

# ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN *PARIAH* MOVIE EPISODE OF SMALLVILLE SERIAL MOVIE

Listiani, M.Pd

## Abstract

This study was to describe the conversational implicature and the violation of the co-operative principle which appears in the 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie. The subject of this study was the utterances which contained the conversational implicature in scene one and scene two of act one in written script of the movie written by Holly Harold directed by Paul Shapiro available in TWIZ TV.COM and originally air dated on February second, 2005.

The result showed that there were fourteen conversational implicatures. They violated the Grice's maxims. Mostly, they violated in Quality maxim which reached 35.7 percentages. The lowest percentage violating the maxim was on quantity maxim. It reached 14.3 percentages.

This suggested that using conversation in movie provided good stimulus for learners to understand well what was implied in the meaning of the utterances, to get casual conversation model, to learn the language easily, and to practice the language in conversation.

**Key words:** *conversational implicatures, violation of co-operative principle in Grice maxims, Pariah episode in smallville serial movie*

## About the Author:

**Listiani, M.Pd** is an English Education lecturer in the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto. Her office address is on Jl. Dukuhwaluh PO Box 202, Purwokerto. Central Java, Indonesia. The author can be contacted via email at [list\\_huda@yahoo.com](mailto:list_huda@yahoo.com)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Communication is needed in this social life. People need this to share and express their ideas and their feeling to other people. They exchange meanings and intention. Thus, people need communication to interpret what people's mean and intend in their utterances in order to socialize with the society well.

In communication, there is Co-operative principle which provides rules for conversation. It controls the participants in doing conversation, so their conversation works in cooperative and polite ways. This conversation mechanism is explained in four maxims, namely: quantity maxim, quality maxim, relevance maxim, and manner maxim. These

maxims deal with their certain part of the rules in this co-operative principle. In conclusion, by following the co-operative principle the conversation can work reasonably.

The meaning in conversation is sometimes stated explicitly and implicitly. The meaning is directly expressed in the utterances and sometimes it is not. The implicit expression provides proposition which is not expressed explicitly in the utterances. The implicit proposition of utterances is what is called by implicature.

The conversational implicature is an inference. The hearer works with implicit messages in the utterances in conversational interaction. Some people sometimes understand them, but they sometimes do not. They get the messages easily, but the other ones do not. Thus, they need to analyze the speech in order to understand the implicit messages well by applying the theory of conversational implicature.

This study focuses on describing the conversational implicature which appears in the 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie and the violation of the co-operative principle which occurs in the movie.

## **II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **2.1 Conversational Implicature**

People exchange meaning and their intention in their communication. They express their ideas and feeling. They do this to get information from their surrounding discourse. They need

communication to interact with other people in their social life. Put in another word, they do conversational interaction.

In their conversational interaction, they provide meaning. The meaning itself is expressed explicitly and implicitly. Explicitly, the meaning is expressed what is actually stated in the conversation. Implicitly, the meaning is expressed more than what is actually said by the speaker. The conversation carries meaning more than what is stated in the speaker's utterance. It is what is called by implicature.

The discussion of Implicature is in Pragmatics study. The conversational implicature is the single most important ideas in pragmatics (Levinson, 1983: 97). It is implication or proposition in conversation which appears because of violating the conversational principle in which the speaker's intention is expressed differently in the speaker's actual utterance (Grice, 1975: 43). The principle expresses four basic maxims which provide rules for how the communication should be. These rules are identified by Grice who joins the rules in a general principle called Grice's co-operative principle.

### **2.2 Grice's Co-operative Principle**

People sometimes converse in unreasonable way, so they may imply meaning and intention which are not stated in their actual

utterances. The way of people's conversation is arranged by such kind of a rule. This rule consists of four basic maxims of Co-operative principle. They specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, natural, co-operative ways they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information (Levinson, 1983: 102).

