Guidelines of Rational Communicative Behavior: An Analysis of Grice's Maxim Exploitation

Norhidayu Hasan*, Nazilah Mohamad, Mohd Faradi Mohamed Ghazali, Muhammad Nasri Rifin

Centre of Malay Language and Communication Studies, Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, 21300 Gong Badak, Terengganu, Malaysia

Nurul Afifah Adila Mohd Salleh

Department of Malay Studies, Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM) 40450, Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia

Abstract

The guidance of rational communicative behavior is a guideline that communication participants should utilize to achieve successful communication outcomes. The guidelines proposed by Grice (1975) constitute assumptions of intention and cooperation that underlie the human communication process. Despite the recognized importance of adhering to these guidelines, which align with innate human desires, speakers violate or exploit these guidelines. This study focuses on the exploitation of rational communicative behavior guidelines among the Malay community. This exploitation is investigated based on dialogues from a film that serves as evidence of actual societal conversations. The film dialogue from *Lampong Karam* (1961) is used to illustrate how these guidelines are exploited to create implicatures that lead to successful interactions. This study employs data analysis methods based on two main theories in effective communication, namely Grice's Theory of Conversation and Relevance Theory. Based on the conducted research, it is found that the exploitation of these guidelines by communication participants aims to produce implicatures in line with the innate human desire for cooperation. The implicatures resulting from this exploitation are effective as they are connected to the relevant desires of the listener, focusing on pertinent information. The exploitation of the identified guidelines in this film dialogue also showcases the diversity of ways the Malay community conveys messages, sometimes deviating from the guidelines but ultimately generating meaningful conclusions.

Keywords: Rational, Communicative, Film, Dialogue, Relevance, Cooperation

Introduction

Rational communicative behavior refers to guidelines that can be implemented by communication participants to achieve effective interaction. Grice (1975) introduced these guidelines under the principle of communication. This principle is supplemented with a list of rational or reasonable behaviors to be undertaken by communication participants and is known as the Cooperation Principle (CP). The Cooperation Principle focuses on the concept of cooperation, which is generally associated with the act of working together. Cooperative activities can also be linked to actions performed according to the requests of other individuals. Cooperative behavior describes an activity carried out collectively and collaboratively to achieve predetermined objectives.

The concept of cooperation has become the foundation for formulating rational communicative behavior guidelines introduced under the CP. Grice (1975) used the concept of cooperation to explain human communication behavior. Grice (1975) emphasized that all human communication is based on cooperation. This concept also helps reduce the risk of indirect utterances being perceived as meaningless speech (Davies, 2006). In communication, cooperation refers to the cooperative behavior of participants working together spontaneously and with the goals of their respective communication in mind, in line with the ongoing conversation (Moore, 2018).

Conversation is a process of giving and receiving meaning, indicating the cooperative nature of this process (Grice, 1989). The concept of cooperation that underlies CP is a rational behavior that each conversation participant should adhere to to achieve the conversation's goals effectively. Grice (1975) suggested that each conversation participant should contribute as required at the stage at which they occur, according to the accepted purpose or direction of the ongoing talk exchange.

"Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged."
Grice (1975:45)

Grice's statement (1975:45) clearly illustrates the idea of conversation as a process that requires cooperative behavior to meet the requirements of the conversation. This concept of cooperation has been further developed by Grice (1975) in the form of CP as a guide to achieving successful and effective communication (Mirivel, 2015; Poggi, 2016; and Oeberst & Moskaliuk, 2016). A conversation is successful when the exchange of meaning is carried out accurately without misunderstandings. CP lists communicative behaviors and can be called the Maxim of Cooperation Principle (MCP). MCP is divided into four types: Maxim of Quantity (MQT), Maxim of Quality (MQL), Maxim of Relation (MRL), and Maxim of Manner (MMN). CP and MCP represent a form of rational communication behavior based on the natural inclinations of humans when involved in an interaction (Grice, 1989; Németh, 2004; Senft, 2008; Dynel, 2013; Carston, 2013; and Mazzone, 2018).

MCP can be further detailed into nine sub-maxims. Each sub-maxim lists communicative behaviors involving truth, clarity, relevance, and the amount of interaction contributions. Although these four MCPs have different emphases, they share the same goal: to ensure that the communication contributions are delivered clearly and effectively. However, even though these MCPs have proven effective in ensuring smooth delivery of conversational contributions, Grice (1975) accepts the fact and is aware that these MCPs may not be adhered to by speakers. Grice (1975) explains that this non-compliance can occur through various

means, such as violation, flouting, clashing, and opting out. Among these four types of non-compliance, Grice (1975) focuses more on the violation or exploitation.

Exploitation generally refers to actions taken to exploit a resource for the benefit and take advantage of a situation for the interests of specific parties. However, in the linguistic corpus, Grice (1975) uses the term exploitation to refer to speech that intentionally violates MCP intending to generate implicatures. Exploitation can also be described as speech that exploits the background knowledge of MCP (Mooney, 2004). Szczepanski (2015) argues that the exploitation of MCP involves using any speech that violates MCP but can be linked to the assumptions of CP. Exploitation of MCP is the use of speech that meets the requirements of cooperation by manipulating rational communication behavior (Brumark, 2006).

The term "exploitation" is intended to distinguish violation from other forms of non-compliance and to refer to any form of speech that does not conform to MCP but can be linked to CP assumptions. The exploitation of MCP is notable for its explicit characteristics, as only the exploitation results will generate implicatures that can achieve the goals of the conversation and the interaction participants. This benefit can be attributed to the speaker's intention to deliver their speech smoothly, allowing the listener to obtain the necessary information successfully.

Exploitation of CPM is often done in Malay community conversations, which are famous for using implicature or indirect speech. The Malay community's high cultural context of politeness influences the use of implicature in speech. Jalaludin and Awal (2006) explain that using implicature in speech has become a common habit in Malay conversations. The preference for using implicature over direct speech can be linked to the community's cultural values and reflects the speaker's wisdom in exploiting rational communication behavior to convey meaning effectively.

The use of implicature in Malay society, resulting from exploitation, can be observed through notable recordings, especially in films. Films are recordings that can show the use of language over time. Through films, society can observe how people used to speak, which cannot be directly seen or heard today (Lyden, 2009). Films are also recognized for their effectiveness as linguistic recordings and can be used as data for pragmatic analysis due to the authenticity of the conversational structures used in dialogue (Locher & Jucker, 2017).

Literature Reviews

Conversation can be defined as a form of cooperation that involves the speaker adhering to certain maxims to convey meaning effectively to the listener (Grice, 1989). However, even if the speaker does not comply with this maxim entirely, cooperation is still taking place in the conversation. These Maxims of Cooperative Principles (MCPs) are adhered to by speakers through exploitation. The explanation of MCPs can be observed in various research contexts such as social media, interview sessions, novels, newspapers, advertisements, and films.

One relevant study by Ayunon (2018) focuses on Facebook posts. Ayunon (2018) explains that speakers apply cooperation in ongoing conversations when delivering responses that comply with the maxims. However, this study found that the Maxim of Quantity (MQT) is often violated, as speakers aim to create humor or sarcasm.

Qassemi et al (2018) also examined cooperation aspects based on MCPs in newspaper news reports. This study found that news reports also exhibit violations of MCPs. Violations are committed through implicit or vague sentences in news reports to capture readers' attention.

Similarly, Sial (2019) also examined MCPs in newspaper news reports, as in the study by (Qassemi et al., 2018). The findings of this study indicate that Grice's cooperation principle can be applied more easily in political news than in sports news. Political news is more amenable to adhering to the Maxim of Relation (MRL) than sports news, which more readily adheres to the Maxim of Quality (MQL). This study also concludes that the application of MCPs varies according to the topic or theme of the news.

