

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents findings and discussion. In the finding section, the researcher presents detailed information about the types of conversational implicature and flouting or violating the maxims. While discussion section, the researcher will give a general explanation of the finding.

#### **1.1 Research Findings**

To answer the research questions, the researcher attempts to present the result by explaining the types of conversational implicature and flouting or violating the maxims that found in “Titanic” movie script. However, the researcher analyzed the utterance of the main characters in “Titanic” movie from the beginning till the end to get various data. Resulting from the research subject, basically, there are 20 data containing implicature in this movie. The utterance which is containing implicature are signed with the bold text which are completed with the context description and analysis after listing the coversation. Those data are used in different setting and context. The data were analyzed based on the types of conversational implicature by Jenny Thomas and flouting or violating the maxims by Grice as follow:

**Table 2**

Table of Conversational Implicature

No. Data	Non-Observance	Maxim	Types of Conversational Implicature
Datum (01)	Flouting	Relation	Generalized
Datum (02)	Violating	Quantity	Generalized
Datum (03)	Violating	Manner	Particularized
Datum (04)	Violating	Quantity	Generalized
Datum (05)	Violating	Quality	Generalized
Datum (06)	Flouting	Quantity	Generalized
Datum (07)	Flouting	Quantity	Generalized
Datum (08)	Violating	Quantity	Particularized
Datum (09)	Violating	Relation	Generalized
Datum (10)	Flouting	Manner	Particularized
Datum (11)	Violating	Relation	Particularized
Datum (12)	Violating	Quality	Generalized
Datum (13)	Violating	Quality	Generalized
Datum (14)	Flouting	Quality	Particularized
Datum (15)	Violating	Quantity	Generalized
Datum (16)	Violating	Quantity	Generalized
Datum (17)	Flouting	Quality	Particularized
Datum (18)	Violating	Manner	Particularized
Datum (19)	Violating	Quality	Generalized
Datum (20)	Flouting	Quality	Particularized

**Table 3**

Types of Conversational Implicature Uttered by The Main Characters

NO.	SPEAKER	TYPES OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE			
		Generalized		Particularized	
		Number	%	Number	%
1.	Jack	5	25	6	30
2.	Rose	7	35	2	10
	Total	12	60	8	40

Two types of conversational implicature are arisen in utterances by each main characters. Jack produced both 5 generalized and 6 particularized conversational implicatures. To follow, Rose produced 7 generalized and 2 particularized ones.

**Table 4**

Number and Percentage of Conversational Implicatures by Each Type

No.	Types of CI	Number	Percentage (%)
1.	PCI	8	40
2.	GCI	12	60
	Total	20	100

From the data collected, the researcher has found the total of 8 implicatures. Between the 2 types, generalized conversational implicature, the latter takes a bigger percentage. It means 12 out of the 20 implicatures are generalized ones. Then, when it comes to the other type, 8 out of the 20 implicatures are found as particularized conversational implicatures. The fact is that the type generalized conversational implicatures (GCI) are produced more frequently.

Datum #01 (**GCI**)

SCENE 23 : ROSE'S STATEROOM / KELDISH – DAY

Broke glances at Bodine... oh oh. Bodine rolls his eyes. Rose finishes arranging her photographs. We get a general glimpse of them: the usual snapshots... children and grandchildren, her late husband.

ROSE : There, that's nice. I have to have my pictures when I travel. And Freddy of course.

(to the Pomeranian)

Isn't that right, sweetie.

LOVETT : Would you like anything ?

ROSE : **I should like to see my drawing.**

At the conversation above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature. Conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication, first described by the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. So, in this case, Rose used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Rose uttered an implicature in the sentence "**I should like to see my drawing**". Based on the theory from Jenny Thomas (1995), this type of conversational implicature it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because it doesn't need to understand the context first. And according to Horn's scale, using the word "*should*" also can be categorized in generalized conversational implicature.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants first. So, it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. Using of word "*should*" in that utterance is marked to be the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate "Rose wants to

see her drawing”. And based on J. Thomas, when there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Rose does not observe the cooperative principle. Grice (1975) explained that the condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. In this case, Rose is **flouting maxim of relation**. According to Grice, flouting the maxim of relation is appear when the speaker deliberately say something which is not relevant to topic being discussed. On the conversation above, Rose flouted the maxim of relation with blatantly give irrelevant information than Lovett needs. She is asking about what she needs (it is normally about things), but Rose replies by saying that she wants to go to see her drawing. It means that the statement is not relevant with the question. Look at Lovett’s question, “Would you like anything?”, it means that he is trying to offer about something that perhaps she needs. But, the response is irrelevant with the question. Rose answer it with, “I should like to see my drawing”. It means that she doesn’t want anything except her drawing and want to see it as soon as possible. So, she has flouted the maxim of relation by saying irrelevant sentence to reply Lovett’s question. Furthermore, they are being irrelevant for the reasons that they want to say implicitly or hide something to the addressee. So, in this case, Rose is flouting the maxim of relation.

Datum #02 (GCI)

SCENE 28 : INT. LAB DECK, PRESERVATION AREA

LOVETT : And that makes you my new best friend. I will happily compensate you for anything you can tell us that will lead to its recovery.

ROSE : I don't want your money, Mr. Lovett. I know how hard it is for people who care greatly for money to give some away.

BODINE : (Skeptical) You don't want anything ?