The rules of conversation are identified by Grice in his conversational principle. They are expressed in Grice's co-operative principle theory. There are four basic maxims of conversation or general principles identified underlying the efficient co-operative use of language. Grice in Levinson (1983: 101) expresses these principles as follows:

- 1) The co-operative principle  
Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.
- 2) The maxim quality  
Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:
  - (i) Do not say what you believe to be false
  - (ii) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
- 3) The maxim of quantity  
  - (i) Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange

- (ii) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

- 4) The maxim of relevance  
Make your contributions relevant

- 5) The maxim of manner
  - (i) Avoid obscurity
  - (ii) Avoid ambiguity
  - (iii) Be brief
  - (iv) Be orderly

By understanding the rules, we may know the people who are exceptions to the rule, and are not capable of making the conversation work. We may also, sometimes, find it useful deliberately to infringe or disregard it as when we receive an unwelcome guest, etc.

### 2.3 'Pariah' episode of Smallville Serial Movie

The movie tells about a story of a super hero called Clark Kent. He has super power which is used to save people. He lives in Smallville village in Kansas where is the "Creamed Corn Capitol" of the world with a population of 25,001. In 1989, all that changes when a meteor shower rains down on the town in a destructive storm of death. The movie is played five times a week at 8.30 p.m. in Trans7 channel recently. The "Pariah" movie is one of the Smallville serial movie episodes. The movie can be consumed for English learning materials. The learners can learn conversational implicature of Grice's maxims in

his co-operative principle from this movie.

### **III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In this study, the descriptive qualitative research method was used. The method showed the conversational implicatures in 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie based on Grice's theory of implication.

The object of this study was the written script of 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie written by Holly Harold and directed by Paul Shapiro available in TWIZ TV.COM and originally air dated on February second, 2005.

The technique of collecting data used the documentation technique. The utterances which contain the conversational implicature in scene one and scene two of act one in written script of 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie were taken as the data.

This study was conducted through several steps of collecting the data; downloading the movie script, selecting the utterances which contained the conversational implicature, classifying the data into four categories of the conversation maxims, identifying each of the violating the conversation maxims, and analyzing the data.

In classifying the data, the data were classified into four categories of maxims which are based on the maxims violation.

The first category is Quantity maxim. The second one is Quality maxim. Then, Relevance maxim is the next category. Finally, the last maxim is manner.

In analyzing the data several steps were conducted, as follow:

- 1) Identifying the utterances which contains conversational implicature based on Grice's theory of implicature in scene one and scene two of act one in written script of 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie by marking the application. The quotations of each utterance are arranged according to the kinds of maxims which are violated through the utterances in the movie.
- 2) Classifying the data taken into four each kind of maxim they belong to.
- 3) Describe the meaning implied in the utterances of the movie.
- 4) Describe the maxims violation existed in the utterances of the movie.
- 5) Checking the data through triangulation. It is used to compare the data through different means.

### **IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **4.1 Types of Maxim**

The types of maxim were found in the utterances in scene one and scene two of act one in written script of 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie. The maxims are presented in the following table. It mentions the

number of the maxims found in the movie. It also describes the percentage of the maxims which

are available in the movie in order to describe the data accurately. The table is as follows:

Table 4.1 Types of maxim

<b>No</b>	<b>Type of maxim</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1.	Quantity maxim	2	14.3 %
2.	Quality maxim	5	35.7 %
3.	Relevance maxim	4	28.6 %
4.	Manner maxim	3	21.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	14	100 %

## 4.2 General Findings

The violation of Grice's maxims in the utterances of the movie which contain the conversational implicature appears mostly in Quality maxim. There is 35.7 % of violation of the maxim. The percentage among the other maxims does not differ sharply. The difference is only 7.1 % from one maxim to the other one. It is stated in the table 4.1. The finding indicates that there is a tendency that the utterances in scene one and scene two of act one in "Pariah" movie episode of Smallville serial movie are mostly brought the implicature of quality maxim. These facts imply that the utterances provide untruth conversation. They give hyperbole and metaphor effects. It is effective strategy to create imagination as the effect of the movie. Thus, it is easy to identify the maxim of quality in this movie.

