

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research

The situation when people talk to you and you replied them is situation which called conversation. It is need more than one participant. Conversation happens when people have an idea to convey. It follows the rules of etiquette. In addition, conversations occur if between speaker and listener has mutual cooperation.

The conversations are able to go smoothly when people talk corporately. People talk corporately by using explicit utterance. Explicit utterance is the utterance which has literal meaning in the sentence. It helps when conversation follows the rules. The specific rules for conversation arise from cooperative principle. According to Grice (as cited in Davies, 2000) cooperative principle is the principles to make our contribution are required as enough which it occurs in the talk exchange. Grice's cooperative principle has 4 sub principles which are called as maxim they are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner and maxim of relevance.

However, many conversations break the cooperative principle. People do not always follow the principles. It means that they break the maxim. Break the maxim means that they flout the maxims. If a speaker flouts a maxim, the speaker will be liable to mislead. It means that the speaker says a deliberately covert statement in order to not to be noticed.

To understand what the speaker means, the hearer has to know the context. If the hearer understands the context in which the speaker is concerned, there will be no misunderstanding. On the other way, if the hearer does not understand the context of the speaker's utterance, there will be misleading. Context is the background of knowledge that must be understood by the speaker and the hearer. Context used to help the speaker and the hearer to understand what is the meaning of the utterance.

The condition when the speaker does not convey their idea in their utterance is usually called as implicature. Implicatures are meanings that are aspects of what the speaker means without being said (Sadock, 2006). Many people often use implicit utterances. Implicit utterance happened when the speaker might describe the idea that is interpreted to be different from what is said. This condition often continues into a conversation. The widespread of implicature that occurs in a conversation is often called conversational implicature.

Conversational implicature refers to something that is left hidden meaning in conversation. The meaning which is implied in conversational implicature occurs based on the context. "Those things that are communicated beyond what is said depend upon the assumption that the speaker is being cooperative called conversational implicature" (Sadock, 2006 p. 59). The case where the speaker does not make sufficient contributions by making statements that are not related to the question, but indirectly answering questions often occur today. Therefore, conversational implicature is important to be studied by the reason above.

Moreover, conversational implicature does not only happen in the real life but also in the entertainment industry, like movie. In the movie, the meaning of the character's utterance makes audience difficult to understand. It is because the utterances sometimes have other meaning that different from what is said. This is the reason why the researcher studies about implicature and takes movie as a source of data.

The DUFF movie is one of famous movie that is used by the researcher. It is an American teen comedy movie which directed by Ari Sandel and written by Josh A. Cagan. This movie tells about Bianca which is called by Wesley as a DUFF. DUFF itself is abbreviation from Designated Ugly Fat Friend. The phenomena of conversational implicature which occur in *the DUFF* movie are provided in some of the conversation between the characters, such as:

Jess : were we fake friends with her?
 Bianca : **Kind of.**

Jess is Bianca's best friend. Jess and Bianca want to go to their class from locker. On the way, they meet with Madison Morgan walks from the opposite. Madison is the most famous girl in their school, but she is a liar and has bad attitude. Jess and Bianca actually do not like Madison because she always judge people by the cover. To avoid from commotion they have to have a fake face. When Jess asked Bianca "were we fake friends with her" means that Jess asks for Bianca's opinion about what should they do to confront with Madison. To make the conversation cooperative the answer could be "yes or no", but in here Bianca answers with "kind of" which means that they need to have a fake face.

Bianca breaks the rule of cooperative principle. So, this conversation is the example of flouting maxim of quality, because Bianca does not provide answer that is true. Bianca answers with “kind of”, means that Bianca not sure with her answers. It makes conversational implicature happened in the conversation above. The answer of Bianca is categorized as the type of the generalized conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature happens when the conversation does not give the specific answer such as “yes or no”. The other examples are:

Wesley : Hey, Billy
 Bianca : **No, just Bianca**
 Wesley : Looking very handsome tonight

Wesley is Bianca’s neighbour. He is a student in the same school with Bianca. In addition, Wesley is the most wanted guys in the school. Jess and Casey got an invitation from Madison, but she does not invite Bianca. Casey has an initiative to rip the invitation letter into two parts. Finally, Bianca attends Madison’s party. Actually Bianca does not like party but her friends, Jess and Casey force her to come. Jess and Casey ask Bianca to dance and she follows them. In the half of party Bianca feels bored and she walks into kitchen to get some drink. For some moment, Wesley come to the kitchen and say hello to Bianca using other names like Billy. This is because Bianca wore boy’s cloth and look different from the other girl whose wore sexy dresses. Wesley tries to mock Bianca about her dresses is different from other. That is why Wesley said “looking very handsome tonight” which implicate you look different from other. When someone greeting us, it could be answer with “hey or hello”. Wesley says

“Hey, Billy” and Bianca answer with “No, just Bianca” which mean that Bianca emphasize to Wesley about her name is not Billy.

