1.1. Research Background

People do communication through the conversation. Sometimes what the speaker says is the opposite of what the words say, what the speaker says has something implied. There are times when people say something exactly what they really mean but for many times they tend to say something implicitly or not totally explicit (Thomas, 1995:56). How a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant, from the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning as the additional or different meaning beyond the semantic meaning of the words uttered is stated in the Grice’s theory about implicature. It is clearly different from explicature that is what people say exactly what the words mean.

There are two different sorts of implicature by Grice: conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature ignores the context when the utterances occur, while conversational implicature is influenced by the context of the utterances when the speaker says something implicitly (Thomas, 1995:57). In addition, conversational implicature is a part of Grice Cooperative Principles. The speaker tries to be cooperative in conversation by saying the truth, being relevant, and making the utterances clearly.

There are two kinds of conversational implicature. They are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature (Carston, 2000). Generalized conversational implicature is implied meaning using context-general and connected with grammatical phenomena. Particularized
conversational implicature is implied meaning with special knowledge of any particularly context (Yule, 1996).

Knowing implicature is very important to find out the implied meaning or hidden intention behind the speaker’s utterances. If the hearers know about implicature that occurs in a conversation, they would find out the hidden intention behind the speaker’s utterance and make them to communicate effectively and sometimes politely. It happens because the speakers sometimes do not observe the maxims of Cooperative Principle in saying something, especially in a particular or specific context. In addition, misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the implied meaning behind the interlocutor intention would make something ruin or out of the main intention. Therefore, the occurrence of particularized conversational implicature is an interesting thing to be analyzed.

Basically, it is very important for the hearers to know and receive the message of every utterance from the speakers, either it is explicit or implicit. But revealing the implicit meaning needs more certain contexts so the hearer can do a future action based on the speaker’s intention. It means that knowing speaker’s intention is useful not only at the time the conversation occurs but also for the future conversation occasion.

There are some researches about conversational implicature examined by some researchers with various kinds of source of data. Some recent studies about implicature are only focused in type of conversational implicature (Carston, 2000; Sedivy, 2007; Bennoti & Blackburn, 2011; Pakpahan & Sumarsih, 2012) without deep analysis about the reasons underlying the occurrence of conversational
implicature. Other studies about implicature (Nanda, Sukyadi & Sudarsono, 2012) only emphasized the research in the use of both conversational implicature in communication, while Wang (2011) only focused in the significant of applying the conversational implicature in listening comprehension. They have not investigated the reasons and the hearer responses about the occurrence of those implicatures.

These researches have the same result that the dominant conversational implicature using in their source of data is generalized conversational implicature. The reasons underlying the generalized conversational implicature as the dominant conversational implicature are there is no extra knowledge to extract the meaning so both the speaker and the hearer can easily understand each other. Moreover, the interlocutor gives the response with clear statements, so there is no special knowledge of any particularly context to the existence of particularized conversational implicatures.

Many researchers have studied about flouting maxims as one of the ways to apply implicatures (Helmi, 2010; Andresen, 2013; Adelia, 2014; Inayati, et al, 2014). Flouting maxims is the part of implicature. Flouting maxims as one of non-observance maxims is usually chosen to apply some implicatures in a conversation besides violating maxims. People flout the maxims to deliver their hidden meaning to the hearer, but not to cause misunderstanding like when people choose to violate maxims. Flouting maxims by Grice happens whenever a speaker says something not directly to the meaning and makes the hearer ‘unfold’ the sentence to get the real meaning and understand the intention from the speaker.
The previous studies have not investigated yet about some topics. First are particular reasons behind the occurrence of implicatures. Second is the hearers' response about the occurrence of those implicatures, whether they are success or fail to reveal the speaker’s intentions. Most of the recent studies only focus on the kinds of conversational implicatures and the dominant result in the certain source of data whereas particularized conversational implicatures need special or specific knowledge of context to occur. Therefore, the researcher chooses a topic to be analyzed that is flouting maxims in particularized conversational implicatures in movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’. It will be an interesting topic to be discussed since Grice always suggests people to obey the Cooperative Principle to make a smooth, effective, and efficient communication.

This study finds out and determines the particularized conversational implicature utterances the speaker used, the kinds of flouting maxims, the hidden meaning, the reasons behind the occurrence of the implicature, and the hearer responses about that hidden meaning. In addition, in this paper it will be made clear that besides explicature, implicature also exists especially to deliver or inform some particular hidden intentions to the hearers in particular conditions.

This research is a descriptive qualitative research with single case study. The researcher uses purposive sampling technique and content analysis technique to collect the data. Then the data are analyzed using pragmatics approach to find the meaning in the context with Grice’s Cooperative Principle Theory.