Lokman and Sarbini-Zin (2019) used annual budget speeches to demonstrate non-compliance with MCPs, focusing on only two maxims: the Maxim of Quality (MQL) and the Maxim of Quantity (MQT). The study found that non-compliance with MCPs in speeches is aimed at creating a harmonious effect when conveying messages about human life. Lokman and Sarbini-Zin (2019) also argued that non-compliance with MCPs should be done in formal speeches because it can have a profound impact and deliver speech messages more clearly.

Furthermore, Chen and Zhang (2020) researched MCPs with a slightly different approach from previous studies. This research was based on two rational behaviors, using the Cooperation Principle (CP) to explain how implicatures are generated and how the Principle of Politeness saves the situation when conflict arises. The study found that the implicatures generated are based on the Politeness Principle to help speakers deliver messages accurately and politely to listeners.

Research on rational communication behavior has also been conducted in novels, as in (Canli's, 2021). This study focused on writing styles and narratives based on Thomas's concept of meaning and CP. The research findings showed that CP plays a significant role in helping readers better understand the aesthetic value and writing style of novels. Furthermore, applying CP detected in novel writing also helps authors develop a conversational technique that becomes the author's writing style.

Haq and Isnaeni (2021) also analyzed CP, focusing on Facebook posts, as in (Ayunon, 2018). This research was conducted to analyze the ethical value of critical speech. The study focused on determining the frequency of MCP violations in critical speech. This study used CP as a guide for delivering ethical criticism. The research found that critical speech in Facebook posts showed a high percentage of MCP violations. The study also concluded that speakers violate the Maxim of Quality (MQL) and the Maxim of Relation (MRL) in delivering critical speech.

Rasool et al (2022) further examined cooperation in interview sessions. The study aimed to analyze CP violations by politicians in interviews. The research found that politicians violate CP in interviews to influence the audience when conveying and sharing their political views. The study also showed that the speech delivered by politicians in interview sessions does not reflect cooperative efforts and needs to be more honest.

The study of CP and MCP has been continued by (Elmahady et al., 2022). This study aimed to explain the types of implicatures generated through MCP violations using everyday conversation data as a focus. Elmahady et al (2022) concluded that MCP violations in everyday conversations focus more on generating implicatures in specific conversations than general conversations requiring contextual information.

Furthermore, research on past studies related to CP and MCP has shown various research corpus types. Previous research findings also indicate the impact of compliance or non-compliance with rational communication guidelines. However, previous research tends to focus on the reasons for non-compliance, whether to explain personality or to demonstrate ethics, as in the studies by (Lokman and Sarbini-Zin, 2019). Haq & Isnaeni (2021); Rasool et al (2022) moreover, discussions in previous studies are more focused on the role of CP in

enriching storytelling and writing techniques in novels, news, or films, as in the studies by (Qassemi et al., 2018; Sial, 2019; Chen & Zhang, 2020; Canli, 2021). Discussion about dialogue in Malay films, specifically examining non-compliance with Grice's rational communication behavior, still needs to be made available. While studies focus on CP's role in film dialogue, such as Chen and Zhang's study (2020), the discussion tends to focus on incivility in speech. Furthermore, research on CP through films in previous studies does not explain the non-compliance process leading to implicatures.

Research Objectives
This study focuses on two objectives
1. Identifying the exploitation of Grice's Cooperative Principle Maxims (CPM) based on the type of maxim exploited by speakers in the dialogues of the film "Lampong Karam".
2. Analyzing utterances that exploit Grice's Cooperative Principle based on Grice's Theory of Conversation and Relevance Theory

Methodology
This study on the exploitation of CPM uses conversation data in the Malay language extracted from the dialogues of the film (Karam, 1967). The selection of dialogue data from this film is based on the fact that the language used reflects real-life conversations in the Malay community. The film Lampong Karam was chosen for this study because it remains relevant in today's context. The film is rich in its use of language that exploits CPM to convey issues or teachings related to spirituality and trust. The use of dialogue to convey such weighty issues undoubtedly requires a high level of interpretation to ascertain the true meaning of a given dialogue. The diversity of issues and conflicts portrayed in this film undoubtedly varies the types and structures of conversations. Values like these make the film Lampong Karam a suitable resource to demonstrate the exploitation of CPMs and indirectly showcase the uniqueness and distinctiveness of the Malay language community. The analysis of CPM exploitation is also conducted by examining all conversations between the involved characters.

This study applies a qualitative method involving literature review, downloading the film from the YouTube platform, viewing, listening, transcribing, and text analysis. This method includes identifying and segregating dialogues that exploit CPM from other dialogues. Only dialogues that exploit CPMs are selected and categorized according to the type of maxim exploited by the speaker, such as Maxim of Quantity (MQT), Maxim of Quality (MQL), Maxim of Relation (MRL), and Maxim of Manner (MMN). After categorization, the data is analyzed based on Grice's Theory of Conversation and the Relevance Theory to explain the true meaning of the utterance and indicate the speaker's intention or purpose of exploitation in the conversation. Examining dialogues in Lampong Karam found 63 instances of dialogue that exploited CPM. However, this article presents and explains only two data points as they are sufficient to illustrate the exploitation.

Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975)
Rational communication behavior is based on cooperation among conversation participants (Grice, 1975). This behavior is an assumption of the innate human desire when giving and receiving meaning. The assumption formulated for such rational communication behavior involves providing adequate information, not causing confusion, providing relevant

information, and stating information clearly. Grice (1975) formulated guidelines for rational communication behavior through CPM and sub-maxims. The guidelines for rational communication behavior in the form of the Cooperative Principle (CP) and CPMs are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Cooperative Principle Maxim.

MAXIM	FOCUS OF MAXIM	DETAILS OF MAXIM
Quantity	Amount of Conversation Contributions	a) Delivering appropriate conversation contributions that meet the conversation's requirements. b) Providing conversation contributions that are as informative as needed by the listener c) Ensuring that conversation contributions do not exceed the conversation's requirements.
Quality	Truthfulness of Content in Conversation Contributions	a) Providing only accurate information b) Presenting conversation contributions with solid evidence to support their accuracy. c) Conveying information believed to be accurate.
Relation	Relevance of Conversation Contributions	a) Delivering conversation contributions relevant to the conversation's direction.
Manner	Clarity of Conversation Contributions	a) Presenting conversation contributions clearly and without ambiguous information. b) Providing conversation contributions that do not contain issues of ambiguity. c) Conveying conversation contributions with clarity, using concise and necessary language. d) Delivering conversation contributions in an organized manner.

Relevance Theory
Understanding the meaning of an utterance depends on the context and involves the cognitive abilities of humans (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). The concept of communication-related to human cognition is the focal point of Relevance Theory (RT). The theory, proposed by Sperber & Wilson (1995), represents an effort to expand upon Grice's framework by formulating all the Gricean maxims into one concept of relevance. RT emphasizes the cognitive assumptions in processing utterances, which were previously centered on the principles of cooperation, as found in Grice's theory. TR is further discussed in the primary concepts and principles: relevance, the principle of cognitive relevance, and the principle of communicative relevance.

    I.   The Concept of Relevance
        The founders of RT put forth the view that every human possesses an inherent sense of relevance. This assumption involves humans distinguishing between relevant and less relevant information. The concept of relevant information in a given context refers to the idea that certain information may be relevant in context

A but not in context B. Context includes information that is constructed or selected through mental processes, including experiences, questions, expectations, intentions, beliefs, or any information that may be useful in the process of interpreting utterances. Overall, this concept refers to information being relevant in a context if it triggers a high cognitive effect.