## 4.3 The Existence of Conversational Implicature in violating the maxims in the 'Pariah' movie episode of Smallville Serial Movie

The description of the conversational implicature and the violation of the maxims are presented in this section. They were found in the utterances of this movie. Table 4.1 has presented the number of maxims which were found and violated. The bold marking tells the violation of maxims which are the focus of utterances analysis. Meanwhile, the quotations of each utterance in the movie are arranged according to the types of maxim which has been presented in table 4.1.

### 4.3.1 Violation of Quantity Maxim

In the rules of this maxim, the contribution of talk exchange should give the right amount of information. Grice's (1975) in Mey (1993:65) describes the contribution, i.e. (a) make your contribution as informative as required and (b) do not make your contribution more informative than required. Thus, the violation of the maxim is when the speaker gives more or less information than it is required by the discourse. The violation of the maxim is available in the following utterances of the movie:

#### 1) Data 1

CLARK : [*Breathless and concerned.*] How's Lana? Is she okay?

*Without waiting for a response, Clark walks past Chloe and Lois and straight to the window to look in at Lana where he sees the doctor shining a small flashlight into Lana's eyes.*

CHLOE : Hey, Clark. Yeah. She's-she's fine. **I mean, lucky for her, Jason pulled a T.J. Hooker and broke the bathroom door down.**

Chloe's utterance implies that she is relieved for Lana's condition and she is glad that Lana survives because of Jason's attempt to save Lana. In this Chloe's answer, she gives more than Clark's requirement in his question. She provides more information than it is required by the discourse. Clark only asks Lana's condition in his utterances "*How's Lana? Is she okay?*", but Chloe responds the question by giving more than Lana's healthy information in her utterances "*I mean, lucky for her, Jason pulled a T.J. Hooker and broke the bathroom door down.*" Thus, it violates the quantity maxim.

#### 2) Data 2

CLARK : [*exasperated.*] Sheriff Adams already has Alicia tried and convicted.

MARTHA : **Sheriff Adams has a point, Clark.**

In this utterance, Martha convinces Clark that Sheriff Adams has an aim on the situation. That gives Clark less information on the situation. Providing less information violates this maxim.

#### 4.3.2 Violation of Quality Maxim

The maxim concerns the truthfulness of the contribution in talk. The contribution is namely: (a) do not do any what you believe to be false and (b) do not say something that is lack adequate evidence (Grice in Mey, 1993: 65). Saying untrue, lack of evidence, metaphor, hyperbole, and such kinds violate the maxim. The following utterances violate the maxim:

##### 1) Data 1

- ADAMS : I'm getting a funny déjà vu here, Mr. Kent. Haven't we acted out this particular charade before?
- CLARK : This is different, sheriff. Alicia did not attack Lana. She was with me.
- ADAMS : [*threateningly.*] I better not find out you're covering for that girlfriend of yours, Mr. Kent. **Having you as an alibi is the only thing keeping me from tossing her tail in jail.**

In Adams' utterance, it implies that she can not imprison Alicia because Clark testifies and becomes an Alicia's alibi. In her words "*tossing her tail*" is metaphor. Alice is human and she does not have a tail. Thus, it is impossible that Adams can toss Alicia's tail in jail. In conclusion, it violates the maxim.

##### 2) Data 2

- CHLOE : Hey, Clark. Yeah, she's-she's fine. I mean, lucky for her, Jason pulled a T.J. Hooker and broke the bathroom door down.
- LOIS : **Only to discover Lana's mystery assailant had somehow flown the coop. So, have they arrested your arm ornament yet?**

It seems that the first utterance implies that Clark's coming surprises Lois. Clark rarely comes out from his house because she mentions "*flown the coop*" which means coming out from house to see Lana. Besides that, in the next utterance it implies that she does not like Clark's girlfriend, Alicia. Lois thinks that Alicia does assault to Lana. "*arm ornament*" refers to Alicia. In Lois' utterances, she provides lack of evidence for accusing Alicia as the assailant. She uses metaphor and does not say truthfully. Thus, these utterances violate the maxim.