This research takes a movie as the data entitled ‘22 Jump Street’. This movie is chosen as the source of data because its dialogues contain of many
particularized conversational implicatures which is realized in flouting maxims. In addition, in a movie, there are contexts including when, where, and why particular utterances are expressed and be the main instrument to reveal the implied meaning delivered by a speaker. This is a 2014 American action comedy film. This movie tells about two cops named Jenko and Schmidt. They are best friend and join ‘Jump Street’, a police’s program to investigate drug case. Then they have to undercover as college students who want to buy that ‘whyphy’ (work hard, play hard) drug then arrest the drug dealer and supplier with a lot of struggle.

As mentioned before, there are many flouting maxims in the particularized conversational implicatures in the movie conversation. For example:

Ghost man : We gotta go!

Ghost : We have to wait for pudding!

Ghost man : (Worried and just silent)

This conversation happens in the roof of the highest building in the Mexico beach where thousands of college students spend their spring time. Ghost and his man want to run away from Jenko and Schmidt who want to arrest them. The Ghost man wants his boss to hurry up because he sees that both of the cops have guns and run in their way. The utterance from Ghost “We have to wait for pudding!” implies that as a good father, he wants to wait his beloved daughter who still fight with the other cops with guns. Ghost flouts the maxim of quantity because he says his intention less than what is required. He should answer that he will only go with his daughter and he will not let his daughter died or arrested by the cops. And the money he brings is also belongs to his daughter. So if he leaves
his daughter and let her die, it is nothing for him. It shows the reluctance of Ghost to go without his daughter.

1.2. Research Questions

Based on the research gap, the research problem statements are:

1. What kinds of flouting maxims are used by the characters in the movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’ in applying particularized conversational implicatures?
2. Why do the characters in the movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’ use flouting maxims in applying particularized conversational implicatures in their conversation?
3. How is the hearer response about the implied meaning from the speaker, whether the hearer are success or fail to reveal the speaker’s intention?

1.3. Research Objectives

Based on the research questions, the research objectives are:

1. To find out the kinds of flouting maxim are used by the speaker in the movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’ in applying particularized conversational implicatures.
2. To find out the reasons why the characters in the movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’ use flouting maxims in applying particularized conversational implicatures in their conversation.
3. To find out the hearers responses about the implied meaning from the speakers, whether the hearers success or fail to reveal the speaker’s intention.

1.4. Research Benefits

Theoretically, this study is hoped to be additional materials in pragmatics, especially providing a depth investigation about the particularized conversational implicatures and flouting maxims. Therefore, the result of this study helps to investigate the occurrence of particularized conversational implicature and the hidden meaning behind it. In addition, the result of this study provides the kinds of flouting maxims and some reasons why the speakers apply some implicatures in their conversation. Fourth, this study shows the responses of the hearers about the implicatures delivered by the speakers, whether they are success to reveal the hidden meaning from the speaker or not.

Practically, this research can be used by lecturers as additional lecture. This study will investigate flouting maxims in particularized conversational implicatures in a movie as life-like story, so it is hoped that by reading this research, people will be more sensitive or easier to find out the implied meaning in their daily conversation to get the real meaning and message from their opponent speaks intention.

Furthermore, this research shows a new perspective in viewing flouting maxims in particularized conversational implicatures. If this research is not investigated, people will only have limited information about the application of implying meaning usually happen in daily life conversation. As result, they can
misunderstand and ruin something. So by this research people also can apply particularized conversational implicatures and flout the maxims of Cooperative Principle in their conversation when they want to say something which cannot be said literally.

1.5. Scope of Research

This research covers the particularized conversational implicatures occurring in the dialogues in the movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’ and the hidden meaning of the implicatures, the kinds of flouting maxims, the reasons underlying the occurrence of implicatures, and the hearers responses about the implied meaning. This research result is not to generalize the using of flouting maxims in particularized conversational implicatures in all same genre movies. This research only limits its focus on the conversations among the characters in the movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’. Finally, this research only analyzes the kinds of flouting maxims in particularized conversational implicatures, not the generalized conversational implicatures in the movie entitled ‘22 Jump Street’ or in the other movies with the same genre.

1.6. Thesis Organization

This thesis is organized into five chapters. The first chapter is INTRODUCTION, which consists of Research Background, Research Questions, Research Objectives, Research Benefits, Scope of Research, and Thesis Organization. The second chapter is THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW. It
consists of the theory of Pragmatics, Cooperative Principle, Implicature, Context, Flouting maxims, and Related Study. The next chapter is RESEARCH METHODOLOGY which consists of Research Design, Research Location, Data and Source of Data, Sampling and Sampling Technique, and Technique of Collecting Data. The fourth chapter is RESULTS AND DISCUSSION which consists of Introduction, Results, and Discussions. The last chapter is CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION.