

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to make a better understanding about this research, the writer used particular theory from an expert to come into analysis and the conclusion. The writer collected some theories about cooperative principle, conversational implicatures conversational maxims, and the flouting maxims. Moreover, the writer also used some previous related studies which also help much in doing this research.

A. Review of Related Theories

1. Definition of Cooperative Principle

Grice as cited by Grundy (2000:74) formalized his observation that when we talk we try to be cooperative by elevating this notion into what he called “The Cooperative Principle (CP)”. One way of being cooperative is for a speaker to give as much information as is expected. Cooperative principle is a theory formulated by Herbert Paul Grice in William James Lectures, delivered at Harvard University in 1967. It was published firstly by Harvard University press in his article entitle “Logic and Conversation” in 1975 that stated: “make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engage” (Grice, 1975:45).

Grice proposed that participants in a communicative exchange are guided by a principle that determines the way in which language is used with maximum efficiency and effect to achieve rational communication.

Levinson (1983:102) summarized the CP as the specification of “what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information.”

In an attempt to describe how the CP works, Grice formulated guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation. The guidelines are known as the maxims of conversation. It should be underlined that Grice (1975) introduces quantity, quality, relation and manner as categories.

The fact that Grice (as cited by Thomas, 1995:62) expressed the cooperative principle in the imperative mood has led some casual readers of his work to believe that Grice was telling speakers how they ought to behave. What he was actually doing was suggesting that in conversational interaction people work on the assumption that a certain set of rules is in operation, unless they receive indications to the contrary. In all spheres of life we make similar assumptions all the time.

Thomas (1995) gave a useful analogy that is driving a car to explain Grice’s theory. When we drive, we assume that other drivers will operate according to the same set of regulations as we do (or, at the very least, that

they know what those regulations are). If we could not make such assumptions the traffic system would rapidly grind to a halt. Of course, there are times when we do have indications that another driver may not obey the rules (a learner, a drunk, a person whose car is out of control, an ambulance or fire tender with its lights flashing and siren blaring or that they may be following a different set of rules (a car with foreign number plates) and on these occasions we re-examine our assumptions or suspend them altogether. And of course, there are times when our assumption that others are operating according to the same set of rules is misplaced, and then an accident may occur.

Thomas (1995:62) points out that the same is true of conversation. Within a given community, when we talk we operate according to a set of assumptions and, on the whole, we get by. There will be times when we may suspend our assumption that our interlocutor is operating according to the same conversational norms as we are. We may be talking to a young child who has yet to acquire our community's conversational norms, to a drunk, to someone in pain or distress. Or we may be talking to a person whom we have reason to think may have different conversational norms from our own (a member of a different cultural or linguistic community). And there will be times when our assumptions are wrong and then mistakes and misunderstanding occur, or when we are deliberately misled by our interlocutor.

For setting out his cooperative principle, Grice was not (as some commentators have erroneously assumed) suggesting that people are always good and kind or cooperative in any everyday sense of the word. He was simply noting that, on the whole, people observe certain regularities in interaction and his aim was to explain one particular set of regularities-those governing the generation and interpretation of conversational implicature.

Suppose that the speaker has accidentally locked herself out of her house. It is winter, the middle of the night and she is stark naked.

(1) A: Do you want a coat?

B: *No, I really want to stand out here in the freezing cold with no clothes on.*

On the face of it, B's reply is untrue and uncooperative, but in fact this is the sarcastic reply we encounter every day and have no problem at all in interpreting. Grice's theory of conversational implicature seeks an explanation of this exchange and the central role of cooperation within it. In order for A to arrive at the intended interpretation of B's utterance, A must at the very least be able to assume that B is being cooperative in the exchange.

Grice argues that without the assumption that the speaker is operating according to the cooperative principle, there is no mechanism to prompt someone to seek for another level of interpretation. Thomas

(1995:63) mentioned that the observation that the speaker has said something which is manifestly untrue, combined with the assumption that the CP is in operation sets in motion the search for an implicature. The four conversational maxims help us establish what the implicature might be.

Mooney (2004:900) stated that what initially look like uncooperative communicative exchange can in fact be viewed as cooperative if the activity type is properly understood. Even if an activity type is uncooperative, the maxims are still productive in understanding how communication takes place and how the activity type is conducted.