II. The Principle of Cognitive Relevance

The principle of cognitive relevance focuses on the assumption that humans are naturally inclined to maximize relevance. This assumption involves the cognitive processes in humans maximizing relevance by selecting the most relevant input. The human tendency to maximize relevance and select the most relevant input directly encourages speakers to produce input that captures the listener's attention. This input is not limited to speech but includes any stimuli that can serve as helpful input in cognitive processes. Sperber & Wilson (1995) explain that something is considered relevant if it can be connected to background information and results in meaningful conclusions, such as resolving doubts, enhancing understanding of a matter, providing answers, or correcting any misconceptions.

III. The Principle of Communicative Relevance

Participants must pay full attention during the ongoing communication. For instance, speakers capture the listener's attention by delivering relevant information. The cognitive inclination in humans to maximize relevance enables them to anticipate the listener's mental state, desiring a maximum of relevant input for themselves. This inclination will drive speakers to generate input that captures the listener's attention, establishes a relevant context, and helps the listener make conclusions. RT explains that the process of making conclusions can be executed through a comprehension procedure involving three processes: i) forming assumptions about explicit information through encoding, disambiguation, reference fixing, and other pragmatic processes, ii) constructing assumptions that fit the context, and iii) creating assumptions that align with conclusions based on the context.

Results and Discussion

The research findings identified 63 utterances of cooperative principle exploitation in the dialogue of the film Lampong Karam. Out of these 63 utterances, the exploitation of the Maxim of Quantity (MQT) had the highest number, totaling 35 utterances, followed by the exploitation of the Maxim of Quality (MQL) with 15 utterances. Exploitation related to Maxim of Relation (MRL) and Maxim of Manner (MMN) in the dialogue of the film Lampong Karam had lower numbers, with eight utterances and six utterances, respectively. However, only 4 data utterances of exploitation are presented in this paper.

Exploitation Utterance 1: *If I were to hand it over, it would mean that I have not only disobeyed Your Majesty but also disobeyed the Almighty Allah*.

Table 2
Exploitation Utterance 1

EU1	a	Pemangku Raja	*Ya itu benar tapi buat sementara waktu serahkahlah pada kita*
			Yes, that's correct, but for the time being, please hand it over to me.
	b	Mufti	***Jika patik serahkan bererti patik telah menderhaka bukan saja pada Paduka Tuanku bahkan pada Allah Maha Berkuasa.*** *Mengapakah Tengku berkelakuan demikian?*
			If I were to hand it over, it would mean that I have not only disobeyed Your Majesty but also the Almighty Allah. Why would Your Highness act this way?

The dialogue presented in Table 2 above involves the exploitation of the Maxim of Quantity (MQT), which is the maxim that concerns the quantity of speech contributions. Grice (1975) argued that to achieve effective communication, each utterance should contain adequate information according to the listener's needs. The speaker exploited the maxim of quantity (MQT) when intentionally not adhering to the guideline of quantity, and the listener notices this act. This condition can be seen through speech accompanied by signals indicating that the speaker is committing a violation. These signals can be linked to the listener's ability to consider the most relevant input over other inputs and the natural human inclination to maximize relevance.

In exploiting MQT, the speaker delivers utterances with excessive or insufficient information compared to the listener's needs. Based on this explanation, EU1/b "If I were to hand it over, it would mean that I have not only disobeyed Your Majesty but also disobeyed the Almighty Allah" can be identified as exploitation of the MQT. EU1/b is a response to Pemangku Raja's request for Mufti to hand over the Sultan's will to him. The Mufti has delivered a statement that does not adhere to the MQT to trigger implicature, indicating the concept of cooperation and indirectly providing information related to the direction of the conversation.

Cooperation focuses on the listener's natural assumption to seek relevant information or any information according to their questions. In the case of EU1, cooperation focuses on EU1/b, demonstrating Mufti's cooperative effort in providing relevant information to the listener. This effort is consistent with the statement in RT, which is that listeners naturally seek or maximize relevant information that is relevant to them (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

Wilson and Sperber (2004) explain that listeners will concentrate on the most relevant information among various available inputs. Recognizing this tendency, speakers construct utterances that attract the listener's attention by satisfying their relevance assumptions and demonstrating their cooperative behavior. In EU1, Mufti captures the listener's attention by providing more information than Pemangku Raja needs. This excessive information serves as input for interpreting the true meaning of EU1/b.

Wharton (2008) explains that the speaker's utterance can be one of the inputs in generating conclusions that meet the listener's relevance assumptions. The process of drawing the meaning of the speaker's utterance begins with encoding the input utterance because this input has the potential to serve as the initial context. Therefore, to understand the real meaning of EU1/b, the process begins by referring to the words used by the speaker.

Based on Mufti's utterance in EU1/b, the input that can serve as a focus and provide an initial context for interpreting the meaning is the word "disobeyed." This lexical input must be encoded to obtain the speaker's true meaning. Encoding the lexical input "disobeyed" can be done using encyclopedia information. Information from the encyclopedia entry on the word "disobeyed" is utilized to obtain information, attributes, characteristics, descriptions, or anything related to "disobeyed".

According to the information in the encyclopedia entry, "disobeyed" refers to actions that go against a particular state. In linguistic context, "disobeyed" means disobedience, betrayal, or opposition to legitimate authority. For the utterance EU1/b, "disobeyed" can be explained as disobedience to both the King and Allah SWT.

However, even though the literal meaning can be obtained through the encyclopedia entry, the literal meaning alone does not reveal the speaker's true meaning. This issue is also explained in RT: encoding word concepts to interpret the speaker's meaning is incomplete and inadequate (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). RT emphasizes the assumption that humans choose information that produces the optimal cognitive effect. Thus, the literal meaning alone does not produce that cognitive effect.

The process of interpreting the meaning of EU1/b continues because the literal meaning alone does not adequately contribute to Pemangku Raja's request or command. The logical form explanation alone does not reveal the speaker's true meaning, and it only states that if the speaker obeys Pemangku Raja's request, the speaker will commit an offense against the King and Allah SWT.

This process is continued by examining relevant contexts for the utterance. In the discussion of RT, context refers to the listener's psychological world-building assumptions. Context includes various conditions or factors based on human observations of their environment, including utterances previously used, memories of situations or events, experiences, religion, culture, beliefs, and more. In the case of EU1/b, the context that can be utilized is the context of past experiences or events.

Mufti is the Sultan's right-hand person, and he has been entrusted with the Sultan's will. Pemangku Raja, on the other hand, is an individual appointed by the Sultan to carry out the Sultan's responsibilities in his absence. Because of concerns about his status being undermined, Pemangku Raja attempts to obtain the will from Mufti, who is responsible for safeguarding and preserving the will per the King's instructions. The "hand it over" in EU1/a refers to the royal will.

Grice (1975) explains that the exploitation of CPM involves the listener's realization that a violation has occurred. This condition results from shared knowledge or a cognitive environment and the relevant input to the listener. The use of the lexical input "disobeyed" in EU1/b is relevant to the conversation's direction because it can be connected to background knowledge. According to RT, the concept of the cognitive environment refers to information that is apparent to the communication participants (Wilson & Sperber, 2004). In EU1/b, the cognitive environment involves beliefs about behaviors that violate trust, integrity, responsibility, orders, or the commands of the King and Allah. SWT is a negative action. Disobeying the King and Allah SWT is associated with prohibited actions.

