



and they articulate different discourses together in various ways. Discourses can be differentiated in terms of semantic relations (synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy) between words – how they classify parts of the world – as well as collocations, assumptions, and various grammatical features (Fairclough, 2004:133). The analysis of discourse is the analysis of language in use. It means that any kind of language we used in this world is included as a discourse. There is no clear distinction between spoken or written text because it is linked each other. *“The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use.”* (Brown and Yule, 1983:1).

James Paul Gee (2011) said that *“Any speech data can be transcribed in more or less detailed ways”*. It means that a discourse analysis is made from the details of speech (gaze, gesture and action) or writing that are arguably deemed relevant in the context and that are relevant to the arguments the analysis is attempting to make. (Gee, 2011:117). Moreover, the dialogue and conversation that occurred in the movie can be included as a text. Then, the script is also included as discourse because it made from detail of speech but in form of writing.

Beyond the discourse itself, the discourse analysis is also study about the context within the text. Context is something ‘beyond the sentence’. Since beginning of the 1970s, linguists have become increasingly aware of the importance of context in the interpretation of sentences (Brown and Yule, 1983:35).



















These maxims represent a descriptive statement of how conversational contribution. Conversational contributions are firstly, there will be occasions when speaker decides to violate a maxim quietly and unostentatiously, for instance, the speaker may lie, or does not give as much of the relevant information as he could, or he may offer utterances which are only later seen to be ambiguous. Secondly, and much more importantly, there will be occasions when speaker is seen to break a maxim either because he has been faced with a clash. This case spelled out by flouting maxim. For instance, the speaker deliberately fails to observe a maxim in order to create an implicature (1985:31).

Anneke and Helen (2008) in *The Multiple Violations of Conversational in Lying Done by the Characters in Some Episodes of Desperate Housewives* stated that violation is the condition where the speaker does not purposefully fulfill certain maxim. Usually the conversation between speaker and hearer can be unsuccessful if the speaker does violation maxim since they will misunderstand each other. Speaker who does violation maxim means does not allow the hearer to know the truth and only understand the surface meaning of speaker's utterances (Tupan and Natalia, 2008:63-64).

Darighoftar & Ghaffari (2012) stated that Gricean Maxims are not always obeyed and their violation or floating bears more information than if they were obeyed. For instance, telling a joke, writing a book and making a movie are different situations in which conversation principle can be violated or flouted, to surprise people so they burst into laughter, to better develop the plot of the story, or to create a special effect (Sobhani and Saghebi, 2014:92).





