kevin: This earthquake's gotta be about a 7.5 magnitude. This could be our last time being together before we die." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Kevin's comment tells us the severity of the earthquake, but it doesn't add any context or significance to the previous conversation about dispersing the bomb. Since the relevance of the earthquake to the present context is not made evident, it might be argued that the rapid switch to the earthquake—which has no apparent link to the previous conversation—violates the Relevance Maxim.

Also "This earthquake's gotta be about a 7.5 magnitude," Kevin says, indicating a degree of trust in the data. Kevin could find it challenging to determine the earthquake's magnitude, though, unless he is a seismology specialist or has access to trustworthy data. It can be argued that Kevin broke the quality principle by making such a claim in the absence of reliable knowledge or experience, as it would mislead people or create doubt about the actual magnitude of the earthquake.

Utterance11:

"Jordan: Do you have a bobby pin?

Kevin: Yeah, yeah, it's in the bun on the back of my fucking head.

Jordan: Okay, don't be an asshole." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Kevin's answer can be interpreted as going against the Quantity Maxim by giving more details than required. Rather than just responding, "yes," he goes on to say where the bobby pin is. Also, Kevin was lying because he doesn't have any bun on the back of his head.

Furthermore, strong language "in the bun on the back of my fucking head" may be interpreted as violating the Manner Maxim if it adds an unnecessary degree of informality or intensity. Jordan's answer also specifically discusses how Kevin supplied the information. By telling Kevin to "don't be an asshole," Jordan seems to be implying that his answer was needlessly harsh or sarcastic.

Utterance12:

"Josh: Kev, how's it going so far, man?

Kevin: It is not going good. This place is like a prison. Do you hear me? And I think Coach Ron is trying to kill me.

Josh: Well, that's just his way. Look at him, he's a teddy bear.

Kevin: He ain't no teddy bear! He's the complete opposite of a teddy bear. And I believe he murdered somebody. I think he murdered a Colombian drug lord. I think he did it." (Die Hart, 2023)

Kevin's response defies the Quantity Maxim by giving more information than is really necessary, using language that is a little theatrical or overdone. Phrases like "I think Coach Ron is trying to kill me" and "this place is like a prison" give the discourse a feeling of tension and potentially even comedy.

Kevin makes a grave and unsupported complaint against Coach Ron, claiming criminal activity in the absence of any supporting documentation or factual support. This fabrication or exaggeration clearly violates the Maxim of Quality since it departs from the standard of communicating in a way that is true and accurate.

Kevin violates the Quantity and relevance Maxims by continuing to use hyperbolic language and by making an unexpected and perhaps unconnected assertion about Coach Ron killing someone. The conversation is made funnier and more ridiculous by the details that are given.

Utterance13:

"Kevin: No! I'm not out of my mind. As a matter of fact, I'm very much in my mind. The dude's tryin' to kill me.

Agent: That's unfortunate.

Kevin: What do you mean? Unfortunate? Listen to me, Danny. He's trying to kill me.

Agent: No, totally. Kev, listen. I've got huge news. All right? Ready? "Pound Pups 4." "Pound Pups 4."

They want you to voice Reggie, a quick-witted, short-tempered goldendoodle who craves mischief." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Kevin violates the Quality Maxim by making an exaggerated and probably untrue assertion that someone is attempting to kill him. Hyperbole gives the conversation a dramatic or hilarious touch.

The agent's reaction seems a little disinterested or unresponsive to Kevin's grave allegation, which might be seen as a violation of the Relevance Maxim. The agent makes a hilarious contrast between the serious charge and the agent's casual attitude by making an apparently unconnected statement in response to the potential threat.

The agent violates the Quantity Maxim when he abruptly switches to discussing a voiceover possibility for a character in a movie ("Pound Pups 4"). This is because the agent delivers unexpected and perhaps excessive material. A comedic aspect is added to the conversation when the agent switches from a serious topic about someone trying to assassinate Kevin to an apparently insignificant employment opportunity.

Utterance14:

"Waylon: You're like a real-life Rambo.

Kevin: I guess I kinda am." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance while it may not be a serious violation of the Maxim of Quality, it does involve a certain level of playfulness or exaggeration, which can be considered a mild flouting of the maxim. Thus, in this context, there is a subtle flouting of the Maxim of Quality, where Kevin's response involves a lighthearted agreement that might not be entirely literal or accurate. In this statement, Kevin seems to play along with Waylon's comparison, implying that he is, in fact, like a real-life Rambo.

Utterance15:

"Ron: What's your problem? I already apologized to you.

Kevin:When? When did you apologize?

Ron: I thought I did.

Kevin: What, you thought you apologized?

Ron: You know what, maybe I would apologize to you if you gave me back my necklace." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Ron's first declaration that he had previously apologized and his subsequent comment, "I thought I did," cast doubt on the sincerity of his apologies. Kevin's doubts regarding Ron's apologies raise the possibility of a lack of clarity or sincerity, which might be seen as a violation of the Quality Maxim.

In his parting words, Ron suggests that returning a necklace as a condition for an apology may be interpreted as a violation of the Relevance Maxim. The condition adds an unexpected aspect to the dialog, as it seems unconnected to the act of apology.

Utterance16:

"Jordan: Kevin, did you just save our lives?

Kevin: No. I just know that being the hero means ownin' up to your mistakes. I had to learn the same thing in my life. Just glad that Ron can learn the same thing too." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Jordan raises a simple point, yet the Quantity Maxim may be subtly contested. Instead, then answering the question directly, Kevin's response offers an alternative viewpoint on bravery and learning from errors. This might be interpreted as a little departure from the question's straight response, which puts some pressure on the Quantity Maxim.

Kevin's answer might put the Relevance Maxim under a little pressure. Kevin steers the discussion away from the topic of saving lives and into the more general themes of bravery and personal development. Although the result is pertinent, it doesn't directly address the original query, which may be interpreted as a little violation of the Relevance Maxim.

Utterance17:

"Kevin: Is he dead?

Jordan: I mean, he took a lot of bullets. I think so." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Jordan's answer, which disclosed the quantity of shots fired, may be seen as following the Quantity Maxim.

But using "I think so" adds a degree of ambiguity that might be interpreted as slightly undermining the Quality Maxim. Regarding the character's standing, the speaker is unsure.

Utterance18:

"Jordan: Okay. I'm going to create a distraction, and then you're going to shoot the guy.

Kevin: Yeah.

Jordan: Are you ready?

Kevin: I've never been more ready in my life." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance Jordan's inquiry just asks for a straightforward confirmation of preparedness, but Kevin's answer provides more details than are necessary is a clear violation of quantity maxim. The extra focus on never being more prepared presents more details than are strictly required for a basic acknowledgement.

Jordan's inquiry is direct and asks for a plain confirmation that they are prepared, but Kevin's answer goes above and beyond that simple acknowledgement. "I've never been more ready in my life" adds an inflated and subjective aspect. Being a subjective and exaggerated statement, it could not be totally true to say that Kevin has never been more prepared in his whole life is a clear violation of maxim of quality.

Utterance19:

"Studio head: That may be the strangest movie I've ever seen. So bizarre and-and-and violent. And yet... authentic. You can't teach acting like that.

Kevin: So, you liked it?

Studio hed: Like it? I like kidney-shaped swimming pools. I like reduced-fat eggnog. This movie? I loved." (Die Hart, 2023)

In this utterance the head of the studio starts out by pointing out that the film is odd and violent, but he then gives it a good spin by calling it genuine and complimenting the performances. Here, the Maxim of Quality is being playfully violated, as evidenced by the unexpectedly good review that stands in stark contrast to the original description.

The studio head's answer contains more details than are required to address Kevin's straightforward query. In addition to giving a succinct response, he also includes funny exaggerations, going against the Maxim of Quantity by giving more information than is necessary.

The studio head answered Kevin's inquiry in a way that wasn't exactly clear-cut. Rather of answering the question directly, he makes ludicrous and disproportionate analogies between kidney-shaped swimming pools and low-fat eggnog which are totally irrelevant to the question of Kevin so this is a clear violation of maxim of Relevance.

5. Findings and Discussions

The tables below provide an illustration of the study's findings.

