

VIOLATION OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN *BEL AMI* MOVIE

Ratri Harida

STKIP PGRI Ponorogo
ratri_pbi@stkipgriponorogo.ac.id

Abstrak: Pendengar dapat memahami komunikasi jika mereka dapat bekerjasama satu sama lain dengan mempertimbangkan *cooperative principles*. Merujuk pada Grice, ada empat maksim dalam prinsip kerjasama yaitu; kuantitas, kualitas, relevansi, dan tata cara. Makna implisit yang disampaikan tetapi tidak terkatakan pada percakapan kemudian disebut implikatur. Fokus dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menjelaskan implikatur percakapan yang berpotensi melanggar prinsip kerjasama dalam film *Bel Ami*. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain deskriptif kualitatif. Analisis yang digunakan adalah analisis induktif dengan menggunakan data penelitian sebagai dasar untuk memahami pelanggaran implikatur percakapan. Kesimpulan dari penelitian ini adalah bahwa tokoh dalam film melanggar prinsip kerjasama karena dipengaruhi konteks situasi. Mereka memiliki alasan tersendiri untuk melanggar maksim. Secara prinsip, seseorang perlu memahami makna yang dimaksudkan oleh pembicara, karena arti sebenarnya tidak hanya dalam struktur kalimat atau permukaan makna, akan tetapi seringkali tersampaikan secara implisit.

Kata kunci: Pelanggaran; Prinsip Kerjasama; Film

Abstract: The listener can be successfully understood if they cooperate with each other by considering cooperative principles. Referring to Grice, there are four maxims in cooperative principles to be considered; quantity maxim, quality maxim, relevance maxim, and manner. The implicit meaning that communicated but unsaid on the conversation called implicature. So the focus of the study is to describe and explain the conversational implicature or violation of cooperative principle in *Bel Ami* movie. In this study the writer uses qualitative descriptive analysis. The analysis used by the writer is inductive analysis by using research data as basis to understand the violation of conversational implicature. The conclusion of this study, character violated cooperative principle in this movie because of the context that makes them to do so, and they have their reason to violate the maxims. The writer concludes that in having conversation, people should understand the meaning intended by the speaker, because the real meaning is not only in the structure sentence or surface meaning but although it is unsaid but it communicated.

Keywords: Violation; Cooperative Principle; Movie

INTRODUCTION

Language is a set of form and function that represent the way speaker thinks and verbalize his/her thoughts (Arwood, 2011; Arifin, 2018; Anita & Rois, 2022). Language as means of communication must be understood by the speakers and partners so that users are not likely to be misunderstood.

Speaker's message that added by speakers to the partners can work well if they understand the meaning of their utterances. Additionally, Yule (1996: 35) says that speakers and listeners are involved in conversation generally cooperating with each other. It means that the purpose of the cooperation is simply enable people to have

the understandable conversation and avoid any confusion.

Cooperative principle happens in verbal communication or conversation (see Arifin & Suprayitno, 2015; Prastyaningsih & Harida, 2021; Sulistianing, et al, 2022). Conversation is spoken event between two participants or more. Ideally, people who are involved in conversation should know about conversation implicature so what their saying can be understood by their speaking partner. Conversational implicature is one branch of pragmatic analysis which considered as an additional conveyed meaning (Yule, 1996: 35). It is attained when a speaker intends to communicate more than just what the words mean. It is the speaker who communicates something via implicature and the listener recognizes those communication meaning via inference based on assumption that speaker observes some principles of cooperative.

According to Grice (in Pradita, 2013: 6), an implicature is what is suggested in an utterance, even though neither expressed nor strictly implied by the utterance". In simple, implicature means an utterance that different from what is said. For many linguists, the notion of "implicature" is one of the central concepts in pragmatics. In Pragmatic, there are two kinds of implicature. They are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. According to Grice, (2002: 39-40) there are five characteristics of the conversational implicature. They are cancellable, non-detachable, non-conventional, calculable, and interminable.