##### 3) Data 3

- CHLOE : Sheriff Adams was just here, and she spent a lot of time focusing on the "attacked inside a locked room" scenario.
- LOIS : **And the name Alicia Baker came up more than once in a bunny boiler kind of way.**

This implication of the utterance is that Alicia is the main suspect as the Lana assailant. She mentions "*in a bunny boiler kind of way*" in her utterance, so she uses metaphor representing the investigation report. It means that the utterance violates the maxim.

4) Data 4

CLARK : Ever since she was released from Belle Reve, she's been wearing her leather bracelet. It prevents her from using her abilities.

LOIS : *[disbelieving.]* **And did she also happen to be wearing anything low-cut when she spun you that tale, 'cause I'm not sure you're thinking with you "big" brain here.**

It implies that Lois is doubtful of Clark's belief on his girlfriend. She thinks Clark does not use a reasonable way of thinking. The way of Lois' utterance does not provide enough evidence and she uses metaphor in her utterances expressing her annoyance and disbelief. Thus, it violates the maxim.

5) Data 5

CLARK : She was with me when Lana got attacked. I was saying good night in Grandville.

CHLOE : Yeah, but every second? You have to admit that she can transport easier than Captain Kirk.

LOIS : **And she did try to carve herself a Jack-o-Lana before, cut and dry. Emphasis on the "cut."**

CLARK : I'm telling you Alicia couldn't have done this. I know her.

It implies that Lois reminds Clark and Chloe for what Alicia did before. It may imply that Alicia is a cold-blooded killer. In this utterance Lois provides lack of evidence telling that Alicia tries to carve herself. She uses hyperbole in her utterance expressing her dislike to Alicia. In conclusion, it violates the maxim.

#### 4.3.3 Violation of Relevance Maxim

Violating this maxim is happened when the speaker gives irrelevant answer to the surrounding discourse. The utterances that violate the maxim are as follows:

1) Data 1

CHLOE : Hey, Clark. Yeah, she's-she's fine. I mean, lucky for her, Jason pulled a T.J. Hooker and broke the bathroom door down.

LOIS : Only to discover Lana's mystery assailant had somehow flown the coop. So, have they arrested your arm ornament yet?

CLARK : *[Confused.]* **What?**

The Clark's utterance implies that he does not understand Lois' question on "So, have they arrested your arm ornament yet?" He confuses why she asks him such a question in which he does not know anything about the happening. He confuses why the question refers to his 'arm ornament' (Clark's girlfriend) in which he does not understand what it refers to, so he answers by asking her question "What?" In this case, Clark makes his co-operative contribution, but he violates the relation maxim. Clark should answer Lois' question asking whether Lana's assailant have been arrested or have not. In fact, Clark responds by asking back Lois' question. He does not suppose to do that. Thus, it violates the maxim of relevance because he gives irrelevant answer to the Lois' question.

2) Data 2

- CLARK : She was with me when Lana got attacked. I was saying good night in Grandville.
- CHLOE : Yeah, but every second? You have to admit that she can transport easier than captain Kirk.
- LOIS : And she did try to carve herself a Jack-o-Lana before, cut and dry. Emphasis on the “cut.”
- CLARK : **I’m telling you Alicia couldn’t have done this. I know her.**

It implies that Clark tries to convince his friends about Alicia that she can not do bad thing to Lana. Thus, it does not answer Chloe’s question “*every second?*” which questions his present in Alicia’. It is whether Clark accompanies Alicia every second or he does not. It is clear that Clark’s answer is irrelevant with the question. In conclusion, it violates the maxim.

3) Data 3

- CLARK : [*Exasperated.*] Sheriff Adams already has Alicia tried and convicted.
- JONATHAN : Sheriff Adams has a point, Clark.
- MARTHA : First Las Vegas and now an assault charge. What are you doing with this girl, Clark?
- CLARK : **Alicia didn’t do this.**

Again, Clark tries to convince that Alicia is not guilty. It is stated in his utterance when her mother, Martha, asks him a question “*What are you doing with this girl, Clark?*” Thus, it is irrelevant answer.