Belief in the act of disobedience is associated with the consequences and negative perceptions of the perpetrator. This belief context helps the listener understand that Mufti will never engage in such behavior because his belief about disobedience is considered wrong and would result in a negative perception of the perpetrator. Additionally, the context that can be used to interpret the meaning of EU1/b is the religious context. Islam requires

individuals to fulfill their duties with honor and honesty. The religious context of Islam, which both Mufti and Pemangku Raja follow, can also help the listener understand EU1/b. Based on the information provided by Mufti and the relevant context, several premises of assumption can be formed, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Premises for the Conclusion of the Meaning in EU1/b

Utterance	*If I were to hand it over, it would mean that I have not only disobeyed Your Majesty but also the Almighty Allah*
Logical Form	*If I were to hand it over, it would mean that I have not only _____* (actions that go against a particular state) *Your Majesty but also the Almighty Allah*
Implicature Premises	i. The Mufti states that if he hand over the king's will to Pemangku Raja, he has disobeyed the king and Allah SWT ii. Mufti will not obey the king's and Allah SWT's commands if he fulfills the Pemangku Raja's request. Acting against the command or order of the king and Allah SWT is a negative act and a sin. iii. If disobeying the king's and Allah SWT's orders is a negative act and a sin, then Mufti indeed refuses to commit that act. iv. Mufti will not obey the command of the king and Allah SWT if he accepts Pemangku Raja's request, which is a strong reason for Mufti to reject Pemangku Raja's request.
Implicature Conclusion	Mufti rejects Pemangku Raja's request.

Through the input provided to the listener in EU1/b and its relevance to the relevant context, the conclusion that can be drawn from the exploitation of MQT is that Mufti rejects Pemangku Raja's request to hand over the will. This cognitive conclusion or effect is highly relevant and valid as it can be connected to the topic of the conversation, that is, the Pemangku Raja's request for the Mufti to hand over the will, as in EU1/a. The excessive use of utterance has been proven to fulfill the assumption of cooperation and relevance in conversation, as the speaker has provided sufficient and relevant information to the listener at an implied level.

Mufti's communicative intention, which is Mufti's intention to provide clear information to the listener, is easily realized. The input conveyed by Mufti in EU1/b is also relevant, even though the literal meaning of the utterance does not meet the listener's expectations. This input has also proven to be connectable to the context and background information that will generate meaningful conclusions. The following is a summary of Exploitation Utterance 1 in Table 4.

Table 4
Summary of Exploitation Utterance 1

Utterance	Types of exploitation	Strategy	Conclusion of implicature
If I were to hand it over, it would mean that I have not only disobeyed Your Majesty but also the Almighty Allah	MQT	Providing excessive information	Mufti rejects Pemangku Raja's request to hand over the will.

Exploitation Utterance 2: *If so, I am not clapping with one hand as people say.*

Table 5
Exploitation Utterance 2

EU2	a	Penghulu	*Rahimah, kenapa waktu kau membunuh diri dan setelah aku mengubati kau, engkau tidak mahu berterus terang yang kau sukakan Sulaiman anak Mufti tu. Janganlah malu. Aku pun tahu yang Si Sulaiman tu sukakan kau juga. Dia hanya segan. Lagipun pada masa tu kau dah nak dinikahkan dengan suami mu sekarang ini, dia juga merana sekarang Rahimah* Rahimah, why, when you attempted suicide and after I treated you, you didn't want to be honest about your love for Sulaiman, the Mufti's son? Don't be ashamed. I know Sulaiman also likes you. He's just shy. Besides, at that time, you were about to marry your current husband, he is also suffering now, Rahimah.
	b	Rahimah	*Apa betul begitu tok?* Is that true, tok ?
	c	Penghulu	*Kalau tak betul begitu mengapa aku ke mari. Aku nak bertanya dengan kau sendiri baru puas hati* If it's not true, why did I come here? I want to ask you myself so that I'll be satisfied.
	d	Rahimah	**Jika demikian taklah saya bertepuk sebelah tangan seperti dikata orang.** Saya akan tunggu saja sampai suami saya balik dengan secara damai saya minta cerai **If so, I am not clapping with one hand as people say**. I will just wait until my husband returns, and peacefully, I will request a divorce.

Exploitation in conversation can also be identified through non-compliance with truthful content contribution guidelines. As shown in Table 5 above, CPM exploitation can be identified through the utterance delivered by Rahimah in EU2/d. EU2/d can be explained as exploitation when Rahimah provides information that she believes to be untrue. The characteristic of EU2/d is consistent with Chapman's (2005) explanation, where MQL exploitation can be identified based on the feature of the speaker providing information that they know to be untrue.

In the conversation above, Rahimah carried out MQL exploitation in EU2/d "If so, I am not clapping with one hand as people say". EU2/d is Rahimah's response to the statements and questions asked by the Penghulu. Therefore, the listener must interpret this utterance to derive the true meaning of Rahimah's exploitation utterance using false information.

The conversation in Table 5 occurs when the Penghulu tries to deceive Rahimah into believing that Sulaiman loves her through EU2/a. Rahimah's response in EU2/d evaluates the statement in EU2/a. Drawing conclusions from the feedback in EU2/d begins by examining the words used in the speaker's utterance, as these words need to be connected in the context to conclude the utterance's meaning accurately. According to RT, analyzing the meaning based on input or context alone will not reach the speaker's meaning. This explanation is in line with the viewpoint of Kreuz and Roberts (2019), which asserts that the meaning of speech cannot be solely explained through input, as the meaning of speech depends on the context that provides additional information to make a speech meaningful and enable the listener to make inferences.

RT explains that context can be accessed through prior speech, the background events of the conversation, and involving encyclopedic notes for the contained words as input. In this EU2/d, the context that listeners can utilize is the most relevant word or phrase compared to other lexical items in the speaker's input, namely the phrase clapping with one hand. RT emphasizes the assumption that it has become the inherent desire of listeners to prioritize information relevant to their goals and seek input that provides a high cognitive impact with minimal processing effort (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2019). Based on this EU2/d, the phrase "clapping with one hand" will provide the most relevant input. Listeners must interpret the phrase "clapping with one hand" by encoding this input to obtain the true meaning of Rahimah's speech in EU2/d.

Through RT, the analysis of understanding speakers' meanings based on encyclopedia entries will provide any relevant information about a lexical term, including its characteristics, nature, description, or relationships. This information can be obtained based on using the lexical term in previous communication situations or the speaker's experiences in using that term. In this EU2/d, the analysis of the speaker's true meaning is done by referring to all relevant information related to the phrase "clapping with one hand", whether in terms of a general description, circumstances, nature, or characteristics. The lexical term "clapping" based on its literal meaning refers to slapping both hands together to produce a sound as a sign of a particular situation. "One hand" means a part of a pair of hand. While "hand" refers to a body part located from the shoulder to the fingertips. Therefore, the phrase "clapping with one hand" literally means an action of slapping using a part of a pair of body parts located from the shoulder to the fingertips to produce a sound as a sign of a particular situation.

Although the input phrase "clapping with one hand" is considered a relevant input, understanding the meaning of EU2/d needs to be continued further because the meaning at this stage alone does not meet the relevant assumption of the listener and fails to fulfill the concept of cooperation. The speaker's intended meaning derived from this logical form also proves inadequate in fulfilling the conversational direction that is Rahimah's evaluation of Penghulu's statement. Consistent with the explanation by Langdon, Davies, and Coltheart, (2002), the form of logical expression alone is inadequate to explain the speaker's meaning, and an inferential process is required to understand the meaning comprehensively. In the context of EU2/d, the input information "clapping with one hand" can be strengthened with an encyclopedia note as a proverbial phrase.

