

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background of the Research

There are norms, both written and unwritten, in learning a language. These rules or principles exist to keep the discussion on topic. The most significant aspect of this rule is to ensure that the aim of the conversation is properly conveyed. Communication will be successful if the speaker and listener cooperative in a dialogue or conversation. Grice (1975) believed that conversation will run cooperatively as long as the participant contributes as much as it needed and provide enough information in the conversation. In short, when the participants want a cooperative conversation, they need to follow certain directions or rules. The rules where the conversation needs to be cooperative is called the cooperative principle.

In conversation, people do not always follow the cooperative principle. Although if they are being uncooperative, the conversation will still proceed smoothly as long as both the speaker and the listener are aware of the context and meaning during the conversation. As stated by Birner (2013), the conversation can work if the speaker and the hearer tried to make the conversation cooperative even when the participants are being completely uncooperative. The phenomenon can be found in the interview such as, the interview with Taylor Swift. On this conversation below, Taylor Swift is the hearer while the correspondent acted as the speaker. This conversation happened on the interview with CBS Sunday Morning News.

Correspondent : "**And you mentioned that you keep wound dressing with you?**"  
 Taylor Swift : "Yeah. I've had a lot of stalkers show up to the house, armed. So, we have to think that way."

(D'Amelio, 2019)

The context in the conversation above started when the speaker asked about where was the hearer's home. And the hearer responds that she did not want to tell the exact location of her house because there would be a lot of creepy guys coming to her house. Then the speaker replied with "**you keep wound dressing with you**" The wound dressing in literal meaning refers to the Band-Aid functioning to heal the wound and prevent complications. However, based on the context the speaker mentioned, the wound dressing referred to the protection made by the hearer to avoid a potentially dangerous situation. The conversation is still considered as cooperative because both of the speaker and the hearer know the meaning. It is proven by the hearer's answer that agreed by the speaker's question. Thus, it means the hearer understood the context, even when the speaker did not directly provide the literal meaning. As a result, the conversation is classified as a conversational implicature. This phenomenon is related to the Grice (1975) theory of conversational implicature where he called conversational implicature applying not only to the expression of what is said but also to the connection with adjacent remarks and its meaning.

Grice (1975) parted the conversational implicature into two generalized and particularized. The particularized implicature required particular context in understanding unstated meaning uttered by the speaker. As also argued by Grice (1975), in practicing particular conversational implicature depending on the

definition of the word, maxims and the cooperative principle, the context, and relevant facts. The example is taken from the data source of journal article by Yudith, Natsir and Lubis (2021) where Young Nickerson acted as the hearer and Joy as the speaker. The conversation happened in the movie titled *The Heart of The Sea* on the minute (00.37.30-00.30.37).

Joy : “Come on place all forces! Give everything I can.”  
 Young Nickerson: “She’s blows.”  
 Joy : “It is a calf?”  
 Young Nickerson : “Is it a calf?”  
 Joy : **“It’s a cow”**

The context in the conversation above refers to Young Nickerson that just has experience catching whales. When he saw the whale for the first time he was amazed and asked “is it a calf?” The calf in this context is the size and age of the whale. This conversation considered as particularized in conversational implicature because when Young Nickerson asked about the whale Joy answered with “it’s a cow” in a humors tone. The speaker was telling the hearer that they have discovered a large whale, not a small whale. However, the way the speaker delivered it made another meaning of a whale (Yudith et al., 2021). In particular conversational implicature context and the meaning are essential. Without understanding the context, the participants will fail to get the meaning of one conversation.

Conversational implicature could also lead to Grice's theory of maxim. From Grice (1975) *Logic and conversation*, it can be concluded that the connection among cooperative principle, maxim, and conversational implicatures showed by the failure of participants to fulfill various maxims in many ways.

Such as, the participant might be unconsciously floated the maxim so that it will be misleading, the participant may opt-out of the cooperative principle, participants may fail to fulfill the maxims, they can also violate the maxim. As shown from the phenomenon between Feifei as the speaker and Rob as the hearer. The conversation below found in the Extensive Listening of BBC Learning English Podcast which analyzed in journal article by Dwiwulandari, (2020).

Feifei : “And me Feifei. Hello! So how did your interview go?”  
 Rob : “**Quite good... ok... well not bad**”

The context in the conversation above is categorized as violating maxim because Rob here did the violation of maxim quantity and failed to provide sufficient answers. The contribution provided by Rob was not enough to answer the questions given hence the conversation looked uncooperative. It is the principle in being conversationally cooperative to give the right amount of answer. According to Birner (2013) the sub maxim quantity is required the participants to be as informative as needed. The speaker clearly violated the maxim quantity when he did not provide enough answer.

Particularized conversational implicatures appears in various media, such as in interview, social media, or other sources. It can also be found in the movie such as the phenomena from the data source. On the conversation below Scot Lang is the speaker and Natasha as the hearer.

Scott Lang : “No, not a machine. More like a... Yeah, like a time machine. I know it sounds crazy...”  
 Natasha : “**Scott, I get emails from a raccoon. Nothing’s crazy anymore.**”

The conversation above happened in the minute 32:46-32:50. The hearer violated the maxim of relevant as the hearer being irrelevant from what the speaker uttered. The hearer's response showed that anything the speaker said would not sound crazy. Even speaker two received an email from a raccoon that should not have been able to make an email and use electronic devices, so what occurred to the hearer sounded even more insane than the speaker. Thus made the conversation classified as particularized conversational implicature because in understanding the meaning a special context is needed. According to Grice (1975) Particularized conversational implicatures are special since they require a specific context in them to operate.