2. Definition of Conversational Implicature

In his article “Logic and Conversation” Grice (1975:44) also coined and introduced a new term in pragmatics study, the verb *implicate* and the related nouns *implicature* (*implying*) and *implicatum* (*what is implied*). Grundy (2000:73) stated that Grice deliberately chose the word “implicature” of his own coinage to cover any meaning that is implied, i.e., conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated. Therefore, a conversational implicature is something which is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use (Mey, 1993:99)

Grice (1975:43) made a very general distinction between what is said by a speaker and what he means or implicates. He gave a very popular example to explain the differences between them. Suppose that A and B are talking about a mutual friend, C, who is now working in a bank. A asks B how C is getting on in his job.

(2) A: How C is getting on his job?

B: *Oh quite well, I think. He likes his colleagues,
and he hasn't been to prison yet.*

Grice explained that at this point, A might well inquire what B was implying, what he was suggesting, or even what he meant by saying that C had not yet been to prison. The answer might be any one of such things as that C is the sort of person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation that C's colleagues are really unpleasant and treacherous people, and so forth. It might, of course, be quite unnecessary for A to make such inquiry of B, the answer to it being, in the context, clear in advance. I think it is clear that whatever B implied, suggested, meant, etc., in this example is distinct from what B said, which was simply that C had not been to prison yet.

According to Griffiths (2006:134) conversational implicatures are inferences that depend on the existence of norms for the use of language, such as the wide spread agreement that communicators should aim to tell the truth. He mentions that it is for historical reason that conversational is

part of the label. Implicatures arise as much in other speech genres and in writing as they do in conversation, so they are often just called implicatures. Speakers, writers, addressees assume that everyone engaged in communication knows and accept the communicational norms. This general acceptance is an important starting point for inferences, even if individuals are sometimes unable to meet the standards or occasionally cheat (for instance, telling lies).

According to Laurence (2004:3) implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. What a speaker intends to communicate characteristically far richer than what s/he directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood.

In addition, According to Yule (1996:35) implicature is an implicit meaning or additional conveyed meaning behind the utterance. In short, implicature is implicit meaning; what the speaker says is not what the speaker means, or what is said is not what is meant. The speaker more often means much more than the words they utter in order for them to be interpreted by the addressee. To interpret the additional meaning, we have to assume that the cooperative principle is in operation.

Grundy (2000:71) also gave example: One Saturday morning He went in when the post office had just opened.

(3) Post master: It's a nice morning, isn't it?

Peter: Not bad.

Post master: *It will be better at one o'clock*

Grundy understood him to mean that he would be happier when the post office had closed, but again, he never explicitly stated this. For the present, it is sufficient to notice that the context is very important in determining what someone means by what they say. Knowing that the post office closes at one o'clock on a Saturday enables us to understand what is meant by saying "*it will be better at one o'clock*". And because its part of their culture to believe that people find it hard to think properly early in the morning.

The example above shows us how important context is in helping us to understand utterances. In the case of implicature, context helps us to determine what is conveyed implicitly but not explicitly stated by the speaker.

According to Thomas (1995:58) an implicature is generated intentionally by the speaker and may (or may not) be understood by the hearer or the addressee. We can see how this operates in this example.

(4) Anne: *We must remember your telephone bill*

(hinting that Louisa had talked long enough)

Louisa: Goodbye

Based on the example above, the speaker actually means more than her words “*We must remember your telephone bill*”, she is hinting or indicating indirectly that she wants to finish the telephone conversation.

Thomas (1995:58) states that to imply is to hint, suggest or convey some meaning indirectly by means of language. We have seen how this operates in example (4), where the speaker hints or indicates indirectly that she wants to finish the telephone conversation.

It is sufficient to notice that the context is very important in determining what someone means by what they say. Given different context, we would have understood that the same utterances will have different meaning.

3. Conversational Maxims

In an attempt to describe how the CP works, Grice formulated guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation. These guidelines are known as the maxims of conversation. It should be underlined that Grice (1975:45) introduces Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner as categories (not maxims as they tend to be called in literature, each of which comprises supermaxim and maxim(s)).

Table 2.1. Conversational Maxims (Grice, 1975:45-46)

Category	Supermaxim	Maxims
Quantity		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. make your contribution as informative as is required 2. do not make your contribution more informative than is required
Quality	Try to make your contribution one that is true	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. do not say what you believe is false 2. do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
Relation	Be relevant	
Manner	Be perspicuous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoid obscurity expression 2. avoid ambiguity 3. be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity) 4. be orderly

a. Quantity

The category of quantity relates to the quantity of information to be provided. The first maxim under this category requires one to “be as informative as required.” This maxim means that the speaker has to include all the information that the hearer requires to understand. If the speaker leaves out a crucial piece of information, the hearer will not understand what the speaker is trying to say.