Based on the cultural sharing within the Malay community, listeners can refer to dictionary information for the input "clapping with one hand", as one of the proverb used by the Malay community. The proverb "clapping with one hand" refers to a situation where someone's feelings of love are not reciprocated by the person they love. In RT, the interpretation of speech needs to reach the correct conclusion through easy processing effort. The process must be stopped once this relevant conclusion or assumption has been reached. Referring to this process, the listener understands that the input "clapping with one hand" will help the listener meet its relevant assumption if considering the proverb's meaning for "clapping with one hand".

Carston (2006) stated in RT that the mapping between concepts and words is considered incomplete because many words are unrelated to the concept or specific reference, such as proverbs, that cannot be understood through a one-to-one mapping between words and concepts. Human conceptualization also varies and is more diverse compared to the lexical concepts encoded by a particular word. In the exploitation EU2/d, the proverb "clapping with one hand" provides information that can help the listener interpret Rahimah's true meaning. The listener can expand the concept of "clapping with one hand" to "CLAPPING WITH ONE HAND*". Table 6 shows the encoded input "clapping with one hand".

Table 6
Encoding input "clapping with one hand".

If so, I am not clapping with one hand/CLAPPING WITH ONE HAND* as people say.	Clapping with one hand = an action of slapping using a part of a pair of body parts located from the shoulder to the fingertips to produce a sound as a sign of a particular situation.
	CLAPPING WITH ONE HAND*= someone's feelings of love are not reciprocated by the person they love.

Based on the RT comprehension procedure, if the listener considers the concept of "clapping with one hand", then the statement EU2/d only explains Rahimah's love situation not being reciprocated by Sulaiman, as people believed. Therefore, the interpretation process continues by examining other relevant contexts. The context that the listeners can utilize in this process involves referencing the context of the events. Based on the context of events, Rahimah loves Sulaiman and has never expressed her feelings of love. Rahimah also attempted suicide out of disappointment upon discovering Sulaiman's love for her sister, Halimah.

Another context that listeners can utilize is the cultural context of the Malay community. Rahimah experiences a sense of shame as a girl because she is driven by the Malay societal culture that emphasizes politeness. Furthermore, Rahimah's belief in Sulaiman's feelings can be seen as a context that provides additional information. Rahimah's belief that Sulaiman does not love her has led her to hide her feelings.

Furthermore, referring to the conversation context of EU2, EU2/d is Rahimah's response to Penghulu's question regarding the reason Rahimah did not express her feelings of love towards Sulaiman when she was saved during the suicide attempt. To explain the true meaning of EU2/d, listeners can connect the input and contexts to generate premises for the conclusion of meaning, as shown in Table 7 below:

Table 7

Premises for the Conclusion of the Meaning in EU2/d

Utterance	*If so, I am not clapping with one hand as people say.*
Logical Form	*If so, I am not* _____ (slapping using a part of a pair of body parts located from the shoulder to the fingertips to produce a sound as a sign of a certain situation) *as people say.*
Implicature Premises	i. If so, Rahimah is not CLAPPING WITH ONE HAND, as people say. ii. Rahimah states that if Sulaiman loves her, she is not clapping with one hand, as people say. iii. If Sulaiman also loves Rahimah, Rahimah's love is not unreciprocated, as people say. iv. If Rahimah believes Sulaiman does not love her, she is undoubtedly ashamed to express her feelings. v. Rahimah is ashamed to express her feelings because she believes Sulaiman does not have romantic feelings for her, strongly suggesting why Rahimah does not want to reveal the truth.
Implicature Conclusion	Rahimah does not want to tell the truth because she believes Sulaiman does not love her.

Based on the premise in Table 7, the listener can infer that the true meaning of EU2/d is that Rahimah does not want to tell the truth because she believes Sulaiman does not love her. This conclusion is relevant as it can be directly connected to the conversation's direction, which provides just enough information in response to Penghulu's question, as in EU2/a. The summary of Exploitation Utterance 2 is presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Summary of Exploitation Utterance 2

Utterance	Types of exploitation	Strategy	Conclusion of implicature
If so, I am not clapping with one hand as people say.	MQL	Providing false information	Rahimah does not want to tell the truth because she believes Sulaiman does not love her.

Exploitation Utterance 3: *Awang and Datuk Penghulu are the ones who committed betrayal.*

Table 9. Exploitation Utterance 3

EU3	a	Pemangku Raja	*Sungguhkah betul aduan-aduan itu Halimah? Adakah ini satu fitnah juga?*
			Are those accusations true, Halimah? Is this also a slander?
	b	Halimah	*Ampun Tuanku demi Allah yang menjadi saksi jika terlambat Datuk Panglima sampai, entahlah apa yang akan terjadi pada diri patik ini. **Awang dan Datuk Penghulu yang membuat khianat***

> Forgive me, Your Highness. By Allah as my witness, if Datuk Panglima arrives late, I don't know what will happen to me. **Awang and Datuk Penghulu are the ones who committed betrayal.**

Grice (1975) suggested that for effective communication, speakers must deliver relevant utterances according to the needs or direction of the conversation. Based on the conversation in Table 9, utterance EU3/b, "Awang and Datuk Penghulu are the ones who committed betrayal" is identified as an MRL exploitation because it is irrelevant to the conversation's direction and has the potential to fail in achieving effective communication. However, EU3/b did apply cooperative elements when Halimah provided sufficient context for the listener to obtain relevant information at the implicature conclusion stage.

In this conversation, the direction or intention of the conversation requires Halimah to provide feedback regarding whether the complaint received by the Pemangku Raja is an act of defamation, as outlined in EU3/a.

Despite Pemangku Raja clearly stating the intention of the conversation in EU3/a, Halimah acted by providing unrelated information to the conversation direction when stating the actions of Awang and Datuk Penghulu committing betrayal. Kleinke (2010) explained that the speaker exploited MRL through two conditions: 1) the speaker intends to change the direction of the conversation, or 2) the speaker does not provide feedback that can be linked to the direction of the conversation. Halimah's feedback in EU3/b meets characteristic condition 2, where the speaker does not provide relevant information to the listener, as Halimah did not provide relevant statements about whether the accusations are slanderous or not.

Based on EU3/b, Halimah was identified using the exploitation of MRL as a strategy to convey relevant information to the direction of the conversation. Halimah delivers EU3/b during interrogation in the trial of Awang and Datuk Penghulu, who are arrested on charges of kidnapping Halimah with the palace authorities represented by the Pemangku Raja. To connect the exploitation utterance EU3/b to the conversation's direction and subsequently comprehend the speaker's true intention, the audience needs to examine the literal content that will provide contextual information.

Based on the Relevance Theory (RT), a speaker will provide input that stimulates the listener's attention to the information they want to convey, thus fulfilling the speaker's intention (Morgan & Green, 1987). In line with Morgan & Green's (1987) explanation, Halimah has provided input that helps the listeners interpret the true meaning of the utterance, specifically through the use of the lexical term "betrayal". The term "betrayal" refers to a negative act involving deception to harm or have a negative impact on others. Through the use of the term "betrayal", listeners can refer to encyclopedic information to understand that the act of "betrayal" refers to malicious actions carried out by Awang and Datuk Penghulu against Halimah for specific purposes. Listeners can also encode this concept of 'betrayal' as the focal point in explaining the true meaning of Halimah's utterance.

The concept of "betrayal" can be narrowed down and referred to as the act of kidnapping. The listener can make inferences regarding the lexical term "betrayal" in EU3/b, which will subsequently refer to the act of kidnapping Halimah. This concept of "betrayal" can be narrowed down to "BETRAYAL*" and supplemented with information about the act of kidnapping Halimah. Here is the lexical input for "betrayal" that has been coded in a table form.