4) Data 4

- MARTHA : What I don’t understand is why do you continue to see her, knowing how we feel?
- CLARK : [*Losing his temper.*] She kept my secret. She got shot protecting me. What else does she have to do to prove herself?
- MARTHA : **What if she did this, Clark? What is she attacked Lana the way she did before?**

In Martha’s utterances, it implies that she does not believe Alicia. She questions Alicia’s personality and behavior because of Alicia’s attempt that she did to Lana. The utterance does not answer Clark’s question. Thus, it makes irrelevant.

#### 4.3.4 Violation of Manner Maxim

The maxim describes the talk should be perspicuous and specific. It refers to (a) avoid obscurity of expression, (b) avoid ambiguity, (c) be brief, and (d) being orderly. Thus, it refers to clear information of talk. The violation of the maxims happened is as follows:

1) Data 1

- CHLOE : Hey, Clark. Yeah, she’s-she’s fine. I mean, lucky for her, Jason pulled a T.J. Hooker and broke the bathroom door down.
- LOIS : **Only to discover Lana’s mystery assailant had somehow flown the coop. So, have they arrested your arm ornament yet?**

It seems that the first utterance implies that Clark's coming surprises Lois. Clark rarely comes out from his house because she mentions "*flown the coop*" which means coming out from house to see Lana. Besides that, in the next utterance it implies that she does not like Clark's girlfriend, Alicia. Lois thinks that Alicia does assault to Lana. "*arm ornament*" refers to Alicia. The information of the utterances does not express clearly. They provide ambiguity, so they violate the manner maxim. They can make the other meaning interpretations.

2) Data 2

- CLARK : Ever since she was released from Belle Reve, she's been wearing her leather bracelet. It prevents her from using her abilities.
- LOIS : [*disbelieving.*] **And did she also happen to be wearing anything low-cut when she spun you that tale, 'cause I'm not sure you're thinking with you "big" brain here.**

It implies that Lois is doubt Clark's belief on his girlfriend. She thinks Clark does not use reasonable way of thinking. It may imply that Clark is stupid, too. Lois' utterance is ambiguous because it can be interpreted different way in expressing her annoyance and disbelief. Thus, it violates the manner maxim.

3) Data 3

- CLARK : She was with me when Lana got attacked. I was saying good night in Grandville.
- CHLOE : Yeah, but every second? You have to admit that she can transport easier than captain Kirk.
- LOIS : **And she did try to carve herself a Jack-o-Lana before, cut and dry. Emphasis on the "cut."**
- CLARK : I'm telling you Alicia couldn't have done this. I know her.

It implies that Lois reminds Clark and Chloe for what Alicia did before. In this utterance Lois gives obscure information on Alicia's and ambiguous information. It may imply that Alicia is cold-blood killer. In conclusion, it violates the maxim.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusion can be drawn from this study is that there are fourteen conversational implicatures found in scene one and scene two of act one in written script of 'Pariah' episode of Smallville serial movie. They violate the Grice's maxims. Mostly, they violate in Quality maxim which reach 35.7 percentages (35.7%). The lowest percentage violating the maxim is on quantity maxim. It reaches 14.3 percentages (14.3%).

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. 1996. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Grice, Paul. 1975. *Logic and conversation*. In P, Cole and J, Morgan (ed), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

Harold, H. "*Pariah*" episode of *Smallville* serial movie script available in <http://www.twiztv.com/scripts/smallville/>

Leech, G. N. 1983. *Principle of Pragmatics*. London and USA: Longman Inc.

Levinson, S. 2005. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mey, J. L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Backwell, Oxford, UK and Cambridge. USA.

Zatys Olga. 2006. *Implicature, Co-operative principle, Conversational Maxims part one*. Available in [http://www.hku.hk/linguist/cou/fir/LING2022/L%206\\_PP\\_20Implicature.ppt](http://www.hku.hk/linguist/cou/fir/LING2022/L%206_PP_20Implicature.ppt)