On the other hand, providing too much information during course of a conversation can be perceived as superfluous and insignificant to the other person. According to the second maxim, which requires one to “be brief”, the speaker should avoid unnecessary, redundant information in his contribution.

b. Quality

Under the category of quality, the maxim of truthfulness falls. This maxim refers to the importance of making only statements one believes to be true as Grice (1975) expects that the contributions to “be genuine and not spurious.” In short, the speaker is expected to be sincere and tell the truth. They are assumed not say anything that they believe to be false or anything for which they lack evidence. The reason is that if s/he gets making false statements s/he will lose one of the most important social assets a person can have, credibility.

c. Relation

Under the category of relation, Grice place a single supermaxim namely “be relevant”. The demand for relevance simply means that the speaker should only include information in the communication that is relevant to the topic being discussed.

d. Manner

Under the category of manner, which Grice understand as relating not to what is said but rather to how what is said is to be said. It assumes the speaker should be brief and orderly, and avoid obscurity and ambiguity expressions.

Grice emphasized that it is important to recognise these maxims as unstated assumptions we have in conversation. Yule (1996:37) assumed that people are normally going to provide an appropriate amount of information; we assume that they are telling the truth, being relevant, and trying to be as clear as they can. Because these principles are assumed in normal interaction, speakers rarely mention them.

Cutting (2002:34) stated that verbal exchanges, whether interviews, conversations, or service encounters tend to run smoothly and successfully when the participants follow certain social convention as called conversational maxim.

In short, these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in maximally efficient, rational, cooperative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly, and clearly, while providing sufficient information.

Grice (1975:46) stated that that the maxim of Quality has to be assumed as the most important; “other maxims come into operation only on the assumption that this maxim of Quality is satisfied.

Thomas (1995:64) gave an interesting case when a speaker observes all the maxims as in the following examples:

(5) Husband: Where are the car keys?

Wife: *They are on the table in the hall.*

The wife has answered clearly (Manner) truthfully (Quality), has given just the right amount of information (Quantity) and has directly addressed her husband's goal in asking the question (Relation). She has said precisely what she meant, no more and no less, and has generated no implicature. There is no distinction to be made here between what she says and what she means, there is no additional level of meaning.

4. Flouting Maxims

According to Grice's theory, interlocutors operate on the assumption that as a rule, the maxims will be observed. But when speakers appear not follow the maxims but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied. Grice was well aware, however, that there are many occasions when people fail to observe the maxims. Grice (1975:49) stated that a speaker may flout a maxim when s/he blatantly fail to fulfil it, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because the speaker wishes to prompt the addressee to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. He called this additional meaning as "conversational implicature."

Thomas (1995:64) stated that a flout occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature. He also stated that most of Grice's own example of flouts involves this sort of "exploitation".

Mooney (2004:907) points out that the case of flouting is an illustration of exactly why the CP and the subordinate maxims are useful. Flouting of maxims explains how a hearer can recuperate a seemingly inappropriate response by adding, as it were, a conversational implicature to the mix.

Grice (1975:49) stated that when s/he blatantly fail to fulfil a maxim, this situation is one, that characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature; and when a conversational implicature is generated, it meant that a maxim is being exploited.

a. Flouts Quantity Maxims

When a speaker flouts the maxims under the category of Quantity, s/he blatantly gives either more or less information than the situation demands. For an example of how the maxims flouted, imagine this scenario. A married couple has just had a quarrel. The husband puts on his hat and coat and stomps to the door. The following exchange takes place:

(6) Wife: Where are you going?

Husband: *Out*

The husband is flouting the maxim of “make your contribution as informative as required”, since it is obvious from his actions that he is going out. His reply therefore carries some additional information, perhaps, that it is none of the wife’s business or the husband does not know where he is going (but he would not tell his wife he knows).

Grice (1975:52) gave an extreme example of flouting of the first maxim of quantity are provided by utterances of patent tautologies like *women are women* and *war is war*. Grice explain his example above that at the level of what is said, such remarks are totally noninformative in any conversational context. They are of course, informative at the level of what is implicated, and the hearer's identification of their informative content at this level is dependent on his ability to explain the speaker's selection of this particular patent tautology.

Yule (1996:35) also gave an example concerning tautologies expressions such as mentioned in the middle of their lunch hour, one woman asks another she likes the hamburger she is eating, and receive the answer in this excerpt.

(7) *A hamburger is a hamburger*

From a purely logical perspective, the reply in (7) seems to have no communicative value since it expresses something completely obvious. When the speaker utters such kind of expressions in a conversation, clearly the speaker intends to communicate more than is said. When the listener hears the expression in (7), she first has to assume that the speaker is being cooperative and intends to communicate something. That something must be more than just what the words mean.

Given opportunity to evaluate the hamburger, the speaker of (7) has responded without an evaluation, thus one implicature is that she has

no opinion, either good or bad, to express. Depending on other aspects of the context, additional implicatures (for example, the speaker thinks all hamburgers are the same) might be inferred.

b. Flouts Quality Maxims

Flouts which exploit the maxims under the category of quality occur when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which he or she lacks adequate evidence. Often an individual will try to deflect unwelcome attention by giving an improbable or obviously untrue response. B was a long train journey and wanted to read her book. A was a fellow passenger who wanted to talk to her.

(8) A: What do you do?

B: I'm a teacher.

A: Where do you teach?

B: *Outer Mongolia.*

A: Sorry I asked.

Outer Mongolia is seen as somewhere impossibly remote, so that B's improbable response prompted the hearer to look for an implicature. The funny thing about this example was that B really did teach in Outer Mongolia, but A was nevertheless correct in assuming that B was trying to give him the brush off.

According to Grice (1975:53), maxim under the category of Quality also can be flouted by giving irony, metaphoric, litotes (understatement) and hyperbole (overstatement) expressions.

According to Mooney (2004:907) indeed, the particular kinds of implicatures that are generated by the use of figurative language deserve special attention. It seems that the meaning that is conveyed by irony and metaphor, for example, can not be conveyed by other ways (thus suggesting that conversational implicature is at work).

In the traditional definition, Mey (2009:406) pointed out, irony is seen as saying something to mean the opposite of what is said. Hearers on noticing that the maxim of Quality has been flouted, will look around for a logical true interpretation that is in some way related to the literal one. For an example of irony, suppose that A has just spilled a half cup of coffee over B, who is dressed in a new suit for an important meeting. B says:

(9) *“That was clever of you”.*

It is impossible that B really thinks that A is clever. In interpreting (9), A will realise that B is flouting the first maxim of Quality (do not say what you believe to be false). Having no reason that B is trying to deceive her in any way, she will assume that B is co-operating in the exchange, and attempting to communicate some true information. The only logical way to properly derive the intended meaning of B is by concentrating on the ironical utterance itself and then searching for the exact opposite meaning of the one has been expressed. The implicature may result in the interpretation: “That was not clever of you.”

As leech (1983:144) says, while irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness), the type of verbal behaviour known as “banter” is an offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness).

Thus, in the case of irony, the speaker expresses a positive sentiment and implies a negative one. If a student comes down to breakfast one morning and says:

(10) *“If only you knew how much I love being woken up
at 4 a.m by a fire alarm*

Actually she is being ironic and expecting her friends to know that she means the opposite.

While sarcasm is a form of irony that is not so friendly; in fact it is usually intended to hurt, as B might say:

(11) *“Why don’t you leave all your dirty clothes on the
lounge floor, love, and then you only need wash them
when someone breaks a leg trying to get to sofa?”*

Banter, on the contrary, expresses a negative sentiment and implies a positive one (Cutting, 2002:38). It sounds a like a mild aggression, as in:

(12) *You are stingy. How can you only give me a
chocholate?”*

Such utterances sound that the speaker gibes the hearer by uttering (12), but it is intended to be an expression of friendship or intimacy. Banter can

be a tease, and sometimes a flirtatious comment. The danger with banter is that it can offend if the hearers do not recover the conversational implicatures, or if they suspect that there is an element of truth in the words.

Similarly, a speaker can flout the maxim of quality by using a metaphor, as in (13) “*you are the cream in my coffee*” characteristically involve categorical falsity, so the contradictory of what the speaker has made as it to say will, strictly speaking, be a truism; so it can not be that such a speaker is trying to get across. The most likely supposition is that the speaker is attributing to his audience some feature or features in respect of which the audience resembles (more or less fancifully) the mentioned substance.

Grice (1975:53) mentioned that it is possible to combine metaphor and irony by imposing on the hearer two stages of interpretation. He says “*You are the cream in my coffee*”, intending the hearer to reach first the metaphor interpretation “*You are my pride and joy*” and then the irony interpretation “*You are my bane.*”

In the case of irony, as we have seen, the ironical interpretation is the contradictory of the literal interpretation, while for litotes it is a weakening, and for hyperbole a strengthening, of the proposition expressed. For example of hyperbole, take a look at the following well-established exaggerating expression:

(14) *“I’m starving”*.

If the speaker of (14) looks healthy and well fed, her/his hearer will realise that the maxim of quality is being exploited and infer the conversational implicature, a somewhat stronger version of “I’m very hungry.”