Table 10

Encoding input "betrayal"

Awang and Datuk Penghulu are the ones who committed betrayal/BETRAYAL*	Betrayal = negative act involving deception for the purpose of harming or having a negative impact on others
	BETRAYAL* = kidnapping Halimah

In this EU3/b, the listener recognizes the lexical term "betrayal" as an act of kidnapping Halimah. Referring to the contextual background, Awang and Datuk Penghulu were arrested for kidnapping Halimah out of vengeance. Therefore, this lexical term "betrayal" is relevant and can be confirmed as "BETRAYAL*".

However, suppose the interpretation of the meaning of EU3/b is based on the lexical explanation level. In that case, the lexical "betrayal" only provides information that Awang and Datuk Penghulu committed the act of kidnapping. The interpretation of meaning at this level alone still does not provide relevant contributions. It does not align with the assumption of sufficient contribution related to Pemangku Raja's question, as stated in EU3/a, "Is this also a slander?". The process of understanding meaning based on RT needs to be continued as long as the meaning at that level still does not fulfill the relevant assumptions of the listener (Gutt, 2014). Halimah's statement that Awang and Datuk Penghulu committed the kidnapping alone still does not meet the relevant assumptions of the listener. It does not comply with the assumption of sufficient contribution. Considering the explanation (Gutt, 2014), this comprehension process is further continued by examining the involved context in this utterance.

Through question EU3/a, Pemangku Raja requires a response from Halimah regarding whether the accusations against Awang and Datuk Penghulu are slanderous or not. Based on the given question, Halimah needs to respond directly, such as using phrases like "yes" or "no". However, Halimah answered the question by providing irrelevant information but guiding the listener toward the true meaning of her statement.

According to RT, the relevant assumption arises through the speaker's utterance, which will provide sufficient information to the listener, and the listener realizes the speaker's effort as an attempt to guide the listener to understand the speaker's true meaning (Brown, 1995). Therefore, the assumption that the exploitation utterance EU3/b is relevant to the listener can be seen through the context of the question, especially in the lexical input "slander". This is because according to Wilson and Sperber (2004), humans naturally select the most relevant input to themselves. Consequently, the listener's cognitive nature will also examine the question that will serve as the context of the previous utterance. The EU3/a question "Is this also a slander?" will provide a context for the previous utterance, and the listener can utilize the information in the lexical "slander".

"Slander" refers to an accusation or narrative created to create a negative perception of someone. Engaging in such slanderous acts can be described as a negative deed that causes distress to individuals due to fabricated accusations (Yaacob, Rasheed, Wahab, & Saidin, 2023). Within the context of the Malay community, nurtured by Islamic teachings, slander is a serious matter that is strongly prohibited, and those who commit it are considered sinful. In the context of EU3, Pemangku Raja is responsible for adjudicating and imposing punishment as an Islamic ruler, while Halimah is an individual practicing the Islamic faith.

Based on the cultural norms of the Malay community that recognize slander as a negative act, alongside the Islamic context that prohibits such behavior, speakers and listeners have shared information regarding "slander" and any related information about

"slander". Thus, the context of engaging in slander, an action prohibited by religion, can provide additional information to listeners to process the true meaning of EU3/b. Listeners can utilize this additional information by referring to environmental circumstances, any pre or post-utterance input, memories, culture, religion, or any shared common environment (Krauss & Fussell, 2014). Subsequently, this additional information will help listeners in interpreting the true meaning of the speaker's utterance. Therefore, through the shared environment, such as Islamic beliefs and Malay cultural values, implicature assumptions can be generated, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11
Premises for the Conclusion of the Meaning in EU3/b

Utterance	*Awang and Datuk Penghulu are the ones who committed betrayal.*
Logical Form	*Awang and Datuk Penghulu are the ones who committed _____ (act of kidnapping Halimah).*
Premises Implicature	i. Halimah states that Awang and Datuk Penghulu committed betrayal.
	ii. Halimah states that Awang and Datuk Penghulu kidnapped her
	iii. Halimah claims that Awang and Datuk Penghulu kidnapped her; Awang and Datuk Penghulu indeed committed the kidnapping.
	iv. Halimah admitting that Awang and Datuk Penghulu committed the kidnapping is a strong reason for the accusation not being slander.
Conclusion Implicature	The accusation against Awang and Datuk Penghulu is not a slander.

Based on the process of understanding the meaning of RT, cognitive effects or conclusions of exploitation utterance EU3/b can be achieved through the interconnection between input and context, not merely the input or context alone. This connection can be observed in the explanation by Wilson and Sperber (2004).

> The most important type of cognitive effect achieved by processing an input in a context is a CONTEXTUAL IMPLICATION, a conclusion deducible from the input and the context together but from neither input nor context alone.
>
> (Wilson & Sperber, 2004, 608)

Based on RT, the connection between input and context needs to be established to achieve cognitive effects. Through the input and the involved context, the conclusion can be drawn for EU3/b that the accusation against Awang and Datuk Penghulu is not slander. This cognitive effect is highly relevant and can be validated as it can be connected to the context of the utterance, which is Halimah's evaluation of the question posed to her in EU3/a.

The cognitive effect of this exploitation can also be confirmed with additional information obtained through previous utterances, such as in the statement "Forgive me, Your Highness. By Allah as my witness, if Datuk Panglima arrives late, I don't know what will happen to me". This statement contains additional information about the actions Awang and

Datuk Penghulu would take when kidnapping her, as mentioned in "I don't know what will happen to me". The additional information from these previous statements can serve as a reference and confirm the actions of Awang and Datuk Penghulu in kidnapping Halimah.

This information also reinforces the assumption that the accusation is not slander, considering the listeners can utilize the contextual encyclopedia by what is described as "slander". The listeners clearly understand that this "slander" refers to any act of fabricating false stories to malign the targeted individual. The implicature conclusion for the exploitation of EU3/b is also easily derived through a low-processing effort because the utterance conveyed by Halimah possesses high relevance.

The cognitive effect of Halimah's utterance exploitation EU3/b demonstrates her cooperative efforts by providing sufficient conversation contributions following the direction of the conversation. Despite Halimah's use of non-compliant utterance, her actions were not intended to hide information because she provided clear context and references to the listener, and this situation is known to the listener. This communicative action by Halimah has proven to comply with and implement cooperative aspects in the conversation, as she provided input that helps the listener generate consistent and sufficient conclusions in line with the conversation direction, specifically answering the question EU3/a.

In this EU3/b exploitation as well, Halimah's intention for her speech to be interpreted beyond the literal meaning is realized by the listener, and Halimah also provides adequate input and context for the listener to carry out this process. Table 12 further shows the summary of the EU3/b exploitation utterance.

Table 12
Summary of Exploitation Utterance 3

Utterance	Types of exploitation	Strategy	Conclusion of implicature
Awang and Datuk Penghulu are the ones who committed betrayal.	MRL	Providing irrelevant information to the conversation direction	The accusation against Awang and Datuk Penghulu is not a slander.

Exploitation Utterance 4: *Recite, my dear*
Table 13
Exploitation Utterance 4

EU4	a	Penghulu	*Bukanlah kerana itu aku leka tetapi itu, Mufti yang bermuka-muka dengan tipu muslihat, bertopengkan agama. Nanti pembalasannya akan tiba* It's not because of that I'm distracted, but it's the Mufti who is two-faced with deception, disguised in religion. His retribution will come.
	b	Penghulu's Wife	***Mengucaplah bang***. *Abang sudah terbabas dari fikiran yang waras* **Recite, my dear**. You have strayed from rational thinking.