This conversation met an interruption because there is no relation between Wesley and Bianca conversations. To make the conversation cooperative, between the speaker and the listener have to be relevant therefore, the conversation does not meet any interruption. The conversation between Wesley and Bianca is the example of flouting maxim of relevance. Bianca’s answer is tried to correct Wesley’s greeting which does not have relation with Wesley’s greeting. It makes conversational implicature happened in the conversation. Bianca utterance gives the specific answer about Wesley’s utterances with using “no” which means that she wants to tells Wesley that her named is not Billy but Bianca. To understand the utterance we need to know the special knowledge about the character. Hence, this conversation categorized as particularized conversational implicature.

The researcher listed some of the previous studies related to conversational implicature. The first Fang and Xin (2017). They used Chinese TV series entitled “Nirvana in Fire” as source of data. The researchers mainly used the theory of cooperative principle and implicature proposed by Grice (1967). They analysed selected examples of every maxim of violated the cooperative principle to help the readers understood the characteristics of the character and the development of the plot. The objective of this research was to prove that the cooperative principle plays an indispensable role in analysing the TV plays “Nirvana in Fire”.

Nanda, Sukyadi, & Ihrom (2012) used TV game shows such as “Take Me Out Indonesia” for their research. They used the episode XXII of the show. The

aims of this research were to investigate conversational implicature used by the presenter. Then, the researchers used the theory of conversational implicature proposed by Grice on 1975. The results of the research showed that the presenters tended to use generalized conversational implicature rather than particularized conversational implicature.

Through previous studies that were conducted by the other researchers, the researcher found the similarities and the differences between this research and the previous studies. The similarities are the object related to analysis; conversational implicature, and the researcher also used Gricean theory as the main theory. The differences are the first study used TV series for source of the data and focused on the maxims of violating the cooperative principle to understand the characteristic of the character and the plot. The second study used the reality or game show for source of the data and focused only on the types of conversational implicature.

In conclusion, the studies about conversational implicature have been carried out by the other researchers. However, the analysis by using “The DUFF” movie has never been done by other researcher. Therefore, the researcher is interested in analysing about conversational implicature in the “The DUFF” movie further. This research concern on the flouting of maxims which found in the conversation and the type of conversational implicature found in the movie.

1.2 Identification of The Problem

Based on the background of the research, the identification of the problem in this research is about:

1. Explicit utterances in conversation “The DUFF” movie.
2. Implicit utterances in conversation “The DUFF” movie.
3. The cooperative principle in the “The DUFF” movie.
4. Flouting of maxims occurs in the “The DUFF” movie.

1.3 Limitation of the Problem

The limitation of the problem in this research is focused on:

1. Maxims which are flouted in the “The DUFF” movie.
2. The types of conversational implicature in the “The DUFF” movie.

1.4 Formulation of the Problem

Based on the limitation of the problem, the researcher formulates main problems to be answered as stated in following research questions:

1. What maxims are flouted in the “The DUFF” movie?
2. What are types of conversational implicature in the “The DUFF” movie?

1.5 Objective of the Research

In this research, the objectives of the research are:

1. To describe maxims which are flouted in the “The DUFF” movie.
2. To describe the types of conversational implicature in the “The DUFF” movie.

1.6 Signification of the Research

The significance of the research can be seen as follow:

1. Theoretical

Theoretically, this research has some purposes. First, hopefully, this research gives further information to the readers about conversational implicature such as the flouting maxims which occur in conversation and the types of conversational implicature. Second, the researcher hopes this research also enhance our knowledge, which can be used in applying scientific research, especially regarding our knowledge of conversational implicature. The last after reading, researcher hopes this research people understand about conversational implicature.

2. Practically

Practically, this research is expected to be useful such as; first, the researcher hopes this research enriches the English student knowledge's in the use of conversation correctly. The second, this research help the student to give more practical contribution for the researcher. For example, describing the phenomenon of conversational implicature that happen in the real life. It also helps another researcher to classify the conversational implicature based on the flouting of maxim or the types.

1.7 Definition of Key Terms

Conversational Implicature : To deal with the aspect of meaning that the speaker implies beyond what he literally said (Grice as cited in Al-Hindawi & Saffah, 2017).

Pragmatics : The study of context in the language used (Moeschler, 2012).

Movie : A story playing in the screen or television by recording of moving images (Merriam-Webster dictionaries online, 2018).