In practice, communication cannot be separated from conversation. Conversations between speaker and listener usually include deep meaning (see Prastyaningsih & Harida, 2021; Kristyaningsih & Arifin, 2022; Rizkitaningrum & Wulandari, 2022). The structural meaning and deep meaning are different. For this reason, knowing implicature is necessary for better understanding. Related to the previous statement, implicature is one branch of pragmatics analysis. Yule (1996: 128)

stated "implicature is an additional unstated meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the cooperative principle". Banga in Lestari (2014:2) stated that everyday conversation; sentence meanings can be expressed explicitly, or be merely implied. In pragmatics, implicit meaning is also called conversational implicature

Grice (in Horn, 2006:7) distinguished four categories of maxim; (1) maxim quantity; relates to the quantity of information to be provided, (2) maxim quality; 'deals with the truthfulness of the utterance, (3) maxim relation, deals with the relevance of the utterances, and (4) maxim manner, includes the speakers' understanding on cooperative principle. By considering and obeying the cooperative principle, the communication can flow well. In the other hand, if the speakers do not fulfill those four maxims, they seem to disobey them. This act called violation (see Sari, 2016; Mahendra, 2022).

Bordwell &Thompson (2008) explain that movies communicate information and ideas and they show the viewer places and ways of life. They further explain that in major, movies are categorized into narrative, documentary and experimental. Based on the explanation above the writer chooses the violation of conversational implicature in *Bel Ami* movie as an object of research. More over the conversational that happen in this movie include many implicatures that replace the character's feeling in that moment. Therefore, this current research aims to explain the maxim in the *Bel Ami* movie and their contexts of situation of each utterance containing conversational implicature.

METHOD

According to Flick (2009:39), qualitative research is oriented towards analyzing concrete cases in their temporal and local particularity and starting from people's expression and activities in their local contexts. Moleong (2002: 4) affirms that qualitative research is the research which analyzes

the data in form of written or spoken word. In this research, the writer chooses a descriptive method to analyze the data. According to Zuriah (2007: 47), descriptive method is to give accurate sign, facts and events systematically. Therefore it can be understood and concluded easily.

The object of the research is the conversational implicature used in the *Bel Ami* movie script. The object focuses on the conversational implicature that are violated by the character when they tried to communicate during in their conversation. The writer uses library research for collecting the data. By this method, the writer gains and selects the information concerning with some theories of the study. The writer reads some books and literatures to complete the writing. The data are collected through the following ways; (1) watching *Bel Ami* movie, (2) trying to understand it thoroughly, and (3) finding any important detail that supported this research and then looking for all of utterances.

Technique analyzing the data starts from downloading the *Bel Ami* movie script, watching the video of drama *Bel Ami*, identifying the utterances which used by the speakers, making some notes of the identified data related to the implicature theory, analyzing the maxims in the conversation and then making a conclusion based on analyzed the data and the last collecting some references. Technique analyzing data covers reading and analyzing *Bel Ami* movie script, selecting the conversational implicature, listing the conversational implicature, describing and analyzing the conversational implicature and social culture background on *Bel Ami* Movie script, making the conclusion and suggestion based on the data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study found forty eight utterances which violated the maxims. There were eight violation of maxim of quality. Seven utterances violated maxim of quantity. There were twelve utterances violated

maxim of relevance and three utterances violated maxim of manner.

Violation of Quantity Maxim

Maxim of quality is related with the degree of certainty of the given information. The first datum of violation quantity maxim found in 00.19.21 in the first part of the movie. The conversation is follow:

Datum 1 (00.19.21)

George : Would you like to drink?

Clotilde : Yes. Yes I would. I'm bit nervous.

It happened when Clotilde came to George's home. George prepared all and offered drink to Clotilde. He asked, "Would you like to drink?", and Clotilde answered, "Yes. Yes I would like. I'm bit nervous." Actually, George needed the answer "yes" or "no" but he added the answer by complimenting her feeling to George. It implied that Clotilde was nervous and confused with what she wanted to do. Because of this, Clotilde violated the quantity of maxim.