Table#1

Utterance	Maxim of Quality	Maxim of Quantity	Maxim of Relevance	Maxim of Manner
01	✓	✓	✓	
02	✓		✓	
03	✓		✓	
04		✓	✓	
05		✓		
06		✓		
07				✓
08	✓	✓		
09	✓			
10	✓		✓	
11		✓		✓
12	✓	✓	✓	
13	✓	✓	✓	
14	✓			
15	✓		✓	
16		✓	✓	
17	✓	✓		
18	✓	✓		
19	✓	✓	✓	

Table#2

Maxim of Quality	Maxim of Quantity	Maxim of Relevance	Maxim of Manner	Total No. of Implicatures	Total No. of Utterances
13	12	10	2	37	19

The sorts of maxims found in 19 utterances are discussed in Table #1. The Quality maxim was found to be violated in utterances #1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 19. Numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, and 19 all exhibit quantity violations. Only the manners maxim has been broken in statements #7 and #11. Relevance maxim violation has been noted in utterances #1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 19.

Table # 2 reveals that a total of 19 utterances have been analyzed, in which 37 implicatures are found. Out of these 37 implicatures, the maxim of quality has been flouted more than the others as it appears with the ratio of 13/37. Then comes the maxim of Quantity with the ratio of 12/37. The maxim of a relevance comes on the third rank with the ratio of 10/37 and in the last comes the maxim of manner with the lowest ratio of 2/37.

6. Conclusion:

The results mentioned above indicate that Die Hart's characters have flouted the quality maxim more often than the other maxims. In this instance, it seems that the characters often give information that is not precise, accurate, or reliable, which is against the idea of guaranteeing the caliber of conveyed content. There are several examples of deception, exaggeration, or misrepresentation in the conversation and actions of the characters throughout the story. This deviation from the quality maxim affects the audience's engagement and comprehension because it creates a layer of inconsistency and jeopardizes the authenticity of communication within the plot. It might just be a purposeful storytelling decision for Die Hart to leave the quality standard in order to add some absurdity, sarcasm, or humor to the story. But it's important to realize that these deviations may affect the storytelling experience in different ways. Although there are times when it may be done deliberately to heighten the entertainment factor (such as when characters break the maxim of quantity), too frequent transgressions of the maxim of quality could cause the characters and the story itself to lose credibility. Fundamentally, Die Hart's characters tend to favor amusement and comedy over accuracy of information which is delivered, suggesting that the show intentionally breaks away from the normal standards of communication quality. While this divergence could make the story funnier, it is still necessary to consider how it will affect the overall coherence and plausibility of the narrative as whole.

References

Andy, A., & Ambalegin, A. (2019). Maxims violation on "Night at the Museum" movie. *Jurnal Basis*, *6*(2), 215-224.

Appel, E. (Director). (2023). *Die Hart*.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge university press.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.

Ekah, M. H., & Akpan, A. N. (2018). Discourse-Syntax Interface: A Study of Gricean Maxims in Computer-Mediated Discourse. *Language in India*, *18*(2).

Imami, T. (2017). *A stylistic analysis of Waiting for Godot* (Doctoral dissertation, BRAC University).

Karim, H. A., & Muhammad, A. A. (2019). An analysis of Grice's cooperative principles in some selected English TV interviews. *Journal of Garmian University*, *6*(2), 444-455.

Labobar, M. F. (2018). The Violation of Cooperative Principles in The Dialogue Among The Characters of David Baldacciâ€™ s The Escape (2014). *English Education Journal*, *8*(3), 370-377.

Qassemi, M., Ziabari, R. S., & Kheirabadi, R. (2018). Grice's cooperative principles in news reports of Tehran Times-A descriptive-analytical study. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, *6*(1), 66-74.

Smiley, B., Wilson, C., Clanagan, J., Hart, K., Clyne, L. K., Stein, M., Healey, K. (Producers), & Appel, E. (Director). (2023). *Die Hart* [DVD]. United States: Transmission.

Tian, Y. (2021). An Analysis of Characters in" The Shadow in the Rose Garden" from the perspective of the Cooperative Principle. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research*, *4*(3), 343-347.

Wahyuningsih, I., & Gustania, R. R. (2021). Disclosing Deceitful Behavior in Aladdin (2019): The Characters' Violation of Grice's Maxims. *KnE Social Sciences*, 353-367.

Yule, G. (1989). The spoken language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *10*, 163-172.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford university press.

Zaidi, S. A. H., Mehdi, M., Sarwar, M., & Mehmood, K. (2020). with reference to Gricean Maxims: A Case Study. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, *40*(2), 709-720.