According to Table 13, there is the use of utterance that does not meet the assumption of natural human communication desires. Exploitation utterance is identified when the

Penghulu's Wife delivers vague and unclear utterances regarding the conversation's direction, as detailed in EU4/b. Grice (1989) explains that speakers should convey clear and not ambiguous utterances. Emphasizing the delivery of clear conversational contributions is one of MMN's guidelines. Although EU4/b is an unclear utterance and does not adhere to rational communication guidelines, Penghulu's Wife has provided sufficient input and context to help listeners draw conclusions that fulfill the conversation's requirements. This situation makes EU4/b identifiable as an MMN exploitation.

Based on Table 13, EU4/b is delivered by the Penghulu's Wife in response to the Penghulu expressing his anger towards the Mufti and intending to seek revenge, as stated in EU4/a. Penghulu's Wife's statement is viewed as an unclear conversational contribution as it merely requests the Penghulu to perform an action, that is, to recite. To explain the real meaning of Penghulu's Wife, this unclear statement needs to undergo an interpretation process to derive a conclusion that aligns with the direction of the conversation.

This interpretation process is carried out by focusing on the lexical input of "recite". The listener can utilize the concepts encoded within "recite" and thereby assist in concluding implicatures that arise from this MMN exploitation. The lexical meaning of "recite" needs to be clarified in its literal sense initially to obtain any references, characteristics, or information that will serve as the context.

Based on the encyclopedia entry, the term "recite" refers to the action of either reciting the two Shahadah phrases or uttering specific words. However, in this context within EU4/b, the listener will discard the assumption of the second meaning as it is less relevant than the first. According to RT, humans are equipped with a relevance concept that enables them to differentiate and select more relevant information over less relevant ones for themselves. In the conversation scenario of EU4, the first meaning is deemed more relevant and connected to the contextual background of the lexical use of "recite".

In the usage by speakers who are Muslims, the lexical term "recite" is used to refer to the act of reciting the declaration of faith (shahadah). The customary use of the lexical term "recite" among Malay speakers provides cultural context that serves as one of the indicators of the true meaning of EU4/b. The concept of "recite" can be narrowed down to "RECITE*" where information regarding the recitation or pronunciation of the declaration of faith will be included in this concept. The following is a conceptual determination table for the lexical term "recite".

Table 14
Encoding input "recite"

Recite/RECITE*, my dear.	Recite = to the action of either reciting the two Shahadah phrases or uttering specific words
	RECITE* = reciting the two Shahadah phrases

An explanation of the logical form of the concept "recite" is still found not to meet the assumption of effective conversational contributions and does not conclude the true meaning of the speaker's utterance. The listener will continue the process of interpreting EU4/b as long as the precise conclusion has not been reached by examining potentially relevant contexts in this EU4/b utterance. The relevant context to be utilized in this process is the context of Islamic religion.

In Islam, there is a declaration of belief or statement of faith in the One God and the Prophet Muhammad as His messenger. This declaration is known as reciting the Shahadah or

uttering the testimony of faith. Uttering this declaration is also one of the pillars of Islam. Within the context of the Islamic faith, this statement not only signifies a belief but serves as a reminder that Allah, the Almighty, reigns over everything (Ali, 1975). This belief aids Muslims in placing their highest hopes and trust in Allah, seeking His assistance in times of difficulty, distress, or anger (Rassool, 2015). Hodge and Nadir (2008) state that there is a strong connection between religious belief and how a person handles their emotions. For Muslims, reciting the Shahadah is an effective way to control anger.

Furthermore, based on reference to the background context, this conversation took place after the punishment for the Penghulu's son, who was accused of adultery, was executed. Penghulu's Wife's statement was delivered upon learning that the Penghulu was angry because of his son's punishment. Through the context of the Islamic religion regarding the concept of "recite" and the background of the conversation, listeners can infer that "recite" in EU4/b refers to the act of "RECITE*" which will also enhance the information that the act of reciting the declaration of faith can pacify the heart and help control emotions and thoughts. To generate this cognitive effect of EU4/b, several implicature assumptions can be formed, as shown in Table 15.

Table 15
Premises for the Conclusion of the Meaning in EU4/b

Utterance	*Recite, my dear.*
Logical Form	_____ (Reciting the two Shahadah phrases)*, my dear.*
Premises Implicature	i. Penghulu's Wife asks the Penghulu to recite.
	ii. Penghulu's Wife asks Penghulu to recite the two shahadah phrases.
	iii. Penghulu's Wife asks Penghulu to recite the two shahadah phrases when Penghulu expresses his anger.
	iv. Reciting the shahadah phrases can help someone control their emotions.
	v. If the act of reciting the shahadah phrases aims to control emotions, surely Penghulu's Wife does not want Penghulu to act based on those emotions.
	vi. Penghulu's Wife asks Penghulu to control his emotions when Penghulu expresses his anger, strengthening the conclusion that Penghulu's Wife does not want Penghulu to act driven by angry emotions.
Conclusion Implicature	Penghulu's Wife prohibits Penghulu from taking actions driven by anger.

Through the process of understanding meaning based on the RT procedure, the premise of implicature that has been generated can contribute to the true conclusion of the exploitation utterance EU4/b. By establishing a connection between the input and the context, the conclusion of the utterance exploiting the effective conversational guide of MMN is that the Penghulu's Wife prohibits Penghulu from seeking revenge against the Mufti.

The resulting conclusion holds high relevance as it can be linked to the direction or topic of the conversation that requires Penghulu's Wife to respond to the Penghulu's angry statements and desire for revenge, as seen in EU4/a "His retribution will come". This

conclusion can also be validated as the true speaker's meaning as it relates to the Penghulu's Wife evaluation of the Penghulu's intentions within the context.

The cognitive effect can also be reinforced by subsequent statements that will provide additional information regarding the speaker's state of mind. Penghulu's Wife states "You have strayed from rational thinking" will provide information about the Penghulu's irrational thinking. This information reinforces the assumption regarding the Penghulu's Wife judgment that Penghulu's intention of seeking revenge is not an act of a rational-minded person.

In this EU4/b, the context has been adequately provided by the speaker, resulting in a high cognitive effect. This condition leads to an easy processing efforts and comprehension by the listener. The use of this exploitation utterance has proven to effectively convey the speaker's intended meaning. The following table summarizes the interpretation of the meaning of EU4/b.

Table 16
Summary of Exploitation Utterance 4

Utterance	Types of exploitation	Strategy	Conclusion of implicature
Recite, my dear	MMN	Providing unclear information	Penghulu's Wife prohibits Penghulu from seeking revenge against the Mufti.

Conclusions

The analysis of the dialogue in the film "Lampong Karam" demonstrates the diversity of utterances the speakers exploit. Each exploitation carried out by these speakers aims to achieve effective communication by utilizing effective implicatures. These resulting implicatures represent the true intentions of the speakers, which cannot be solely derived from the literal meanings. Particularly among the Malay community, speakers are observed to manipulate human natural inclinations when conveying information or messages adeptly. They employ various strategies tailored to their intentions, whether conveying untrue, excessive, irrelevant, or ambiguous information. While speakers may not employ an effective conversational contribution structure in their literal expressions, listeners are aware of this because they craft their utterances in a manner comprehensible to the listener, enabling the listener to connect with the context to attain the true meaning intended by the speakers.