ROSE : (Indicating the drawing) **You may give me this, if anything I tell you is of value.**

In the dialogue, Rose uttered a conversational implicature. Conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication, described by Herberb Paul Grice. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, Rose used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. The Rose's utterance "**You may give me this, if anything I tell you is of value**" is included to a conversational implicature because she implied that the drawing is very valuable by indicating her drawing. Based on the theory from Jenny Thomas (1995), this type of conversational implicature it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because it doesn't need to understand the context first. Rose actually wants only the drawing not something else. She can simply have replied "Yes", because the utterance above has implication that she doesn't want money or anything unless her drawing. There is

no relation between the contexts for generating implicature from the utterance. So, the implicature is classified as generalized conversational implicature.

The other reason indicating that sentence becomes a generalized conversational implicature is because there is a word “*may*”. According to Horn’s scale, the word “*may*” is indicating generalized conversational implicature. To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants first. So, it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. Using of word “*may*” in that utterance is marked to be the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate “Rose only wants her drawing as the compensation”. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue, Rose is violated a maxim. According to Grice (1975:49), if a speaker violates a maxim, ‘s/he will be liable to mislead’. And also according to Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. In this case, Rose uttered uncooperative utterance by **violating maxim of quantity** which has blatantly given more information than required. Rose can simply replies “Yes or No” it was clear enough to answer the Bodine’s question but Rose gives more specific information than he needs that is her drawing. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that

speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. A speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. So, in this case, she is violating the maxim of quantity.

Datum #03 (**PCI**)

SCENE 34 : EXT. SOUTHAMPTON DOCK – DAY

RUTH : Honestly, Cal, if you weren't forever booking everything at the last instant, we could have gone through the terminal instead of running along the dock like some squalid immigrant family.

CAL : All part of my charm, Ruth. At any rate, it was my darling fiancée's beauty rituals which made us late.

ROSE : You told me to change.

CAL : I couldn't let you wear black on sailing day, sweetpea. It's bad luck.

ROSE : **I felt like black.**

On the dialogue above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature in sentence “**I felt like black**”. Based on the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In the conversation above, Rose used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature from Jenny Thomas (1995) it can be categorized as particularized conversational implicature that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context

used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can understand that Rose wore black dress and Cal asked her to change because he assumed that black is a symbol of bad luck and then Rose felt like black (specific context, indicates she is unhappy or bad). The situation also supported with Cal's utterance "I couldn't let you wear black on sailing day, sweetpea. It's bad luck". It means that Cal forbids her to wear black dress. When the utterances rises implicature and needs a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

On the dialogue above, Rose uttered uncooperative utterance in the sentence "I felt like black". She is violating a maxim. According to Grice (in Thomas, 1995:72), defined as the term "violation" very specifically as the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim. And according to Grice (1975:49), if a speaker violates a maxim, 's/he will be liable to mislead'. And also according to Thomas (1995:74), 'violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim' where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. In this case, she does not observe the maxim by **violating maxim of manner**. Violating maxim of manner is when speakers does not speak perspicuously and the speakers may say something true in order to imply an untruth case. They may use an obscure expressions, an ambiguous term, or do not speak briefly nor orderly. In this case, violates the maxim

of manner is marked when Rose's reply is using ambiguous term that is "I felt like black". So, it means that she is violating maxim of manner.

Datum #04 (GCI)

SCENE 59 : INT. PALM COURT RESTAURANT – DAY

CAL : (To the waiter) We'll both have the lamb. Rare, with a little mint sauce. (To Rose, after the waiter moves away) You like lamb, don't you sweetpea ?

Molly is watching the dynamic between Rose, Cal, and Ruth.

MOLLY : So, you gonna cut her meat for her too there, Cal ? (Turning to Ismay) Hey, who came up with the name Titanic ? You, Bruce ?

ISMAY : Yes, actually. I wanted to convey sheer size. And size means stability, luxury and safety...

ROSE : Do you know of Dr. Freud ? His ideas about the male preoccupation with size might be of particular interest to you, Mr. Ismay.

Andrews chokes on his breadstick, suppressing laughter.

RUTH : My God, Rose, What's gotten into...

ROSE : **Excuse me** (She stalks away)

RUTH : (Mortified) I do apologize.

At the conversation above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature. Based on the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this

case, Rose used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Rose uttered an implicature in the sentence “**Excuse me**”. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature from Jenny Thomas (1995) it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this utterance doesn’t need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. Using of word “**Excuse me**” in that utterance is marked to be the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate “Rose wants to leave the conversation”. It also supported with Rose’s utterance before, “Do you know of Dr. Freud? His ideas about the male preoccupation with size might be of particular interest to you, Mr. Ismay” which shows her disagreement with Mr. Ismay. It means that she is uncomfortable with them and wants to leave the conversation. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

On the conversation above, Rose uttered the other uncooperative utterance. Grice (1975) explained that the condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. In this case, Rose does not observe the cooperative principle. She is **flouting maxim of quantity**. Flouting the maxim quantity means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It happens whether the speaker provides information either more or less than is required. In this case, flouts the maxim of quantity is marked when Rose decided to leave the conversation, it

means that she doesn't want to give more information than required (less information because she leaves the conversation). So, in this case, Rose is flouting the maxim of quantity.

Datum #05 (GCI) and Datum #06 (GCI)

SCENE 65 : EXT. POOP DECK - NIGHT

JACK : Ever been to Wisconsin ?

ROSE : (Perplexed) No.

JACK : Well they have some of the coldest winters around, and I grew up there, near Chippewa Falls. Once when I was a kid me and my father were ice fishing out on Lake Wissota... ice fishing's where you chop a hole in the...

ROSE : I know what ice fishing is!

JACK : **Sorry. Just... you look like kind of an indoor girl.** Anyway, I went through some thin ice and I'm telling ya, water that cold... like that right down there... it hits you like a thousand knives all over your body. You can't breath, you can't think... least not about anything but the pain.

(Takes off his other shoe) which is why I'm not looking forward to jumping in after you. But like I said, I don't see a choice. I guess I'm kinda hoping you'll come back over the rail and get me off the hook here.

ROSE : You're crazy.

JACK : That's what everybody says. **But with all due respect, I'm not the one hanging off the back of a ship.**

On the dialogue above (05), Jack uttered a conversational implicature in sentence "**Sorry. Just... you look like kind of an indoor girl**". According to the English language philosopher Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to

follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, he used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature from Jenny Thomas (1995), it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this utterance doesn't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. The sentence "Sorry. Just... you look like kind of an indoor girl" was certainly implicate that Jack thinks that Rose didn't know everything outside her home, he thinks that she always spend her time more in her luxury house. It also supported with Rose's performance in that movie (dress, make up, and habit which shows her aristocracy) that reflects her luxurious life. It means that Jack thinks that she is a noblewoman. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

After that, Jack also uttered the other conversational implicature in sentence "**But with all due respect, I'm not the one hanging off the back of a ship**"(06). He used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. That utterance is classified into generalized conversational implicature because we can interpret that this utterance is used to tease Rose that wants to kill herself by jump to the sea from the deck-ship. This reason is supported by something happen in that

moment (in movie). Rose is crying and running to the point of the ship. It means that she had problem and stuck in bad condition. To understand this implicature, we do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or we had to know the participants, so it could be said that we could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above (05), Jack does not observe the cooperative principle. He is violating a maxim. According to Grice (in Thomas, 1995:72), defined as the term “violation” very specifically as the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim. And according to Grice (1975:49), if a speaker violates a maxim,’ s/he will be liable to mislead’. And also according to Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. In this case, he is **violating maxim of quality**. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks adequate evidence. Jack is violating maxim quality by blatantly not saying truth. It is marked when he already knew that Rose is not like indoor girl, but he said it to tease her because of her dress. So, in this case, Jack is violating the maxim of quality.

After that, Jack also uttered the other uncooperative utterance. In the dialogue above (06), Jack does not observe the cooperative principle. He is **violating maxim of quantity**. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. It happens whether the speaker provides information either more or less than is required. In this case, Jack gave more information than required because he can simply answer it with “Yes” or “No” but he decided to add a sentence again. So, in this case, Jack is violating the maxim of quantity.

Datum #07 (GCI)

SCENE 66 : EXT. POOP DECK – NIGHT

Cal is leaving without a second thought for Jack.

GRACIE : (Low) Ah... perhaps a little something for the boy ?

CAL : Oh, right, Mr. Lovejoy. A twenty should do it.

ROSE : **Is that the going rate for saving the woman you love ?**

CAL : Rose is displeased. Mmm... What to do ?

Cal turns back to Jack. He appraises him condescendingly... a steerage ruffian, unwashed and ill-mannered.

CAL : I know (to Jack) Perhaps you could join us for dinner tomorrow, to regale our group with your heroic tale ?

JACK : (Looking straight at Rose) Sure. Count me in.

On the dialogue above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature in sentence “**Is that the going rate for saving the woman you love ?**”.

Conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication, first described by the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different from the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. On the conversation above, Rose used the question to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature from Jenny Thomas (1995), it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this utterance doesn't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants first, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. The sentence “**Is that the going rate for saving the woman you love ?**” was certainly implicate Rose wants more than 20 dollars. It means that she teases Cal to give more value than his money if he really love her. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

Rose uttered the uncooperative utterance in the question above. In the dialogue above Rose does not observe the cooperative principle. She is **flouting maxim of quantity**. 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. Flouting the maxim quantity means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It happens whether the speaker provides

information either more or less than is required. In this case, Rose implied pushing Cal with her question. It means that Rose is not accepting what Cal said and need more value. It indicates that she gave more information than required. So, in this case, Rose is flouting the maxim of quantity.

Datum #08 (PCI)

SCENE 73 : EXT. BOAT DECK – DAY

Jack and Rose walk side by side. They pass people reading and talking in steamer chairs, some of whom glance curiously at the mismatched couple. He feels out of place in his rough clothes. They are both awkward, for different reasons.

JACK : So, you got a name by the way?

ROSE : Rose DeWitt Bukater.

JACK : **That's quite a moniker. I may hafta get you to write down.**

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature in sentence **“That's quite a moniker. I may hafta get you to write down”**. According to the English language philosopher H. P. Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. He used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. It indicates that sentence is particularized conversational implicature, that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly

require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can understand that Rose had a long nickname (specific context). The situation also supported with Jack's utterance "**That's quite a moniker. I may hafta get you to write down**". It means that Jack got a difficulty to remember Rose's name so he said that he needs to write down her name. In this case, the word "moniker" is a term to mention someone's name (nickname). So, when Jack uttered "That's quite a moniker", it implies that it is too long name for her nickname to remember. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Jack is violated a maxim. According to Grice (1975:49), if a speaker violates a maxim, 's/he will be liable to mislead'. And also according to Thomas (1995:74), 'violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim' where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. In this case, Jack uttered uncooperative utterance by **violating maxim of quantity** which has blatantly given more information than required. Based on Grice's theory, violating the maxim quantity means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It happens whether the speaker provides information either more or less than is

required and may say something true in order to imply an untruth case. It was marked when Jack said that it is a long nickname, he should write down her name (untruth), actually he could say “Yes” or “No”, but he decided to add more sentence in the utterance “That’s quite a moniker. I may hafta get you to write down” which indicates that it was more information than required. In this case, Jack gave more information than required. So, in this case, Jack is violating the maxim of quantity.

Datum #09 (GCI)

SCENE 74 : EXT. BOAT DECK – DAY

She studies one drawing in particular, the girl posed half in sunlight, half in shadow. Her hands lie at her chin, one furred and one open like a flower, languid and graceful. The drawing is like Alfred Steiglitz print of Georgia O’Keefe.

ROSE : You liked this woman. You used her several times.

JACK : **She had beautiful hands.**

ROSE : (Smiling) I think you must have had a love affair with her...

JACK : (Laughing) No, no! Just with her hands.

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature in sentence “**She had beautiful hands**”. Based on H. P. Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. in the conversation above, Jack used the question to give implicit meaning in that

conversation. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature from Jenny Thomas (1995), it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this utterance doesn't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. The sentence “**She had beautiful hands**” in that utterance is marked to be the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate Jack doesn't love the woman in his drawing (in movie), he just amazed and interested in her hands. It means that he denies the statement from Rose. So, it is indirectly replied Rose's statement with the answer “No”. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Jack does not observe the cooperative principle by violating a maxim. According to Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. In this case, Jack is **violating maxim of relation**. He is violating maxim of relation with blatantly give irrelevant information than Rose needs. Rose said about someone, but he replies about someone's hands. It means that the statement is not relevant or related with the statement before. Violating the maxim of relation is appear when the speaker deliberately say something which is not relevant to topic being

discussed, it means that they have violated the maxim of relation. Furthermore, they are being irrelevant for the reasons that they want to say implicitly or hide something to the addressee. So, in this case, Jack is violating the maxim of relation.

Datum #10 (**PCI**)

SCENE 79 : INT. UPPER LANDING / GRAND STAIRCASE AND A-DECK

Jack steps in and his breath is take away by the splendor spread out before him. Overhead is the enormous glass dome, with a crystal chandelier at its center. Sweeping down six stories is the First Class Grand Staircase, the epitome of the opulent naval architecture of the time.

And the people: the women in their floor length dresses, elaborate hairstyles, and abundant jewelry... the gentlemen in evening dress, standing with one hand at the small of the back, talking quietly.

Jack descends to a deck. Several men nod a perfunctory greeting. He nods back, keeping it simple. He feels like a spy.

Cal comes down the stairs, with Ruth on his arm, covered in jewelry. They both walk right past Jack, neither one gecognizeing him. Cal nods at him, one gent to another. But Jack barely has time to be amused. Because just behind Cal and Ruth on the stairs is Rose, a vision in red and black, her low-cut dress showing off her neck and shoulders, her arms seathed in white gloves that come well above above the elbow. Jack is hypnotized by her beauty.

Close on Rose as she approaches Jack. He imitates the gentlemen's stance, hand behind his back. She extends her gloved hand and he takes it, kissing the back of her fingers. Rose flushes, beaming noticeably. She can't take her eyes off him.

**JACK : I saw that in a Nickelodean once, and I always wanted to do it.**

ROSE : Cal, surely you remember Mr. Dawson.

CAL : (Caught off guard) Dawson! I didn't recognize you. (studies him) Amazing! You could almost pass for a gentlemen.

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature in sentence **“I saw that in a Nickelodean once, and I always wanted to do it”**. Based on the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different from the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, Jack used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. It indicates that sentence is particularized conversational implicature, that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can understand that Nickelodeon is the most popular TV show in that era (specific context). The situation also supported with Jack's utterance **“I saw that in a Nickelodean once, and I always wanted to do it”**. It means that Jack never did that before. In this case, specialized knowledge is needed to be able to understand the implicature of the utterance above. Special knowledge that is needed to understand is the word “Nickelodeon”. According to Wikipedia, Nickelodeon is the 90's TV shows that famous with the mellow drama that showing the story about the social gap between the nobles with the high class habit and the lower ranks. So, when Jack uttered “I

saw that in a Nickelodeon once, and I always wanted to do it”, it implies that it feels like a drama on TV show, and he experienced it. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered uncooperative utterance in the sentence “I saw that in a Nickelodeon once, and I always wanted to do it”. According to Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. In this case, Jack does not observe the maxim by **violating maxim of manner**. And according to Grice, violating maxim of manner is when speakers does not speak perspicuously. They may use an obscure expressions, an ambiguous term, or do not speak briefly nor orderly. In this case, Jack’s statement is using ambiguous term by saying those sentences because in this era Nickelodeon is not as popular as before. So, it means that people can be false to interpret that meaning and automatically he is flouting maxim of manner.