The other phenomena appear from the data source is found in the conversation between Steve as the speaker and Natasha as the hearer below.

Steve	: "I spotted a pod of whales coming over the bridge."
Natasha	: (dubious) "In the Hudson?"
Steve	: " <b>Fewer ships, cleaner water. Just saying, there's still a world out there</b> "
Natasha	: "If you're about to tell me to look on the bright side, I'm about to hit you with a peanut butter sandwich."

The conversation above happened in the movie titled Avenger: Endgame from minutes 28:50 – 29:05. Particularized conversational implicature is found from the conversation above as stated by Grice (1975) particularized conversational implicature is based on a presence of context and background information of the utterance. This conversation would lead to various interpretations if speaker one and speaker two did not know each other and that is why speaker two understands where the conversation goes without any other explanations. But it will be a whole different situation if the speakers are

strangers. Thus, the conversation is categorized as a particular conversational implicature because it needs specific context and background knowledge to understand its meaning. The speaker unconsciously violated the maxim of manner as he spotted being ambiguous and unclear about what happened outside. Grice (1975) stated that a participant or speaker would fail to fulfill maxims in various ways they might quietly or unconsciously violate the maxim which can be led to some liable cases. Birner (2013) added to violate the maxim is to fail it with assumptions the hearer will not realize. The hearer which knows well about the speaker's personality who always trying to be positive all the time caught the context wanted him to stop because she does not want to hear it.

The bold utterances can be considered as strategy 12: be vague, as the speaker becomes vague about what he was saying and wanted the listener to figure out the possible meaning that was implicated but failed because the listener interpreted it differently. Brown and Levinson (1987) believed that participants may violate the FTA by being unclear about the FTA's object. It means that the statement expressed vaguely addressed to a specific person whom the speaker hopes will understand the potential meaning.

Conversational implicature has been analyzed in numerous studies and the researcher found two previous studies about conversational implicature. The analysis from Akmal (2020) analyzed the types of conversational implicature with non-observant maxim and the researcher used the "Kingdom of Heaven" movie as the source to collect the data. This research applied the theory by Grice (1975) cooperative principle analyzed the analysis. As the findings of this study, the

previous researcher found flouting maxim occurred the most frequently compared to violating maxim as the participant wanted to be safe by expecting the hearer to understand their point without saying it directly.

Sili and Setyowati (2020) investigated and conversational implicature using a movie named "Jumanji: Welcome to The Jungle" as the media to collect the data. This study used the theory by Levinson's implicature theory and context by Devito. For the findings this previous research collected 37 data of conversational implicatures. The particularized conversational implicature occurred 34 times and 3 times occurrence of generalized conversational implicature.

As the similarity from the previous studies this present research used the theory by Grice (1975) as the main theory. And for the different the movie titled Avenger Endgame is used as the data source. Additionally, the second objective supported by (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Furthermore, this present research concerned with the utterances by the characters in a movie titled Avenger: Endgame 2019. The researcher focused on analyzing the types of violating maxim in particularized conversational implicature and the strategies violating maxim of the particularized conversational implicature which can be found in the Avenger Endgame movie: Pragmatic approach.

## **1.2 Identification of the Problem**

1. The importance of context in conversational implicature
2. The existences of particularized conversational implicature
3. The violating maxim found in a movie

4. The violation maxim in particularized conversational implicature found in Avenger Endgame movie
5. The strategies of particularized conversational implicature found in Avenger Endgame

### **1.3 Limitation of the Problem**

1. Types of violating maxim found in particularized conversational implicature in Avenger Endgame movie.
2. The violating maxim strategies found in particularized conversational implicature in Avenger Endgame movie

### **1.4 Formulation of the Problem**

1. What types of violating maxims are found in particularized conversational implicature in the Avenger Endgame movie?
2. What strategies of violating maxims are found in particularized conversational implicature in the Avenger Endgame movie?

### **1.5 Objectives of the Research**

1. To reveal the types of violating maxim found in particularized conversational implicature in Avenger: Endgame movie
2. To examine the strategies of violating maxim found in particularized conversational implicature in Avenger: Endgame movie



## 1.6 Significance of the Research

### 1. Theoretical Significance

The aims of this research theoretically are to give information, knowledge, and experiences about conversational implicature. And this research hopefully can be functioned for readers to classify the types of the violating maxim in particularized conversational implicature with the maxim. The last is this research aimed to be the reference for other researches in the future.

### 2. Practical Significance

This research hopefully can be the example for the speaker and the hearer to understand more about implicature. In obeying cooperative principle, we need to understand about the basic principles of maxim. Therefore, hopefully by this research both speaker and the hearer would find out more about the types of implicature and the maxim as well as the strategies.

## 1.7 Definition of Key Terms

**Pragmatics** : Pragmatic comprehension includes not just interpreting the meanings of conversation, but also understanding the definition of the utterances (Yule, 1996).

**Implicatures** : Implicature indicates an action that means or implies one thing by saying

something else, or the object of that action (Grice, 1975).

### **Particularized Conversational**

**Implicature** : The types of implicature that based on a present of context and background information of the utterance (Grice, 1975).