Datum 2 (00.32.06)

George : Excuse me.

Rousset : I always like your audacity.

George : I don't need to hide my face. I'm not criminal. You're not gonna throw me out.

This conversation happened when George came to the Rousset party because the new government succeeded in taking over Maroko. Actually, Rousset dislike George coming to the party. So he said, "I always like your audacity." George replied, "I don't need to hide my face. I'm not criminal. You're not gonna throw me out." George gave more than Rousset needed. He violated the maxim of quantity. It implied that George was brave and he was not criminal. So, it was not a problem if he came to the party.

Violation of Quality Maxim

Maxim of quantity deals with the amount of given information by the speaker. The first datum is presented in the conversation below:

Datum 3 (00.24.02)

Girl : Hello.

Clotilde : Hello.

Girl : I am talking to your friend here.

Clotilde : George?

George : I think you've mistaken me for somebody else.

The conversation took place when George and Clotilde saw a girl. The girl greeted George, "Hello" and then Clotilde answered, "Hello." The girl seemed in the bad mood and said, "I am talking to your friend here." Clotilde thought only George that beside her, and then George said, "I think you've mistaken me for somebody else." George lied and gave the wrong information. Actually George knew who was she and he did it because he would not Clotilde known about him.

Datum 4 (00.40.56)

Clotilde : Well you've chosen exactly the woman you need. Yes. And you love her?

George : Clo

Clotilde : No, no I'll be fine

The conversational took place when Clotilde and George were in the bedroom. George had a wish to marry with Madelein. When George said that he wanted to marry Madelein, Clotilde responded, "Well you've chosen exactly the woman you need. Yes. And you love her?" George answered, "Clo" and after hearing the George saying, Clotilde cried and she said that, "No, no, I'll be fine. It implied that Clotilde disliked George choice, because Clotilde loved him so much. In this conversation Clotilde violated the quality maxim because she lied and gave the wrong information. She hides the true answer.

Violation of Relevance Maxim

Maxim of relevance deals with the relevance information given by the speaker. The first datum of violation within the relevance maxim found at 00.09.55 in the first part of the movie. The following is the conversation:

Datum 5 (00.09.55)

Virginie : What do you think dearest?

Rousset : What fish are we having?

This conversation happened when Virginie and Rousset were in the dinner room. They discussed about George would joined with their Journalistic media and would write the news about George experience as soldier. Virginie asked to her husband, "What do you think dearest?", and then her husband didn't answer the question and moved their talking by saying, "What fish are we having?" In this case, Rousset violated the relevance maxim because Rousset's response was not relevance with Virginie's question. It implied that Rousset dislikes George, he did not believe that her wife like George and agreed if George wrote the news helped by Madeleine. So, to indicate his disagreement about it, Rousset changed the topic of conversation.

Datum 6 (00.45.36)

George : What did he want?

Madelein : It's Tuesday. He always comes on Tuesday.

The conversation happened in Madeleine's house. George came to house and called his wife, and then he saw Vaudrec went out from room. George asked her wife, "That'll be all. What did he want?" and then Madeleine answered, "It's Tuesday. He always comes on Tuesday." The previous conversation showed the irrelevant response from George's question. Actually Madeleine answered the question with the reason why Vaudrec came. She violated maxim of relevance. It implied that Vaudrec always came to house and it is a habit for Madeleine.

Violation of Manner Maxim

Manner maxim deals with the way how participants convey their message clearly and execute their performance with reasonable dispatch. The first datum of violation manner is presented below:

Datum 7 (00.09.22)

Madelein : You could run something extraordinary about this. Mmm? I think it would be timely.

Clotilde : Timely? Why?