Datum #11 (**PCI**)

SCENE 83 : TIME TRANSITION: Dessert has been served and a waiter arrives with cigars in a humidor on a wheeled card. The men start clipping ends and lighting.

ROSE : Jack, must you go ?

JACK : **Time for my coach to turn back into a pumpkin** (He leans over to take her hand).

INSERT: We see him slip a tiny folded note into her palm.

Ruth, scowling, watches him walk away across the enormous room. Rose surreptitiously opens the note below table level. It reads: "Make it count. Meet me at the clock".

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature in sentence "**Time for my coach to turn back into a pumpkin**". Conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication, described by Herbert Paul Grice. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different from the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, he used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. It indicates that sentence is particularized conversational implicature, that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can relate with the story of Cinderella (specific context). Cinderella is famous with her change from the poor girl into a princess in one night with riding a pumpkin that changed by the fairy into a kingdom cart. In this case, Jack uttered "**Time for my coach to turn back into a pumpkin**" to imply that his life is like Cinderella that has everything

in one night. The word “pumpkin” is refer to his poor life. In this case, Jack is poor and he can diffuse with rich people in one night just like Cinderella’s story. So, when Jack uttered “**Time for my coach to turn back into a pumpkin**”, it implies that he will back to the reality again that means his poor life. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Jack does not observe the cooperative principle. Grice (1975) explained that the condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. He is **flouting maxim of relation**. 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 is flouting maxim of relation with blatantly give irrelevant information than Rose needs. Rose asked Jack that must he go, but Jack replied with irrelevant statement. It means that the statement is not relevant or related with the question. flouting the maxim of relation is appear when the speaker deliberately say something which is not relevant to topic being discussed and may say something true in order to imply an untruth case, it means that they have flouted the maxim of relation. Furthermore, they are being irrelevant for the reasons that they want to say implicitly or hide something to the addressee. Jack uttered the statement with untruth case (flout). So, in this case, Jack is flouting the maxim of relation.

Datum #12 (GCI)

SCENE 99 : EXT. TITANIC - DAY

JACK : Close you eyes.

She does, and he turns her to face forward, the way the ship is going. He presses her gently to the rail, standing right behind her. Then he takes her two hands and raises them until she is standing with her arms outstetched on each side. Rose is going along with him. When he lowers his hands, her arms stay up... like wings.

JACK : Okay. Open them.

Rose gasps. There is nothing in her field of vision but water. It's like there is no ship under them at all, just the two of the soaring. The Atlantic unrolls toward her, a hammered copper shield under a dusk sky. There is only the wind, and the hiss of te water 50 feel below.

ROSE : **I'm flying !**

On the dialogue above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature in sentence "**I'm flying !**". Conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication, described by Herberb Paul Grice. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, she used the statement to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature from J. Thomas, it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this kind of utterance don't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants first, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. It was certainly implicate Rose feels like she can fly and feels the air. It means that she doesn't fly in real but only feel the air like she is flying. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Rose does not observe the cooperative principle. Grice (1975) explained that the condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. She is **flouting maxim of quality**. 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. She is flouting a maxim of quality. According to Grice's theory of implicature, flouting the maxim of quality means that speakers do not say something that represent what they actually think or the speakers may say something untrue in order to imply a truth. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks adequate evidence. In this case, Rose is flouting maxim quality by blatantly not saying truth. It is impossibe that someone can fly. So, by saying that, it means that Rose is flouting the maxim of quality.

Datum #13 (GCI)

SCENE 103 : INT. ROSE'S SUITE

... 1912. Like in a dream the beautiful woodwork and satin upholstery emerge from the rusted ruin. Jack is overwhelmed by the opulence of the room. He sets his sketchbook and drawing materials on the marble table.

ROSE : Will this light do ? Don't artist need good light ?

JACK : (Bad French accent) That is true, I am not used to working in such 'orrible conditions (see the paintings). Hey... Monet! He crouches next to the paintings stacked against the wall. Isn't he great... the use of color? I saw him once... through a hole in this garden fence in Giverny.

She goes into the adjoining walk-in wardrobe closet. He sees her go to the safe and start working the combination. He's fascinated.

ROSE : Cal insist on lugging this thing everywhere.

JACK : Should I be expecting him anytime soon ?

ROSE : **Not as long as the cigars and brandy hold out.**

On the dialogue above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature in sentence "**Not as long as the cigars and brandy hold out**". Conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication, described by Herbert Paul Grice. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different from the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. It means that she used the statement to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Based on the theory of types of conversational

implicature from J. Thomas, it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this kind of utterance don't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants, so it could be said that we could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. The sentence “**Not as long as the cigars and brandy hold out**” in that utterance is marked to be the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate that Rose think that as long as Cal still wealth, she can take the advantages from him. It means that she doesn't need him when he lost his wealth. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Rose does not observe the cooperative principle by violating a maxim. According to Jenny Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. In this case, she does not observe the maxim by **violating maxim of quantity**. Rose is violating maxim of quantity which has blatantly given more information than required. She can simply replies “Yes or No” it was clear enough to answer the Jack's question because the utterance above has implication that she should answer Jack's question with her opinion. So, in this case, she is violating the maxim of quantity.