Corresponding Author
Norhidayu Hasan
Centre of Malay Language and Communication Studies, Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, 21300 Gong Badak, Terengganu, Malaysia
Email: norhidayuhasan@unisza.edu.my

References
Ayunon, C. (2018). Gricean Maxims Revisited in FB Conversation Posts: Its Pedagogical Implications. *TESOL International Journal, 13,* 82-95.
Ali, A. Y. (1975). *The Glorious Quran: translation and commentary*. eduright4all.
Brown, G. (1995). Speakers, listeners and communication: Explorations in discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press.

Brumark, Å. (2006). Non-Observance Of Gricean Maxims In Family Dinner Table Conversation. *Journal Of Pragmatics, 38*(8), 1206–1238. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Pragma.2005.03.014

Carston, R. (2013). Legal Texts And Canons Of Construction. A View From Current Pragmatic Theory. *Law And Language: Current Legal Issues*, *15*, 8-33.

Carston, R. (2006). Relevance theory and the saying/implicating distinction. *The handbook of pragmatics*, 633-656.

Chapman, S. (2005). *Paul Grice: Philosopher and Linguist*. Springer.

Canli, M. (2021). Violation of Grice's Maxims and its Effect on the Conversational Structure and Plot Development of Ishiguro's Never Let Me Go. *Eurasian Journal of English Language and Literature, 3*(2), 386-394.

Chen, J., & Zhang, Y. (2020). A Study of Conversational Implicature in the Movie "Flipped" Based On Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle. *International Journal of Social Science and Economics Invention*, *6*(09), 239 to 241. https://doi.org/10.23958/ijssei/vol06-i09/229

Davies, B. L. (2006). Testing Dialogue Principles In Task-Oriented Dialogues: An Exploration Of Cooperation, Collaboration, Effort And Risk. *Leeds Working Papers In Linguistics And Phonetics*, *11*, 30-64

Dynel, M. (2013). Being Cooperatively (Im) Polite: Grice's Model In The Context of (Im) Politeness Theories. *Research Trends In Intercultural Pragmatics*, 16, 55-83.

Echterhoff, G., Higgins, E. T., & Levine, J. M. (2009). Shared reality: Experiencing commonality with others' inner states about the world. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*(5), 496-521.

Elmahady, O, R. M., Subaiah, S., & Mohammed, S. B. A. (2022). Investigating the Importance of Conversational Implicature and Violation of Maxims in Daily Conversations. *Arab World English Journal, 13* (2) 109-122. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.8

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies In The Way Of Words*. Harvard University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic And Conversation. In P. Cole And J. Morgan (Eds) *Studies In Syntax And Semantics Iii: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, Pp. 183-98

Gutt, E. A. (2014). *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context*. Routledge.

Haq, Z., & Isnaeni, M. (2021). Analysis of Ethics in Speech Criticism on Facebook: Grice's Cooperative Principles. In *Proceedings of the International Conference of Learning on Advance Education (ICOLAE 2021)* (Pp. 781-787). Atlantis Press.

Hodge, D. R., & Nadir, A. (2008). Moving toward culturally competent practice with Muslims: Modifying cognitive therapy with Islamic tenets. *Social work*, *53*(1), 31-41.

Jalaludin. N. H., & Awal, N. M. (2006). Citra Lelaki Dulu Dan Kini Dalam Prosa Melayu: Analisis Teori Relevans. *E-Bangi: Jurnal Sains Sosial Dan Kemanusiaan*, *1*(1), 1-21.

Kleinke, S. (2010). Speaker activity and Grice's maxims of conversation at the interface of pragmatics and cognitive linguistics. *Journal of pragmatics*, *42*(12), 3345-3366.

Krauss, R. M., & Fussell, S. R. (2014). Mutual knowledge and communicative effectiveness. In Intellectual teamwork (pp. 125-160). Psychology Press.

Kreuz, R., & Roberts, R. (2019). *Changing minds: how aging affects language and how language affects aging*. Mit Press.

Langdon, R., Davies, M., & Coltheart, M. (2002). Understanding minds and understanding communicated meanings in schizophrenia. Mind & Language, 17(1-2), 68-104.

Locher, M. A., & Jucker, A. H. (2017). *Pragmatics Of Fiction*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter Gmbh & Co Kg.

Lokman, M. N., & Sarbini-Zin, M. (2019). Perlanggaran Maksim Kerjasama (Kualiti Dan Kuantiti) Dalam Ucapan Bajet Tahunan Dato' Sri Najib Razak: Sebuah Kajian Pragmatik. *Asian People Journal (APJ), 2*(1), 95-105. Retrieved from https://journal.unisza.edu.my/apj/index.php/apj/article/view/92

Lyden, J. (Ed.). (2009). *The Routledge Companion To Religion And Film*. Routledge.

Mazzone, M. (2018). *Cognitive Pragmatics: Mindreading, Inferences, Consciousness* (Vol. 20). Walter De Gruyter Gmbh & Co Kg.

Moore, R. (2018). Gricean Communication, Joint Action, And The Evolution Of Cooperation. *Topoi*, *37*(2), 329-341

Mooney, A. (2004). Co-Operation, Violations And Making Sense. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, *36*(5), 899-920.

Morgan, J. L., & Green, G. M. (1987). On the search for relevance. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *10*(4), 726-727.

Mirivel, J. C. (2015). Cooperative Principle. In *The International Encyclopedia Of Language And Social Interaction* (Eds K. Tracy, T. Sandel And C. Ilie). Doi:10.1002/9781118611463.Wbielsi126

Németh, E. (2004). The Principles Of Communicative Language Use. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica (Since 2017 Acta Linguistica Academica)*, *51*(3-4), 379-418.

Oeberst, A., & Moskaliuk, J. (2016). Classic Conversational Norms In Modern Computer-Mediated Collaboration. *Journal Of Educational Technology & Society*, *19*(1), 187-198.

Poggi, F. (2016). Grice, The Law And The Linguistic Special Case Thesis. In *Pragmatics And Law* (Pp. 231-248). Springer, Cham.

Qassemi, M., Ziabari, R. & Kheirabadi. R. (2018). Grice's Cooperative Principles in News Reports of Tehran Times- A Descriptive-Analytical Study. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies. 6*(1).66-74.

Rassool, G. H. (2015). *Islamic counselling: An introduction to theory and practice*. Routledge.

Rasool, S., Zahra, T., & Khawar Z. (2019). An Investigation of Grice's Cooperative Principle in an Interview with Ishaq Dar: A Pragmatic Analysis. *Kashmir Journal Of Language Research, 25*(2).

Senft, G. (2008). The Case: The Trobriand Islanders Vs Hp Grice. Kilivila And The Gricean Maxims Of Quality And Manner. *Anthropos*, 139-147.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance: Communication and Cognition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sial. (2019). Grice Cooperative principles in Kabul times," *Journal of Research Initiatives*: Vol. 4: Iss. 2, Article 10.

Szczepanski, P. (2015). Flouting The Maxims In Scripted Speech : An Analysis Of Flouting The Maxims Of Conversation In The Television Series Firefly (Dissertation). Retrieved From Http://Urn.Kb.Se/Resolve?Urn=Urn:Nbn:Se:Kau:Diva-38455

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance theory. In Horn, L. & Ward, G. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (Pp. 607-632). Oxford: Blackwell

Wharton, T. (2008). "Meaning Nn " And "Showing": Gricean Intentions And Relevance-Theoretic Intentions. *Intercultural Pragmatics - Intercult Pragmat. 5*. 131-152. 10.1515/Ip.2008.008.

Yaacob, N. I. M., Rasheed, N. A., Wahab, N. S. A., & Saidin, M. (2023). Terjemahan Hadis Isyarat Mesra OKU Pendengaran: Hadis Larangan menyebarkan Fitnah.