The conversation happened in the dinner room of the Forestier's house. There were Forestier and wife (Madelein), Rousset and wife (Virginie) and Clotilde and George. They talked about the project news and politic of Maroko. Madelein had a planning about it and talked, "You could run something extraordinary about this. Mmm? I think it would be timely." Madeleine's answer was ambiguous. Clotilde felt confused because Clotilde did not know about politics and she could not understand what Madelein said. So she said, "Timely? Why?"

Datum 8 (00.25.54)

George : Rival? Yes

Partner : No. You still owe me 40. I need to eat too.

The conversation happened at the office when George saw his partner's money. In that moment, he had no money. George asked to his partner, "Rival?" and then his partner answered, "No, you still owe me 40. I need to eat too". His partner knew that George wanted to owe more money. In this conversation George's utterance was ambiguous. So, George violated the maxim of manner. It implied that his partner disagreed to owe more money for George due to his prior owe to the speaker.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion and the results of the study, the writer concluded that there were some maxims violation in the conversation of the movie entitled *Bel Ami*. The maxims were maxim of quantity, maxims of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. The characters in the movie entitled *Bel Ami* movie violated the maxim of quantity because they gave too much information than it was required. The characters violated the maxim of quality because they told about something wrong and lied to the partner of conversation. The characters violated the maxim relevance because they avoided to talk something, gave irrelevant response and some characters also changed the topic abruptly. The characters violated the maxim of manner because they used non systematic and ambiguous language. Violation of maxims done by the characters had various intended meaning.

REFERENCES

- Arifin, A. & Suprayitno, E. 2015. *Flouting the Grice's maxims found in Mr. Poppers*" Penguin movie. *Prosiding Prasasti*, 1(1), pp. 1-8. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.20961/pras.v0i0.434>
- Arifin, A. 2018. How Non-native Writers Realize their Interpersonal Meaning? *Lingua Cultura*, 12(2), hal. 155-161. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i2.3729>
- Arwood, E. L. 2011. *Language Function: An Introduction to Pragmatic Assessment and Intervention for Higher Order Thinking and Better Literacy*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publisher.
- Bordwell, D. & Thompson, K. 2008. *Film Art: An Introduction*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Flick, U. 2009. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Grice, P. 2002. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

- Horn, L. & Ward, G. 2006. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kristyaningsih, N. & Arifin, A. 2022. Politeness Strategies in *Freedom Writers* Movie. *Salience*, 2(2), pp. 77-84. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Salience>
- Lestari, R. Y. P. 2014. *The Conversational Implicature in the Croods Movie Written and Directed by Kirk Demicco and Chris Sanders*. Undergraduate Thesis. Ponorogo: STKIP PGRI Ponorogo.
- Mahendra, Sutejo & Suprayitno, E. 2022. Prinsip Kerjasama dalam Film *My Stupid Boss* Karya Upi Avianto. *Leksis*, 2(2), pp. 74-81. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Leksis>
- Moleong, L. J. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Pradita, I. 2013. The Pragmatics Aspects of Humor Creation: A Study on Grice's Cooperative Principles. *Journal of English and Education*, 7(2), pp. 1-15. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20885/jee.vol7.iss2.art1>
- Prastyaningsih, E. & Harida, R. 2021. The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in *New Moon* Movie. *Salience*, 1(2), pp. 61-69. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Salience>
- Rizkitaningrum, H. & Wulandari, R. S. 2022. The Implicit Meaning of CocaCola TV Advertisement. *Salience*, 2(2), pp. 69-76. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Salience>
- Sari, O. N. 2016. Flouting Maxim of Quantity and Relevance in the Novel of *Mice and Men* by J. E. Steinbeck. *Jurnal bahasa dan Sastra*, 3(1), pp. 51-56. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/JBS>
- Sulistianing, T. D., Astuti, C. W. & Setiawan, H. 2022. Penyimpangan Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Percakapan Jual Beli di Pusat Perbelanjaan Elektronik Ponorogo. *Leksis*, 2(1), pp. 26-34. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Leksis>
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Zuriyah, N. 2007. *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial dan Pendidikan Teori- Aplikasi*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.