Datum #14 (**PCI**)

SCENE 103 : INT. ROSE'S SUITE

CLUNK! She unlocks the safe. Galncing up, she meets his eyes in the mirror behind the safe. She opens it and removes the necklace, then holds it out to Jack who takes it nervously.

JACK : What is it ? **A sapphire ?**

ROSE : A diamond. Avery rare diamond, called the Heart of the Ocean.

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature in the question “**A sapphire ?**”. According to Herberb Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. in this case, he used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. It indicates that sentence is particularized conversational implicature, that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can understand that sapphire is very cheaper than diamond and Jack is very poor and doesn't understand how meaningful that diamond (specific context). The situation also supported with

Rose' reply "A diamond. A very rare diamond, called the Heart of the Ocean". It means that Rose convinced that it was very expensive. So, when Jack uttered "A sapphire ?", it implies that it is he never saw an expensive stone like it before. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Jack does not observe the cooperative principle by flouting a maxim. Grice (1975) explained that the condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. 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. In this case, he is **flouting maxim of quality**. According to Grice's theory of implicature, flouting the maxim of quality means that the speaker says something that needs to be perceived as blatantly untrue. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks adequate evidence. Jack is flouting the maxim of quality by blatantly not saying truth. The truth is that the stone is diamond (very expensive stone) not a sapphire (very cheaper than diamond), but Jack said that the stone is sapphire. So, by saying that, it means that Jack is flouting the maxim of quality.

Datum #15 (GCI)

SCENE 154 : EXT. FORWARD WELL DECK

Jack and Rose are leaning over the starboard rail, looking at the hull of the ship.

JACK : Looks okay. I don't see anything.

ROSE : Could it have damaged the ship ?

JACK : **It didn't seem like much of a bump. I'm sure we're okay.**

At the conversation above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature. According to Herberb Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, he used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Jack uttered an implicature in the sentence “**It didn't seem like much of a bump. I'm sure we're okay**”. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this kind of utterance don't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the hearers do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. The use of words “**It didn't seem like much of a bump.**

**I'm sure we're okay**" in that utterance be marked the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate "Jack ensures that they will be okay after hitting the ice chunks". It also supported with Rose's utterance before, "Could it have damaged the ship?" which shows her afraid after that accident. It means that Jack tries to decrease Rose's afraid after that accident. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

On the conversation above, Jack uttered the other uncooperative utterance. In the dialogue above, Rose does not observe the cooperative principle by violating a maxim. According to Jenny Thomas (1995:74), 'violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim' where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. In this case, he does not observe the maxim by **violating maxim quantity**. According to Grice, violating the maxim quantity means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It happens whether the speaker provides information either more or less than is required. In this case, Jack can simply replies "Yes or No" it was clear enough to answer the Rose's question but he decided to give more information than required to decrease Rose's afraid. So, in this case, he is violating the maxim of quantity.

Datum #16 (GCI)

SCENE 193 : INT. MASTER AT ARMS OFFICE

Jack has climbed up on the bench, and is hugging the waterpipe. Rose wades in, holding the axe above her head.

ROSE : Will this work ?

JACK : **We'll find out.**

At the conversation above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature. According to Herberb Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, he used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Jack uttered an implicature in the sentence “**We'll find out**”. Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this kind of utterance don't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the hearers do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. The use of words “We'll find out” in that utterance be marked the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate “Jack still not sure that it will works or not”. It also supported with Rose's utterance before, “Will this

work?” which asking him about the axe itself to help Jack. In that condition, it means that Jack is not sure the axe will work or not to help him, but he still has a hope, so he said that implicature to prove that his believe or hope will be real (the axe can save him). When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Jack does not observe the cooperative principle by violating a maxim. According to Jenny Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. In this case, he does not observe the maxim by **violating maxim quantity**. According to Grice, violating the maxim of quantity means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It happens whether the speaker provides information either more or less than is required. In this case, Jack can simply replies “Yes or No” it was clear enough to answer the Rose’s question but he decided to give more information than required. Flouting the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. A speaker may say something untrue in order to imply an truth. So, in this case, he is flouting the maxim of quantity.

Datum #17 (PCI)

SCENE 193 : INT. MASTER AT ARMS OFFICE

JACK : (Sounding calm) You can do it, Rose. Hit it as hard as you can, I trust you.

Jack closes his eyes. So does she. The axe comes down. K-WHANG ! Rose gingerly opens her eyes looks... Jack is grinning with two separate cuffs. Rose drops the axe, all the strength going out of her.

JACK : **Nice work, there, Paul Bunyan.**

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature in the sentence “**Nice work, there, Paul Bunyan**”. According to Herberb Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, he used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. It indicates that sentence is particularized conversational implicature, that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can understand that Jack is trying to give her compliment with comparing her with Paul Bunyan

(specific context). Paul Bunyan is a fiction character of a giant lumberjack in American folklore. He often bring the axe and it means that his skill about using the axe is very good. In this situation describes that Jack equates her with Paul Bunyan. So, when Jack uttered “Nice work, there, Paul Bunyan“, it implies that it is he is trying to compliment her with equates her with Paul Bunyan. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Jack does not observe the cooperative principle by flouting maxim. Grice (1975) explained that the condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. 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. In this case, he is **flouting maxim of quality**. According to Grice, flouting the maxim of quality means that the speaker says something that needs to be perceived as blatantly untrue. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks adequate evidence. Jack is flouting the maxim of quality by blatantly not saying truth. He calls Rose with “Paul Bunyan”, and it is not her name. So, by saying that, it means that Jack is flouting the maxim of quality.

Datum #18 (PCI)

SCENE 225 : INT. DINING SALOON

Lovejoy moves among the tables and ornate columns, searching... listening... his eyes tracking rapidly. It is a sea of tables, and they could be anywhere. A silver serving trolley rolls downhill, bumping into tables and pillars.

He glances behind him. The water is following him into the room, advancing in a hundred foot wide tide. The reception room is now a roiling lake, and the grand staircase is submerged past the first landing. Monstrous groans echo through the ship.

JACK : (Whispering) Stay here.

Lovejoy moves over one row and looks along the tables. Nothing. The ship groans and creaks. He moves another row. Angle on a metal cart... five feet tall and full of stacks of china dishes. It starts to roll down the aisle between tables. On Rose as the cart rolls toward her. It hits a table and the stacks of dishes topple out, exploding across the floor and showering her. She scrambles out of the way and Lovejoy spins, seeing her. He moves rapidly toward her, keeping the gun aimed.

That's when Jack tackles him from side. They slam together into a table, crashing over it, and toppling to the floor. They land in the water which is flowing rapidly between the tables.

Jack and Lovejoy grapple in the icy water. Jack jams his knee down on Lovejoy's hand, breaking his grip on the pistol, and kicks it away. Lovejoy scrambles up and lunges at him, but Jack gutpunches him right in the solar plexus, doubling him over.

**JACK : Compliments of the Chippewa Falls Dawsons.**

On the dialogue above, Jack uttered a conversational implicature in the sentence "**Compliments of the Chippewa Falls Dawsons**". According to Herbert Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, he used the sentence to give implicit

meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. It indicates that sentence is particularized conversational implicature, that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can understand that Jack is trying to introduce himself with his own way (specific context). Jack Dawsons is his real name, but he added “Chippewa Falls” which means his hometown. He often mention it many times in the dialogues before. So, when Jack uttered “Compliments of the Chippewa Falls Dawsons“, it implies that Jack is trying to tease Mr. Lovejoy with his introducing. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Jack does not observe the cooperative principle by violating a maxim. According to Jenny Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. In this case, he does not observe the maxim by **violating maxim manner**. According to Grice, violating the maxim of manner means when speakers does not speak perspicuously and the speakers may say something true in order to

imply an untruth case. They may use an obscure expressions, an ambiguous term, or do not speak briefly nor orderly. In this case, Jack's statement is using ambiguous term which can make the hearers misunderstand if they don't know about that specific context. So, it means that she is violating maxim of manner.

Datum #19 (GCI)

SCENE 300 : EXT. DECK/ CARPATHIA - DAY

CAL : (After a long beat) What do I tell your mother ?

ROSE : Tell her that her daughter died with the Titanic.

She stands, turning to the rail. Dismissing him. We see Cal stricken with emotion.

CAL : You're precious to me, Rose.

ROSE : **Jewels are precious.** Goodbye, Mr. Hockley.

At the conversation above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature. According to Herberb Paul Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, she used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. Rose uttered an implicature in the sentence "**Jewels are precious**". Based on the theory of types of conversational implicature it can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature, this kind of utterance don't need to understand the context first.

To understand the implicature, the listeners do not must relate it with the any context, because the utterance present not in the particular situation or had to know the participants, so it could be said that they could generate the implicature from the utterance itself. The use of words “Jewels are precious” in that utterance be marked the meaning of utterance. It was certainly implicate “Rose doesn’t agree with Cal’s statement before, but she thinks that only jewels and wealth which are very precious for him”. It also supported with Cal’s utterance before, “You’re precious to me, Rose” which stating that he wants to show her about his feeling. But, in that condition, Rose seems not agree with Cal’s statement. She thinks that Cal only loves his wealth. We can see on her utterance “Jewels are precious”. It means that she denies it. When there was no special knowledge to know about conversational implicature, it must be generalized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Rose uttered the uncooperative utterance by violating a maxim. According to Jenny Thomas (1995:74), ‘violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim’ where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim. In this case, she does not observe the cooperative principle by **violating a maxim of quality**. According to P. H. Grice, violating the maxim of quality means that the speaker says something that needs to be perceived as blatantly untrue. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is

believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks adequate evidence. Rose is violating the maxim of quality by blatantly not saying truth. In the conversation, she said “Jewels are precious” which indicates that she wants to tease Cal with her statement by judging what he wants. It means that she said it with no evidence just by her opinion. So, in this case, Rose is violating the maxim of quality.

Datum #20 (PCI)

SCENE 302 : LATER CARPATHIA DISCORGES THE SURVIVORS at the Cunard pier, Pier 54.

Over 30.000 people line the dock and fill the surrounding streets. The magnesium flashes of the photographers go off like small bombs, lighting an amazing tableau.

Several hundred police keep the mob back. The dock is packed with friends and relatives, officials, ambulances, and the press.

Reporters and photographers swarm everywhere... 6 deep at the foot of the gangways, lining the tops of the cars and trucks... it is the 1912 equivalent of a media circus. They jostle to get close to the survivors, tugging on them as they pass and shouting over each other to ask them questions.

Rose is covered with a woollen shawl and walking with a group of steerage passengers. Immigration officers are asking them questions as they come off the gangway.