Similarly, the flouts of Quality also occur when a speaker utters conventional euphemisms to smooth their utterances in order to be more polite to be heard as happen in this example. Suppose that a student asks permission to go to bathroom to the teacher during they have a class by saying:

(15) Excuse me, Ma’am, *“I’m going to wash my hands”*

The meaning of utterance (15) is I’m going to urinate, the implied sense of the words is so well established that the expressions can only mean one thing. It is also well understood that *“I’m going to wash my hands”* is more smooth utterance than I’m going to urinate to be uttered directly.

c. Flouts Relation Maxim

The maxim of relation (Be Relevant) is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g. by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address the other person’s goal in asking a question). Examples of flouting the maxim of relation by changing the subject or by failing to address the

topic directly are encountered very frequently, and the example which follows is typical.

(16) A: There is somebody at the door.

B: *I'm in the bath.*

In such kind of exchange, B expects A to understand that his present location is relevant to her comment that there is someone at the door, and that he can not go and see who it is because he is in the bath.

d. Flouts Manner Maxims

The maxim under the category of manner is exploited by giving ambiguity and obscure expressions, failure to be brief and orderly. It is often trying to exclude a third party, as in this sort of exchange between husband and wife.

(17) Husband: Where are you off to?

Wife: *I was thinking of going out to get some
of that funny white stuff for somebody.*

Husband: OK, but don't be long – dinner is nearly
ready

B speaks in an ambiguous way, saying “*that funny white stuff*” and “*somebody*”, because he is avoiding saying “*ice cream*” and “*Michelle*”, so that his little daughter does not become excited and ask for the ice

cream before her meal. Sometimes the speakers play with words to heighten the ambiguity, in order to make a point.

5. Movie

According to Rizzo (2005:2) movie or film is a story delivered with moving images. It is produced by recording photographic images with cameras, or by creating images using animation techniques or visual effects. People usually reflect their imaginations and their experiences in to a movie. Consequently, some of the stories in the movies are fiction and nonfiction.

A movie which relates to the reality is called documentary film. It is intended to document some aspect of reality, primarily for the purposes of instruction or maintaining a historical record (<http://en.wikipedia.org>).

The process of making movie is developed in a film industry. A movie contains several elements. Those are:

- a) Title; the title of the movie may name of the main actor, place or indicate the story behind.
- b) Dramatic conflict; dramatic conflict of the movie is what takes the audience attention. It makes the emotion of the audience involved.
- c) Genre; genre refers to the kind of movie whether it is comedy, drama, horror and so on.
- d) Plot; plot is the sequence events of the movie.

- e) Setting; setting refers to the background of the story. It provides the situation of the event in the movie and where the event took place.
- f) Actors; actor is a person who act in a movie. S/he plays a certain character in a movie to convey the story of the movie.

The story of the movie is conveyed by the actors through a dialogue. Here, the dialogue will be analyzed by the researcher. By considering the character of qualitative approach which the data is in the form of word, the dialogue of the movie is the appropriate data to be studied.

B. Review of Related Studies

The previous researches about Grice's theory have been conducted in STAIN Tulungagung, Tantri in her thesis, *An Analysis of Cooperative Principles on Facebook's Conversation, 2011*. Employing Grice's CP as the underlying theory, her study is focused on the quantity of the observance and the violation of cooperative principle in facebook's conversation by indicating the age and the relationship among the facebook's users. She found that the maxim of relevance is the highest frequently observed maxim and the maxim of quality is the highest frequently violated maxim on facebook conversation.

Another research, Faisal, 2013, has studied about the *Flouts of Grice's Cooperative Principle: the Case of Verbal Humour in Srimulat*. He

intended his research on the flouting of cooperative principle in producing verbal humour. He investigated how the maxims flouted but he found that only flouting occurs in Srimulat. He did not explain yet why the other non-observance (violating, infringing, opting out) did not happen in Srimulat. In his thesis, he stated that the characters of Srimulat flout the maxim to produce social implication that is humour. He found that Relation maxim is mostly flouted by the speakers to produce humour and laughter for the addressee and the listeners.

Based on the previous research above, the writer of the research wants to discuss about Grice's theory. In this research, she wants to specify her research on the application of Grice's theory on movie conversation. It is the same theory used by Tantri and Faisal but this research is definitely different from the previous research since this research is used qualitative approach and focus on the flouting of conversational maxim (another way of non-observance maxims). Moreover the researcher intended to analyze the dialogue of the movie and interpret the implicatures generated from the flouted maxims. So, the researcher asserts that this research is different with the previous research.