IMMIGRATION OFFICER : Name ?

ROSE : Dawson. **Rose Dawson.**

On the dialogue above, Rose uttered a conversational implicature in the sentence “**Rose Dawson**”. According to the English language philosopher H. P. Grice, conversational implicature is a type of indirect communication. He proposes

that when a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. It means that the speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning. In this case, she used the sentence to give implicit meaning in that conversation. This kind of utterance that needs to understand the context first. It indicates that sentence is particularized conversational implicature, that is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature.

By estimating the context of the conversation people can understand that Rose is trying to introduce herself with her new identity (specific context). Rose Dewitt Bukatter is her real name, but she decided to change it into “Rose Dawson”, we know that Dawson is Jack’s last name (in the movie scene). We can conclude that she wants to change her identity. So, when Rose uttered “Rose Dawson “, it implies that Rose is trying to change her identity with her new name. When the utterances rises implicature and needed a special knowledge to generate it, it must be particularized conversational implicature.

In the dialogue above, Rose does not observe the cooperative principle by flouting a maxim. Grice (1975) explained that the condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. 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. In this case, he is **flouting maxim of quality**.

According to Grice, flouting the maxim of quality means that the speaker says something that needs to be perceived as blatantly untrue. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks adequate evidence. Rose is flouting the maxim of quality by blatantly not saying truth. The truth is that her real name is Rose Dewitt Bukatter and doesn't married yet, but she said that her name is Rose Dawsons, using Jack's last name like she is his wife. So, by saying that, it means that Rose is flouting the maxim of quality.

## 1.2 Discussion

After presenting and analyzing the data in the previous findings, in this section, the researcher explains the discussion which is aimed to provide rich descriptions of the research problems that have been formulated in Chapter I.

From the research findings which has answered the research questions, there are two types of conversational implicatures found in "Titanic" movie those are generalized conversational implicature (GCI) and particularized conversational implicature (PCI). Related to the focus of the study, those kinds of conversational implicatures consists of 12 *generalized conversational implicatures* and 8 *particularized conversational implicatures*. It means that generalized conversational implicature (GCI) is produced more frequently than particularized conversational implicature (PCI).

In this research, the finding shows that generalized conversational implicature (GCI) dominated the data because it is used in daily conversation and also people do not need specific knowledge to interpret. Particularized conversational implicature (PCI) depends on the context of their meaning and only used when speaker and audience can identify what is being referred to from the situational context. It is consequently used when the speakers do not want to utter the sentences or do not see the importance in the context of the informal conversation. It seems that participants focus on the point being made so that a specific utterance for the concept is not important.

Based on the findings, the researcher found that in the “Titanic” movie, there are four realization types of Grice’s maxims. There are the violated maxims of quantity, quality, manner, and relation and the flouted maxims of quantity, quality, manner, and relation. And the violated maxim of quantity is dominant uttered by the main characters in this movie those are Jack and Rose, because many utterance give not enough or more information than required. Violating the maxim of quantity means the speakers make contribution less or more informative than is needed, so it results in less or more meaning. In this movie, the utterances not only obey the maxims, but also violate or flouted the maxims. The researcher found that violated maxims are dominant rather than the flouted maxims. The researcher found 5 violated maxim of quantity from all of the data. The violated or flouted of the maxims are rising to hide or even show up the truth of the case or something.

The researcher can draw conclusion that the dominant strategy that appears as cooperative principle is quantity maxim and it can give influence to other

maxims. It is because the meaning of the utterance can be understood through cooperative principle and the maxim.

According to Grice (1975: 45) there are some principles that can help the communication runs well. He formulated these in basic rule sub principle that is maxim: maxim of quantity, maxim quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relation. In the conversation, we have to avoid ambiguity meaning, because it causes misunderstanding and conflict. And according to Rohim (2009: 12) communication is a social process, it means communication is a part of human activity in daily life. The meaning of conversation/ utterance can be known as explicit with cooperative principle or particular maxim so the meaning of utterance/ conversation need interpretation and understanding (specific context).

From the finding above, the researcher showed that generalized conversational implicature (GCI) is dominated the data as found by most of the previous studies. But, some different results are also found in this present study that flouted or violated maxims appear to help the speakers to imply their own purpose or meaning as listed by the researcher in the research findings.

This finding is in line with previous study done by Lestari in 2003 with title “The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in the Movie Script of “Despicable Me” which also found that the subjects show a lot of non-observed maxims including flouted and violated maxims. This previous study was conducted to analyze the using of conversational implicature in the movie script “Despicable Me”. The study focuses on conversational implicature which is based on cooperative principle on movie script. The researcher of this study analyzes four

cooperative principles, which are maxim quality, maxim quantity, maxim relation, and maxim manner. The conclusion is the most of non-observed maxim which happened in the movie are maxim quality and maxim manner. The researcher of this study also explains context and situation of each utterance does not follow the rules of aphorism to make the movie funny and not too serious.

From all the analysis above, the researcher found that in this research, violating the maxims is dominant as found by the previous study. Violating the maxims is dominant than flouting the maxims because the researcher found 13 violating the maxims and 7 flouting the maxims. It means that this research supported the previous study which had the same result with this research that is the dominancy of violating of the maxims. Both of flouted or violated of the maxims are rising commonly to hide or show up the truth of something or phenomenon.